Protein Design and Variant Prediction Using Autoregressive Generative Models Supplementary Information

This file includes:

Supplementary Figures 1 to 12 Supplementary Tables 1 to 6

Supplementary Figures

Supplementary Fig. 1. Autoregressive models of biological sequences. **a** Instead of finding correlations between columns in a multiple sequence alignment (left), the autoregressive model predicts a residue given all the preceding positions (right). **b** Causal dilated convolutions are used to model the autoregressive likelihood.

Supplementary Fig. 2. Individual scatterplots of the experimental results and the mutation effect prediction using the autoregressive model trained on each individual family of naturally occurring proteins. Experimental measures of fitness are on the y-axis and fitness predictions are on the x-axis. Spearman correlation values and corresponding two-tailed p-values are displayed per plot.

5

Supplementary Fig. 3. Comparison of model performance across datasets. **a** The Spearman correlation distributions of predictions for each model compared to 40 experimental datasets of deep mutational scans across 33 proteins, totaling 690,257. Two fragment lengths were used to build the HMM models (0.5 and 0.7), and only 0.5 is displayed in Figure 2. Two hidden sizes (24 and 48) were tested for the autoregressive model; 48 was chosen for further study. The box-plot elements are as follows: center line, median; box limits, upper and lower quartiles; whiskers, range of values. Mean and quartile values are displayed for each model in the box-and-whisker plot, whiskers span the entire range. **b** A comparison of model prediction Spearman correlations, including Envision LOPO prediction correlations. BRCA1 RING and UBE4B were validated but not tested by Envision due to poor validation performance. **c** A comparison of model predictions' Spearman correlation with every dataset for which experimental Spearman or Pearson correlations are available for biological or technical replicates. Pearson correlations have been included where a Spearman correlation is unavailable.

Supplementary Fig. 4. Spearman correlations for models trained on alignments of 8 protein families at 4 depths. Spearman correlations shown as-is (left) or normalized to the highest observed correlation for each family (right). Meff/L is the length-normalized number of nonredundant sequences after weighting sequences at 80% identity. Prediction accuracy for aliphatic amidase is nearly identical between a 151,555 sequence set (Meff=36,020; Meff/L=136; $p=0.542$) and a 3,982 sequence set (Meff=123; Meff/L=0.38; $p=0.536$).

Autoregressive:

8

Supplementary Fig. 5. Fitness prediction of the autoregressive and HMM models vs. experimental thermostability measurements from nanobody thermostability datasets for which there are at least ten data points. Thermostability measurements are in degrees Celsius and the fitness predictions are reported as log probability scores of each nanobody sequence. Spearman correlation values and corresponding two-tailed p-values are displayed per plot.

IGPD insertions and deletions snoRNA insertions and deletions

Supplementary Fig. 6. Indel mutation scan measurement comparisons for three proteins and one RNA: IGP dehydratase, snoRNA, β -lactamase and P53. Spearman correlation values and corresponding two-tailed p-values are displayed per plot.

Supplementary Fig. 7. Pathogenic single amino acid deletions (as annotated by Clinvar) are predicted to be on the more deleterious spectrum of all possible single amino acid deletion effect predictions in a gene indicated in Alzheimer's (APOE), and two genes indicated in cancer (P53, BRCA1). Other single amino acid deletions that are predicted to be highly deleterious by the autoregressive model may be interesting to test for pathogenicity.

Supplementary Fig. 8. (top) *In silico* mutation scan of all single mutants for the human Tau protein, isoform Tau-4 (P10636-8). (bottom) Distribution of fitness predictions relative to wildtype for all mutations and for known variants annotated as pathogenic or not pathogenic in the Alzforum repository (https://www.alzforum.org/mutations/mapt). The box-plot elements are as follows: center line, median; box limits, upper and lower quartiles; whiskers, 1.5x interquartile range; points, outliers. Fitness predictions distinguish pathogenic and not pathogenic groups (two-tailed independent t=-4.5, $p=3.8\times10^{-5}$ (****, $p < 0.0001$); AUC=0.86).

Supplementary Fig. 9. Compared to a synthetic library generated by codon randomization (McMahon et al., 2018), the designed library has more similar properties to the natural repertoire, while maintaining nearly the diversity of the synthetic library. **a** Synthetic CDR3s have slightly different distributions of hydrophobicity and isoelectric point from the natural repertoire, and the synthetic library contains CDR3s of 3 lengths rather than a broad length distribution. **b**, **c** The designed library contains nearly as much diversity as the synthetic library as measured by **b**, distances to the nearest neighbors within each library, and **c**, distances to the nearest neighbors in the natural llama single-domain antibody repertoire.

Supplementary Fig. 10. Full distributions of nanobody expression in the original synthetic library and our designed library. The designed library has a larger fraction of cells expressing nanobodies compared to the synthetic library (large difference in replicate 1 and small in replicate 2) and is closer to resembling the positive control. The vertical lines are the local minima between the non-expressing cells (the mode to the left of the line) and the expressing cells (to the right of the line). The distribution of the expressing cells are displayed in the main text in Fig. 4a.

Supplementary Fig. 11. Experimental measurements of polyreactivity in the designed library (green) as compared to the original synthetic library (blue) shows similar, if not slightly lower proportions of poly-reactive nanobodies in the designed library when sorted for binding to a nonspecific insect cell membrane reagent. The log experimental fluorescent measurements are shown on the x-axis, in two replicates (left and right).

Design nanobody library

Synthetic nanobody library (McMahon, et al, 2018)

Supplementary Fig. 12. Example of flow cytometer yeast gating. Standard gating was used. Yeast form a single population in an FSC/SSC plot and were gated accordingly. Cells were further gated on an FSC-A/ FSC-H plot to exclude doublets. FL1-A uses AlexaFluor 647 and measures expression of the nanobodies per cell (Fig. 4a,b, Supplementary Fig. 10). FL4-A uses AlexaFluor 488 and is used to measure binding to antigen (HSA: Fig. 4c,d; PSR (poly-reactivity reagent): Supplementary Fig. 11).

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1. Deep mutational scans included in the paper and information regarding the experimental data, including sequence information, number of mutations, and experimental replicate measurements.

Supplementary Table 2. Spearman correlations of predictions with experiments using training sequence sets derived from alignments at four different bitscores. Meff is the number of nonredundant sequences after weighting sequences at 80% identity. Sequence coverage is the length of the focus sequence covered by the alignment, including non-focus columns that would have been excluded by alignment-based models.

Supplementary Table 3. Description of thermostability datasets for llama nanobody sequences used to validate the model's predictive capacity for nanobodies.

Supplementary Table 4. Indel mutation scans that were used for validating the model's predictive power for sequences of different lengths. Experimental scans are included in the paper and their summary statistics.

Supplementary Table 5. Number of unique nanobody sequences remaining after each step of filtering of the designed nanobody library.

Supplementary Table 6. Oligonucleotides used for synthesis and construction for the nanobody library.