

Supporting Information

Haruspex: A Neural Network for the Automatic Identification of Oligonucleotides and Protein Secondary Structure in Cryo-Electron Microscopy Maps**

[Philipp Mostosi,](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0111-8225) [Hermann Schindelin,](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2067-3187) [Philip Kollmannsberger, and](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8049-6186) [Andrea Thorn*](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4503-4258)

anie_202000421_sm_miscellaneous_information.pdf

Supporting Information: Computational Methods

Training Data

We queried the Electron Microscopy Data Bank (EMDB) for all single particle Cryo-EM maps with a resolution ≤ 4 Å, for which corresponding protein models were available in the Protein Data Bank in Europe (PDBe), yielding 576 map and model pairs as of February 2018. We filtered these EMDB/PDB pairs by the following three criteria: (1) Convincing visual fit between map and model; (2) presence of at least one annotated α -helix or β sheet; and (3) preference of the highest resolution map in case the same authors deposited several instances of the same macromolecular complex. Maps with severe misfits, misalignments, or models without corresponding reconstruction densities, and vice versa, were discarded. After applying these criteria, we retained 293 map/model pairs for generating the training data (see Table 1, below).

To extract secondary structure information from the PDB data, we developed a custom parser for the PDBML $[1]$ format based on xmltodict. To obtain additional secondary structure information, we implemented a variant of the DSSP algorithm^[2] without strand direction, and a torsion angle based secondary structure detection inspired by STRIDE^[3]: annotated or DSSPdetected secondary structures were extended by neighboring amino acids if they matched the same Ramachandran profile.

Annotation of reconstruction maps

For every entry pair, the augmented model was then superimposed on the map and all voxels within 3 Å of a protein backbone atom, or, in the case of nucleotides, within 3 Å of any non-Hydrogen atom, were assigned to the respective class (helix, sheet or nucleotide) if their value was higher than $\frac{1}{2}$ of the average backbone density of the helix, sheet or nucleotide in question. Secondary structures with a backbone standard deviation of ≤ 2 σ and atoms without secondary structure assignment were either excluded, as they were likely incorrectly modelled, misfitted, or flexible structures, or labelled as 'unassigned'. For some training data pairs, such as virus capsids, only small or partial protein models were deposited for large Cryo-EM maps, resulting in well-defined high-density regions without model coverage. These regions would not get annotated and hence result in false positives if the network tried to predict the actual structure. To mitigate this, all voxels with density ≥ 1.0 r.m.s.d. but not within 5 Å of a model atom with density ≥ 1.0 r.m.s.d. were masked as unmodeled density and hence did not contribute to training.

Since our network generated a single class label as output, the reconstruction density of the secondary structures must be converted to a strict assignment to one of the three classes in order to be used as training examples. For each secondary structure, the reconstruction map density was multiplied by the backbone standard deviation and rescaled to an output density between zero and one (corresponding to 0.5 and 1.0 times the average backbone density of the local secondary structure element) for each label type. The highest channel value determined the voxel class. If multiple channels shared the same value, sheets took precedence over oligonucleotides, which took precedence over helices. Voxels where all channel values were below 0.01 were assigned the 'unassigned' class.

Finally, reconstruction maps were rescaled to a voxel size of 1.1 Å if they were outside of [1.0; 1.2] Å.

Generation of training segments

To generate the $70³$ voxel sized segments needed for training, candidate volumes were sampled from the entire map, and segments with a mean backbone density < 3.0 r.m.s.d., less than 5% annotated volume, or less than 100 atoms with standard deviation ≥ 1.0 r.m.s.d. were discarded. This resulted in altogether 2183 training segments, of which 110 segments (5%) were held back for evaluation during training. To generate additional segments for training, we applied rotations in steps of 90° around all three axes, resulting in 24 rotated versions of each segment that could all be used as separate training volumes since the convolutional network is not rotation-invariant. Segments were further augmented during training by using a randomly translated 40^3 sub-cube for each step.

Figure 4. Haruspex neural network architecture. The network consists of multiple interconnected layers, shown as rectangular boxes. The layers are connected by convolution and pooling operations (arrows). Layer height represents the level of abstraction: lower layer data, generated by pooling operations, contain more abstract representations of the map. Input data (blue) is fed into the downconvolutional arm (yellow) in order to extract valuable information, which is then combined with previously discarded information through concatenations in the upconvolutional arm (purple) to compute annotated output data (green) for a subsection (20³) of the input volume (40³). Our network consists of two encoder blocks, containing altogether three convolutional layers (3x3x3) and two pooling layers. This is followed by two decoder blocks, one with upconvolution followed by two 3x3x3 convolutions and 128 feature channels, and one with upconvolution followed by two 3x3x3 convolutions with 64 and 32 feature channels, with concatenated sections of the corresponding layer in the encoding part. The output part consists of a final 1x1x1 convolution followed by a soft-max output layer. This results in 13 layers in total (12 + 1 convolution at bottom).

Network Architecture

We used a state-of-the-art U-Net-like encoder-decoder architecture $[4,5]$ (see Fig. 4) with a single input channel (the reconstruction density). This architecture is a variant of so-called fully convolutional networks where spatial information and object details are encoded, reduced by pooling layers and then recovered again with up-sampling or transpose convolutions; the term U-Net arises from the U-like shape of the data flow. The encoding branch consisted of two 3x3x3 convolutional layers with 32 and 64 feature channels, respectively, followed by maxpooling layers. Another convolutional layer with 128 feature channels followed by a max-pooling layer finally resulted in an $8³$ cube with 128 feature channels at the deepest layer of the network. This cube was passed through another convolutional layer with the same data padding in order to preserve its dimensions. A fully connected layer was considered, but not chosen due to its high memory and performance cost. The decoding branch of the U-Net was made of two blocks, each consisting of a deconvolution followed by two 3x3x3 convolutions (128 feature channels in the first, 64 and 32 channels in the second block to restore symmetry) with concatenated sections of the corresponding layer in the encoding part. The output part consists of a final 1x1x1 convolution followed by a soft-max output layer. The output layer reproduced the central 20 3 voxel cube of the input layer in four annotation channels representing co-dependent probabilities for the four classes (helix, sheet, nucleotide, unassigned) summing up to one. The highest channel value determined the predicted class. Implementation was realized using TensorFlow^[6]. The network was trained end-to-end by comparing the predicted class of each voxel to the annotated EMDB model using crossentropy loss, back propagating the error through the network, and adapting the network weights to iteratively minimize the error.

Network Training

The network was trained for 40,000 steps on training batches of 100 random segment pairs per step corresponding to 80 epochs,

using ADAM stochastic optimization^[7] with a learning rate of 0.001, $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$ and $\varepsilon = 0.1$. Error assignment for backpropagation was performed using cross-entropy loss, where the target class was represented in one-hot encoded binary format (1 for the target class, 0 for the other three classes). To account for class imbalance, voxels were weighted according to overall class occurrence in the training data. Furthermore, nontrue negatives were weighted 16-fold stronger than true negatives.

- [1] J. Westbrook, N. Ito, H. Nakamura, K. Henrick, H. M. Berman, Bioinformatics 2004, 21, 988–992.
- Examples 2008, 2008. The Contract of the Contract of the W. Kabsch, C. Sander, Biopolymers: Original Research on Biomolecules 1983, 22, 2577–2637.
- [3] D. E. Tronrud, D. S. Berkholz, P. A. Karplus, Acta Crystallographica Section D Biological Crystallography 2010, 66, 834-842.
- [4] Ö. Çiçek, A. Abdulkadir, S. S. Lienkamp, T. Brox, O. Ronneberger, in International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention, Springer, 2016, pp. 424–432.
- [5] T. Falk, D. Mai, R. Bensch, Ö. Çiçek, A. Abdulkadir, Y. Marrakchi, A. Böhm, J. Deubner, Z. Jäckel, K. Seiwald, et al., Nature Methods 2019, 16.
- [6] M. Abadi, A. Agarwal, P. Barham, E. Brevdo, Z. Chen, C. Citro, G. Corrado, A. Davis, J. Dean, M. Devin, et al., TensorFlow: Large-Scale Machine Learning on Heterogeneous Distributed Systems, 2015.
- [7] D. P. Kingma, J. Ba, arXiv preprint arXiv: 1412.6980 2014.

Table 1. List of EMDB/PDB entries used as training data.

Table 2. List of EMDB/PDB entries used as test data with individual test results.

^a As defined in the main article:

 \overline{a}

recall = true positives / (true positives + false negatives)

 $precision = true$ positives / (true positives + false negatives)

SUPORTING INFORMATION

Figure 5. Resolution of depositions vs. year. These boxplots show the trend of annual average resolution for published EM maps/structures in the Electron Microscopy Data Bank (EMDB). We used the main resolution as given in the deposition for entries deposited between $1/1/2011$ and $3/3/2020$. Entries without resolution were omitted. The midline of the boxes corresponds to the median values, which are 3.8 Å for 2018, 3.6 Å for 2019 and 3.3 Å for 2020.