

The evaluation of protein folding rate constant is improved by predicting the folding kinetic order with a SVM-based method

Emidio Capriotti, Rita Casadio

Biocomputing Group,

Dept of Biology/CIRB University of Bologna, ITALY

e-mail: emidio@biocomp.unibo.it

Abstract

Protein folding is a problem of large interest since it concerns the mechanism by which the genetic information is translated into proteins with well defined three-dimensional (3D) structures and functions. Recent data on protein folding suggest that several pathologies such as prion and Alzheimer diseases may be due to change in protein stability during folding processes. Recently theoretical models have been developed to predict the protein folding rate considering the relationships of the process with topological parameters derived from the native (atomic-solved) protein structures. Previous works classified proteins in two different groups exhibiting either a single-exponential or a multi-exponential folding kinetics. It is well known that these two classes of proteins are related to different protein structural features. The increasing number of available experimental kinetic data allows the application to the problem of a machine learning approach, in order to predict the kinetic order of the folding process starting from the experimental data so far collected. This information can be used to improve the prediction of the folding rate.

In this work first we describe a support vector machine-based method (SVM-KO) to predict for a given protein the kinetic order of the folding process. Using this method we can classify correctly 78% of the folding mechanisms over a set of 63 experimental data. Secondly we focus on the prediction of the logarithm of the folding rate. This value can be obtained as a linear regression task with a SVM-based method. In this paper we show that linear correlation of the predicted with experimental data can improve when the regression task is computed over two different sets, instead of one, each of them composed by the proteins with a correctly predicted two state or multistate kinetic order.

Keywords: folding kinetics, kinetic order, folding rate, machine learning, support vector machine, contact order.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the last years, many theoretical and experimental studies have focused on the problem of describing the mechanism of protein folding [1–7]. An important result was the development of empirical models that estimate protein folding kinetics and rates. The number of proteins under investigation is rapidly increasing, allowing more data to be collected. Many proteins fold by a simple two-state transition mechanism (TS), lacking observable folding intermediates under any experimental condition. In turn, other proteins are endowed with intermediates during the folding process; their folding process is therefore classified as a multistate one (MS).

Experimental and theoretical work focused particularly on small two-state folding (TS) proteins. It was demonstrated that the logarithm of the in-water folding rates of these proteins correlates with some topological parameter as computed from their 3D structure or from that of closely related proteins, such as single point mutants or homologs with high level of sequence identity [1, 8, 9]. Other methods predict protein folding rates starting from the Einstein diffusion equation [10] or from the secondary structure of the protein [11]. More recent work demonstrated that the chain length is one of the main determinants of the folding rate for proteins with a multistate folding (MS) kinetics [12, 13]. As a general observation, it appears that the logarithm of the folding rate correlates with structural topological parameters in TS proteins and with chain length in MS proteins. In this paper we adopt a different perspective: we use the experimental data so far collected and, based on these observations, we develop a method to predict salient aspects of protein folding that can be directly computed starting from the protein structure.

2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

The problem here addressed concerns the kinetics and mechanism of the protein folding: starting from few simple parameters derived from the protein structure, the aim is to predict important features of the folding mechanism. In particular we implement a support vector machine (SVM)-based method trained over a set of 63 proteins known with atomic resolution and whose folding pathway has been experimentally characterized to predict the logarithm

of the folding rate and whether the protein folds through intermediate states or not.

2.1 Database and Tools

Our data set is derived from the supplementary material of [13]. It contains folding data determined for 63 proteins, 38 of which are endowed with a TS folding mechanism. The other 25 proteins have a MS folding mechanism. The set comprises only single-domain proteins having no S-S bonds and/or no covalently bound ligands. When necessary, we generate two different sets (TS1 and MS1) including only those proteins correctly predicted with the corresponding folding mechanisms (TS1 comprises 34 proteins and MS1 15 proteins).

The in-water folding rates (k_f) and native structure of these proteins have been established experimentally. The protein structure were collected from the Protein Data Bank (www.pdb.org) [14].

The method proposed here predicts some features of the protein folding process using a SVM approach. In particular we choose the LIBSVM tools available online at the web site <http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvmtools/>.

The protein secondary structure was calculated with the DSSP program (<http://www.cmbi.kun.nl/gv/dssp/> [15]).

Sequence clustering was performed by means of the *blastclust* program available within the BLAST suite at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/> [16].

2.2 Protein structural parameters

In order to investigate the relationships between the folding rate constant and the protein native conformation we evaluate four structure-based parameters. The first parameter is the effective length of the protein chain (L_{eff}) defined as

$$L_{eff} = L - L_H + 3 * N_H \quad (1)$$

where L is the chain length, L_H is the number of residues in helical conformation and N_H is the number of helices. The others topological parameters are: the contact order (CO),

$$CO = \frac{1}{NN_c} \sum_{k=1}^{N_c} \Delta L_{ij} \quad (2)$$

the absolute contact order

$$CO = \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_{k=1}^{N_c} \Delta L_{ij} \quad (3)$$

and the total contact distance

$$TCD = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{k=1}^{N_c} \Delta L_{ij} \quad (4)$$

where N is the number of amino acid residues of a protein, N_c is defined as total number of contacts and $\Delta L_{ij} = |i-j|$.

The number of contacts is evaluated considering all the residues that have two heavy atoms within a given value of cut-off radius R and at a given sequence separation (w).

2.3 The predictor

The method addresses two different tasks: (1) the prediction of the existence of intermediate states in protein folding and (2) the prediction of the logarithm of the folding rate value. The former case is a classification task, discriminating whether for a given protein the folding pathway is or is not endowed with intermediate states; the latter one in turn is a fitting-regression task for estimating the folding rate. To address the two tasks, we developed a method based on support vector machines and relying on the same input for testing different kernel functions. Also, different SVMs explore different protein features. SVMs take two inputs for a given protein: the chain length and, one at a time, the four structured-based parameters described above (Eqn 1-4). We found that the best performing predictor was the one having as input the protein chain length and the contact order, tested by splitting the dataset in five parts and adopting a cross-validation procedure. The methods were then optimized trying different values of cut-off radius (R) and of sequence separation (w).

In the final section of our work we focus our attention on the 49 proteins that are correctly classified as TS and MS proteins. According to the protein kinetic order we split the dataset in two subsets, composed by 34 TS proteins and 15 MS proteins, respectively. We show that when linear regression fitting is performed on the two sets independently, the prediction of the logarithm of the folding rate is largely improved (see below).

2.4 Scoring the classification performance

All the results obtained with our systems are scored using a cross-validation procedure on the data pertaining to the 63 proteins. The dataset was divided in 5 subsets, putting in the same set proteins with the same PDB code and proteins with related sequences, as obtained by means of the *blastclust* program, by adopting the default value of length coverage equal to 0.9 and the score coverage threshold equal to 1.75.

The efficiency of the predictor is scored using the statistical indexes defined in the following. The overall accuracy is:

$$Q2 = \frac{p}{N} \quad (5)$$

where p is the total number of correctly predicted folding mechanisms and N is the total number of proteins.

The Matthews correlation coefficient MC is defined as:

$$MC(s) = \frac{p(s)n(s) - u(s)o(s)}{D} \quad (6)$$

where D is the normalization factor $[[p(s)+u(s)] [p(s)+o(s)] [n(s)+u(s)] [n(s)+o(s)]]^{1/2}$, for each class s (TS and MS, for two-state and multistate folding processes, respectively); p(s) and n(s) are the total number of correct predictions and correctly rejected assignments, respectively, and u(s) and o(s) are the numbers of under and over predictions.

Finally, it is very important to assign a reliability score to each SVM prediction. Using one SVM output this is obtained by computing:

$$Rel(i) = 20 * abs [O(i) - 0.5] \quad (7)$$

2.5 Scoring the regression performance

The quality of the prediction when evaluating the protein folding constant rates was assessed by computing the Pearson linear correlation coefficient r and the associated value of the standard error σ .

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to solve the tasks discussed in section 2.3 we developed different support vector machines. Taking advantage of previous studies, each of the SVMs considers two important protein features: (1) sequence length and (2) the four structural parameters described above. The best performing predictor was then optimized testing different values of cut-off radius (R), different sequence separation values (w) and different kernel functions. We found that the best performance was achieved by a SVM endowed with a linear kernel function $K(x_i, x_j) = x_i^T x_j$ (data not shown).

3.1 Structural parameter optimization

Previous studies have highlighted in proteins the correlation between folding kinetics and structural parameters as described in section 2.2 [6, 8, 9, 13]. Table I lists the scoring performance of each method when predicting the logarithm of the folding rate and the folding kinetics.

3.2 Optimization of the cut-off radius

The results shown in Table I indicate that the best SVM method has as input the sequence length and the contact order (see column CO). For this method we tested different values of the cut-off radius. In Table II (see next page), the scoring indexes for the two previous tasks are shown as a function of the radius value ranging from 4 to 12 Å.

Structural Parameter		L_{eff}	CO	ACO	TCD
Prediction of	MC	0.15	0.42	0.27	0.36
Folding States	Q2	57.1	73.2	65.9	69.8
Prediction of	r	0.45	0.64	0.45	0.63
$\log(k_f)$	σ	1.57	1.39	1.57	1.37

TABLE I: **Scoring the SVM method.** The first two rows list the accuracy (Q2) and the Matthew’s correlation coefficient (MC) of the four methods that include in the SVM input one of the different structural parameters and the sequence length. The four SVMs labeled with the name of the relative structural parameter, are tested in the binary classification between two-state (TS) and multistate (MS) folding mechanism. In the last two rows the correlation coefficient (r) and the standard error (σ) of the previous methods for the prediction of the logarithm of the folding rate (k_f) are reported.

Cut-off radius (\AA)		4	6	9	12
Prediction of	MC	0.42	0.31	0.48	0.40
Folding States	Q2	73.2	67.1	75.6	72.0
Prediction of	r	0.64	0.61	0.65	0.64
$\log(k_f)$	σ	1.39	1.44	1.35	1.38

TABLE II: **Scoring SVMs as a function of the cut-off radius.** Here the method takes as input protein sequence length and contact order. The last structural parameter is calculated using a cut-off radius ranging from 4 to 12 \AA . The first two rows list the quality of the prediction in the classification task; the last two rows show the quality of the prediction of the logarithm of the folding rate (k_f).

3.3 Sequence separation optimization

When considering the protein folding mechanism, an important issue is the different contribution of local and non-local interactions. It is well known that local interactions involved in the formation of particular motifs of secondary structure are established between

Windows Length		0	2	4	6	8
Prediction of	MC	0.48	0.50	0.46	0.53	0.42
Folding States	Q2	75.6	76.1	74.6	77.7	73.1
Prediction of	r	0.65	0.60	0.61	0.58	0.60
log(k_f)	σ	1.35	1.52	1.29	1.45	1.41

TABLE III: **Local vs global interactions.** In this table we report the accuracy of the best methods (cut-off radii 9 Å) for different values of a sequence separation (w), spanning from 0 to 8 residues, when evaluating the contact order number. In other words, we consider only contact between residue i and j provided that $|i-j| > w$. The efficiency of the predictions for the two tasks are scored using the same measures reported in Table I.

residues with a sequence separation below 4 residues that is approximately the span length of one turn of an α -helix structure. Therefore, by increasing the value of w in the calculation of CO, we should encompass local interactions and include also contacts between residues that may contribute to non-local interactions during the folding process. We address this task by evaluating the contact order as a function of sequence separation; the best performing implementation of SVMs was consequently optimized and the results are shown in Table III.

3.4 Prediction of the folding mechanism.

From our results we conclude that the best method for the binary classification between the two-state and the multistate folding mechanism takes as input the sequence length and the contact order. The best discrimination between TS and MS proteins is obtained when the contact order value is calculated considering a cut-off radius of 9 Å and a sequence separation >6 residues. In figure 1 we report the accuracy (Q2) and the Matthew’s correlation coefficient (MC) as a function of the reliability index (RI).

3.5 Prediction of the logarithm of the folding rate

Similar to the classification task, the regression task for the prediction of the logarithm of the folding rate is optimized considering as input the sequence length and the contact




FIG. 1: Accuracy (Q2) and Matthew's correlation coefficient (MC) as a function of the reliability index (RI). DB is the fraction of the dataset with a reliability value higher or equal to a given threshold.

order. The results of our method are shown in figure 2.

3.6 Improving the prediction of folding rate

Can we discriminate between two-state and multistate proteins when predicting the folding rate constant? In other words can we relate the folding rate constant to the protein structural features? To address this problem we selected from the dataset only those proteins for which our predictor correctly evaluates the kinetic order (49 proteins over 63 in the whole set) and we compute the linear regression between calculated and experimental folding rate for each of the two folding types. In figure 3 we report the regression plot calculated over the 34 that are correctly predicted as TS proteins.

In the figure 4 the last procedure was performed for the 15 correctly predicted MS proteins. It appears that both the slope and the intercept are different, depending on the




FIG. 2: Value of the logarithm of the folding rate (k_f) versus its experimental value. The correlation coefficient for the best method previously described is 0.65 and the standard error is 1.35. We also reported the equation of the linear best fit.

protein folding type, and that the correlation coefficient and standard error are better when each folding type is considered separately than when accumulated.

4 CONCLUSION

This work represents a first attempt to address the problem of the prediction of the folding mechanism using a machine learning approach. In particular we try to predict whether the folding process follows a two-state or a multistate mechanism and the logarithm of the folding rate considering only few simple inputs: the length of the protein sequence and the contact order, as calculated according to the eq. (2). This is the first time, at the best of our knowledge, that a statistical evaluation of the problem is provided. We optimize our method considering different values of the cut-off radius and introducing a sequence separation for the calculation of the contact order (CO) from the protein structure, in order to




FIG. 3: Value of the logarithm of the folding rate (k_f) versus its experimental value for correctly predicted TS proteins. The correlation coefficient is 0.84 and the standard error is 0.90. We also reported the equation of the linear best fit. These values are calculated on the subset of 34 over 39 correctly predicted TS proteins.

discriminate local versus non local interactions. Our approach allows to generalize on the given examples since it is tested adopting a cross-validation procedure. We find that the best predictive performance is achieved when the value of the contact order is calculated using a cut-off radii of 9 Å and a sequence separation larger or equal to 6, suggesting that non local more than local interactions are important in determining the parameters at hand for the given protein set.

With our method the prediction of possible intermediate states during the folding process reaches accuracy of 78% with a significant Matthew's correlation coefficient of 0.53. Furthermore, when predictions with a reliability index value =3 are considered, the SVM method increases its accuracy to 85% and its correlation to 0.66 over 75% of the database. Results in Tab. 2 indicate that for discriminating between TS and MS folding mechanisms, contacts between residues with sequence separation >6 are important. In turn, for predicting the




FIG. 4: Value of the logarithm of the folding rate (k_f) versus its experimental value for correctly predicted TS proteins. The correlation coefficient is 0.79 and the standard error is 0.89. We also reported the equation of the linear best fit. These values are calculated on the subset of 15 over 25 correctly predicted MS proteins.

value of the logarithm of the folding rate the highest score is obtained considering all the contacts. On the contrary, with respect to the classification between TS and MS proteins, the regression task for the prediction of the logarithm of k_f , performs better when local and non local interactions are considered taking also into account contacts with sequence separation less or equal then 6. In this particular task our best method reaches a significant correlation coefficient of 0.65 with a related standard error of 1.35. These values can be considered satisfactory, since they are obtained with only two element vectors as input in the training of the SVM and since the method is tested using a cross-validation procedure. In order to improve the prediction of the logarithm of the folding rate in the last part of this work we developed a new method that use the two different linear regression calculated over two subsets. The two sets are built starting from the 63 proteins and selecting the 34 proteins with correctly predicted TS kinetic and the 15 proteins with correctly predicted

MS kinetic. On this set of 49 proteins data the linear regression fit calculated between experimental and predicted logarithm of k_f is 0.74 and the standard error is 1.25. The subsequent division of the database in predicted TS and MS proteins leads to an increase of the correlation between experimental and predicted logarithm of k_f . The obtained values are 0.84 when the regression fitting is performed on the 34 correctly predicted TS proteins and 0.79 when the regression fitting is calculated over the 15 predicted MS proteins, respectively. Similarly, a general decrease of the standard error that reaches a mean value of about 0.90 is noticed.

In spite of the fact that the SVM predicts incorrectly 22% of the folding kinetic order values, the new method allows us to improve the efficacy in the evaluation of the folding rate. The results confirm the hypothesis that the folding rate of TS and MS are a function of the same protein structural features (protein length and contact order). However the relative weight of their contribution to the overall rate constant may be different for the two folding types. This work represents to our knowledge the first attempt to predict the folding protein type from sequence length and contact order, as computed from the protein structure. Furthermore we can also predict the folding rate constant. This value is better correlated to experimental values when the two folding protein types are considered separately, suggesting that sequence length and contact order interplay differently as a function of the protein folding type. Although the number of available experiments is not so high this research suggests some ideas and a general procedure to investigate the kinetic of the protein folding.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by following grants: PNR 2001-2003 (FIRB art. 8) and PNR 2003 project (FIRB art. 8) on Bioinformatics for Genomics and Proteomics and LIBI-Laboratorio Internazionale di Bioinformatica, both delivered to RC. EC is supported by a grant of the European Union VI Framework Programme to the Bologna Node of the Biosapiens Network of Excellence project.

-
- [1] S. E. Jackson, *Fold Des* **3**, R81 (1998).
 - [2] K. W. Plaxco, K. T. Simons, and D. Baker, *J Mol Biol* **227**, 985 (1998).
 - [3] A. R. Fersht, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **97**, 1525 (2000).
 - [4] S. Gianni, N. R. Guydosh, F. Khan, T. D. Caldas, U. Mayor, G. W. N. White, M. L. DeMarco, V. Daggett, and A. R. Fersht, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **100**, 13286 (2003).
 - [5] M. Compiani, E. Capriotti, and R. Casadio, *Phys Rev E Stat Nonlin Soft Matter Phys* **69**, 051905 (2004).
 - [6] K. W. Plaxco, K. T. Simons, I. Ruczinski, and D. Baker, *Biochemistry* **39**, 11177 (2000).
 - [7] S. O. Garbuzynskiy, A. V. Finkelstein, and O. V. Galzitskaya, *J Mol Biol* **336**, 509 (2004).
 - [8] H. Zhou and Y. Zhou, *Biophys J* **82**, 458 (2002).
 - [9] D. N. Ivankov, S. O. Garbuzynskiy, E. Alm, K. W. Plaxco, D. Baker, and A. V. Finkelstein, *Protein Sci.* **12**, 2057 (2003).
 - [10] D. A. Debe and W. A. Goddard, *J Mol Biol* pp. 619–625. (1999).
 - [11] H. Gong, D. G. Isom, R. Srinivasan, and G. D. Rose, *J Mol Biol* **327**, 1149 (2003).
 - [12] O. V. Galzitskaya, S. O. Garbuzynskiy, D. N. Ivankov, and A. V. Finkelstein, *Proteins* **51**, 162 (2003).
 - [13] D. N. Ivankov and A. V. Finkelstein, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **101**, 8942 (2004).
 - [14] H. M. Berman, J. Westbrook, Z. Feng, G. Gilliland, T. N. Bhat, H. Weissig, I. N. Shindyalov, and P. E. Bourne, *Nucleic Acids Res* **28**, 235 (2000).
 - [15] W. Kabsch and C. Sander, *Biopolymers* **22**, 2577 (1983).
 - [16] S. F. Altschul, T. L. Madden, A. A. Shaffer, J. Zhang, Z. Zhang, W. Miller, and D. I. Lipman, *Nucleic Acids Res* **25**, 3389 (1997).