Supplementary information

De novo design of protein interactions with learned surface fingerprints

In the format provided by the authors and unedited

Supplemental Material

De novo design of protein interactions with learned surface fingerprints

Pablo Gainza^{*1,†}, Sarah Wehrle^{*1}, Alexandra Van Hall-Beauvais^{*1}, Anthony Marchand^{*1}, Andreas Scheck*¹, Zander Harteveld^{#1}, Stephen Buckley^{#1}, Dongchun Ni^{#2}, Shuguang Tan^{#3}, Freyr Sverrisson¹, Casper Goverde¹, Priscilla Turelli⁴, Charlène Raclot⁴, Alexandra Teslenko⁵, Martin Pacesa¹, Stéphane Rosset¹, Sandrine Georgeon¹, Jane Marsden¹, Aaron Petruzzella⁶, Kefang Liu³, Martin Pacesa¹, Zepeng Xu³, Yan Chai³, Pu Han³, George F. Gao³, Elisa Oricchio⁶, Beat Fierz⁵, Didier Trono⁴, Henning Stahlberg², Michael Bronstein^{7,6}, Bruno E. Correia^{1,6}

- 1. Laboratory of Protein Design and Immunoengineering, School of Life Sciences, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, and Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Lausanne, **Switzerland**
- 2. Laboratory of Biological Electron Microscopy, Instute of Physics, School of Basic Science, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, and Dep. of Fund. Microbiology, Faculty of Biology and Medicine, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland
- 3. CAS Key Laboratory of Pathogen Microbiology and Immunology, Institute of Microbiology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
- 4. Laboratory of Virology and Genetics, School of Life Sciences, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland
- 5. Laboratory of Biophysical Chemistry of Macromolecules, School of Basic Sciences, Institute of chemical sciences and engineering (ISIC), École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland
- 6. Swiss Institute for Experimental Cancer Research, School of Life Sciences, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland
- 7. Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

[†] Present address: Monte Rosa Therapeutics AG, Basel, Switzerland

 $*$ equal contribution; $*$ equal contribution; \circ corresponding authors

Supplementary Figure S1: Modeling buried surfaces as radial patches. a, Histogram of the patch areas of thousands of randomly selected protein patches with a fixed radius of 12 Å. **b,** Histogram of the area of the buried surface area on 1380 dimeric PPIs. We note that areas are computed for only one of the proteins (i.e. each subunit in a PPI is computed separately), and that we used the solvent excluded surface area, while other authors report buried areas on the solvent accessible area that include the buried surface area of both proteins (see methods). **c,** Size of the maximum inscribed radial patch for the 1380 proteins (see methods). Patch area for the radius used here (12 Å), using a set of 30,000 randomly selected patches. **d,** Example of the buried interface area for two well known, high affinity binders, Immunity Protein IM9 (PDB ID: 1EMV) and the protein Barnase (PDB ID: 1BRS). The buried interface of each protein when bound to its partner is shown in red. The maximum inscribed radial patch's circumference is shown in black, and the circumference of a patch with radius 12 Å is shown in green. **e,** Histogram of similaries between MaSIF-search fingerprint similarity between: (blue) pairs of patches that are co-crystallized from transient PPIs, with the fingerprint computed for the patch centered on the largest inscribed radial patch, and (orange) pairs of patches where one was taken from the center of the interface of a random PPI and the other was taken from a random patch surface.

Supplementary Figure S2: Overview of helical and non-helical seeds used in the recovery benchmark. Examples of **a,** helical seed, **b,** non-helical seeds that were extracted for the recovery benchmark.

Supplementary Figure S3: Analysis of successful/failed helical benchmark cases and comparison between MaSIF-seed and ZDock/ZRank2 performance. a-b, Plong of Top 1, Top 10, Top 100 and failed cases for MaSIF-seed and ZDock/ZRank2, showing the maximum circumscribed patch area in the buried interface (y-axis) and the median shape complementarity for vertices of that patch (x-axis) for **a,** MaSIF-seed, and **b**, ZDock/ZRank2. **c**, Comparison of cases solved by only MaSIF-seed, only ZDock/ZRank2, or both MaSIF-seed and ZDock/ZRank2 in the Top 1, top 10 or Top 100 rank. **d**, Analysis of two cases that showed both a large circumscribed patch and high complementarity at that patch where MaSIF-seed failed. Left (Failed case 1) shows the BHRF1:Bak BH3 complex (PDB ID: 2XPX); right (Failed case 2) shows proteinase A complexed with a IA3 mutant (PDB ID: 1G0V). In both cases, MaSIF-seed failed because it idenfied a different site as the top site, but increasing the number of sites explored to the top two resulted in successful predictions. The white dots on the surface denote the predicted site patches.

Supplementary Figure S4: MaSIF-site target site predicon on SARS-CoV-2 RBD, PD-L1, PD-1, and CTLA-4. Surface mode shows a MaSIF-site per-surface-vertex regression score on the propensity of each point on the surface to form an interface ranging from 0 (blue) to 1 (red) a-c, Predictions on each target, with the natural ligand of the target shown in cartoon representation as a reference. The structures highlight the predicted site and the bottom row shows a 180 degree rotation. a, MaSIF-site prediction on SARS-CoV-2 RBD (PDB ID: 6M17), with the RBD shown in surface and the ACE2 in beige. **b**, Prediction on PD-L1 (PDB ID: 5JDS), with PD-1 shown in purple. **c**, Prediction on PD-1 (PDB ID: 4ZQK) with the natural binder PD-L1 shown in cyan. **d**, Prediction on CTLA-4 (PDB ID: 5GGV) with the natural binding partner B7 (PDB ID: 1I8L) shown in light green.

Supplementary Figure S5: RBD-binder metrics for up- and down-orientaons . a, Distribuon of the IPA scores for the seeds of the up- and down-orientations and respective cluster sizes. **b**, Interface metrics (n=1) of the DBR3_01 model in complex with ACE2 for the up- and down-orientations were computed using Rosetta's interface analyzer. The following Rosetta metrics are shown: predicted ddG = change in Rosetta energy of separated versus complexed binding partners, interface ΔSASA = solvent accessible surface area buried at the interface, hydrophobic ΔSASA = solvent accessible surface area buried at the interface that is hydrophobic, polar ΔSASA = solvent accessible surface area buried at the interface that is polar, shape complementarity = Lawrence and Coleman shape complementarity of the interface surfaces, # interface residues = number of residues at the interface, # interface Hbonds = number of hydrogen bonds across the interface, ΔunsatHbonds = number of buried, unsatisfied hydrogen bonds at the interface, interface per residue energy = average Rosetta energy of each interface residue, packstat = Rosetta's packing statistic score for the interface ranging from 0 (low packing) to 1 (high packing).

Supplementary Figure S6: Binding seed idenfied by MaSIF tested as a synthec pepde. a, Structure of the synthesized binding seed. **b**, MaSIF prediction of seed (lavender) binding to RBD (wheat). c, SPR data of high concentration of the peptide flowing over RBD. No binding signal is observed for the peptide.

Supplementary Figure S7: Directed Library for DBR3_01. a, Posion of residues included in a combinatorial library to improve binding affinity. **b**, Sequence logo plot of specific mutations allowed within the library. The sequences list the residues mutated in DBR3_01 (highlighted in blue) and the mutations gained through the library in DBR3_02 (green).

Supplementary Figure S8: SSM of DBR3_02. a, Heat maps of DBR3_02 SSM at two concentrations of RBD-Fc. X indicates the original amino acid of DBR3_02. Red indicates an enrichment of the mutation in the binding population, blue indicates an enrichment in the non-binding population. Three positions, green box, were enriched in both concentrations. The positions of these mutations are highlighted on the DBR3 03 structure. **b**, Yeast display of DBR3 02 with mutations from the SSM introduced shows increase in affinity to RBD.

Supplementary Figure S9: Biophysical characterization of the designed binders. From left to right: The oligomeric status was determined via multi-angled light scattering (MALS). Folding was measured using circular dichroism. Thermal stability was determined by plotting the ellipticity at 218 nm at increasing temperatures. **a**, DBR3_03, **b**, DBL1_03, **c**, DBL2_02.

Supplementary Figure S10: Cryo-EM data processing of the D614G Spike-DBR3_03 complex. Image processing workflows performed in CryoSPARC v.3.3.1.

Supplementary Figure S11: Details of Cryo-EM data processing for D614G Spike-DBR3_03 complex. a, A representative raw micrograph of the Cryo-EM sample for D614G Spike-binder complex. 20,794 micrographs of such similar quality were acquired for this complex. **b,** The 2D classes of the D614G Spike-binder complex. **c**, A representative 2D class. **d**, Direction distribution of the particle alignment and **e**, FSC curves of the final overall map. **f**, Direction distribution and **g**, FSC curves of the locally refined map. **h,i,** Local resolution distribution of the overall and focused refined maps.

Supplementary Figure S12: Highlights of the Cryo-EM densies of DBR3_03 with D614G spike. Cryo-EM densities are shown as surfaces. RBM (receptor binding motif) in blue with DBR3_03 in pink. The atomic model is shown as stick or ribbon representation.

Supplementary Figure S13: Cryo-EM data processing of the Omicron Spike-DBR3_03 complex. Image processing workflows performed in CryoSPARC.

Supplementary Figure S14: Details of Cryo-EM data processing for Omicron Spike-DBR3_03 complex. a, A representative Cryo-EM micrograph for the D614G Spike-binder complex. 22,266 micrographs of such similar quality were acquired for this complex. **b**, The representative 2D classes of the omicron Spike-binder complex. **c**, Direction distribution of the particle alignment and **d**, FSC curves of the final overall map. e, Direction distribution and f, FSC curves of the locally refined map. g,h, Local resolution distribution of the overall and focused refined maps.

Supplementary Figure S15: Highlights of the cryo-EM densies of DBR3_03 with Omicron spike. Cryo-EM densities are shown as surfaces. RBM (receptor binding motif) in blue with DBR3_03 in orange. The atomic model is rendered as stick or ribbon representation.

Supplementary Figure S16: Planarity of the targeted interface sites. a, Buried interface on PD-L1 upon complex formation with PD-1. b, (Top) PD-L1 predicted buried interface, with selected target patch marked with a green contour. (bottom) View of the selected target patch to show its planarity. **c**, Plong of the planarity of each of 1068 dimeric protein interfaces. Y-axis: error in multidimensional scaling when flattening the patch from 3D to 2D. X-axis: ranking of each protein according to the planarity value with respect to the dataset of 1068 dimeric protein interfaces. The PD-L1 interface targeted in this work is marked with a red star, SARS-CoV-2 with a gold triangle, PD-1 with a blue X, and CTLA-4 with a magenta circle.

Supplementary Figure S17: Clusters of putave binding seeds idenfied by MaSIF-seed docked on the PD-L1 surface (PDB ID: 5JDS). 140 million patches from ~250,000 helices extracted from the PDB were compared and docked to the predicted interface in PD-L1 using MaSIF-seed. The top scoring seeds were selected for further processing. Twelve-amino acid fragments of these seeds that occupied the largest buried surface were then clustered using metric multidimensional scaling of all pairwise RMSDs between all seeds. **a,** Histogram of clusters, showing the prevalence of each orientation. **b**, Binding seed clusters in the multidimensional scaling plot. A box is drawn around the center of each cluster and the picture shows the selected helix orientation for all points inside the box. The circled binding seed cluster shows the helix orientation of the seed used for the PD-L1 designs. A star symbol shows the PD-L1 seed used for the designs.

Supplementary Figure S18: Binding signals of inial PD-L1 binder designs. Binding measured on the surface of yeast with 15 µM PD-L1-Fc. Comparison of DBL1_01 and DBL2_01 with corresponding interface mutants.

Supplementary Figure S19: Electron density map of the crystalized DBL1_03 and DBL2_02. **a**, Crystal structure of DBL1_03 (green) in complex with PD-L1 (gray). Refined 2mFo-mFc electron density map of the binder, contoured at 1.0σ , is rendered as a white surface **b**, Crystal structure of DBL2_02 (blue) in complex with PD-L1 (gray). Refined 2mFo-mFc electron density map of the binder, contoured at 1.0 σ , is rendered as a white surface

Supplementary Figure S20: Overview and comparison between PD-1 binders. a, PD-1 surface (blue) with the region targeted by PD-L1 (red) and the overlapping region targeted by DBP13_01 (yellow contour). **b**, Histograms of the binding signal (PE) measured on 3 yeast clones displaying designed binders against PD-1. Yeast cells were labeled with 500 nM PD-1-Fc (coloured) or secondary antibodies only (gray, negative control). c-d, Overview and close-up of DBP40 01 (a, pink) and DBP52_01 (b, blue) models in complex with PD-1 (gray). Interface seed residues similar to DBP13_01 are highlighted in red, while residues that are different are highlighted in orange. **e,** Seeds used to design DBP13_01 (green), DBP40_01 (pink) and DBP52_01 (blue) aligned with interface residues numbered. **f,** Sequence logo of the seed interface residues for the three PD-1 binders as numbered in e.

Supplementary Figure S21: SSM of DBP13_01. Heatmap covering all posions of DBP13_01. Yeast displaying point mutants were analyzed by flow cytometry and subsequently binding and nonbinding populations were sorted. For each mutation the log-ratio between the enrichment in binding versus non-binding populations was computed. Mutations in red highlight a deleterious effect on binding, while mutations in blue indicate an enrichment on the binding population.

Supplementary Figure S22: AF structure predicon of DBP13_01 in complex with PD-1. a, Comparison of the DBP13_01 computational model (green) and the AlphaFold multimer (AF) prediction (red) on the surface of PD-1 (blue). **b**, Buried interfaces in both DBP13_01 model (left) and AF prediction (right) are shown in red with an overlap yellow, a yellow contour of the footprint of the original model is shown for ease of comparison. **c**, Comparison of the DBL3_01 computational model (purple) and the AlphaFold Multimer (AF) prediction (gray) on the surface of PD-L1 (orange).

Supplementary Figure S23: Surface similarity of the computaonal designs, experimentally solved structures or AF models relave to inial binding seeds. Each complex was aligned to the target protein (RBD, PD-L1 and PD-1), and the surface similarity of the computational design, the experimental structure or AF model to the binding seed is shown in a gradient from white to red. The buried surface area of the initial binding seed is shown by a green contour. The surface similarity was calculated in the same way as shape complementarity but normal vectors are not inverted during the process, i.e. the normal vectors for both surfaces point outwards of the molecular surface. Briefly, pairs of nearest vertices between the surface of the design or structure/model and the initial binding seed were computed based on the nearest neighbor of the aligned model. The shape similarity was evaluated by computing the dot product of the vertex pairs normal vectors yielding the enclosed angle and scaling it with the distance of the vertex pair. The resulting values are colored in a gradient from white to red and range from 0 (colored in white) indicating no similarity, to 1 (colored in red) indicating high similarity.

Supplementary Table 1: *Extended Benchmark of MaSIF-seed against other docking methods in recovering the native binder in the correct conformation from co-crystal structures for 31 helix-receptor complexes or 83 non-helix seed-receptor complexes, discriminang between 1000 decoys. ^aBenchmarked method. b-dNumber of receptors for which the method recovered the nave* binding motif (<3 Å iRMSD) within the ^btop 1, ^ctop 10, and ^dtop 100 results. ^eNumber of receptors for *which the method did not recover the nave binding mof in the top 100 results. ^fAverage running me in minutes, excluding pre-computaon me.*

Supplementary Table 2: Sequences of the designed proteins.

Supplementary Table 3: SARS-CoV-2 variant mutations.

Supplementary Table 4: Summary of binding candidates obtained after deep sequencing with the optimized design pipeline. Binding seeds were helical (H) or strand (E) . Deep sequencing data comprises reads from the non-binding (Neg reads) and binding population (Pos reads). The enrichment score is calculated based on the logarithm of the ratio between positive and negative reads. Computational models of the complexes were predicted by AlphaFold Multimer (AF) and aligned with respect to the target. Binding signals detected on the surface of yeast (at 500 nM ligand) were categorized as negative(-), marginal (-/+), weak (+), moderate (++) or high (+++). Marginal and weak binding signals were not further characterized (Competition assay, knock-out mutants and negative controls).

Supplementary Table 5: Antibodies used in flow cytometry experiments.

Supplementary Table 6: Primer sequences.

Supplementary Table 7: Target protein sequences.

