Supplementary Information for

**Real-Time Structure Search and Structure Classification for AlphaFold Protein Models** Tunde Aderinwale<sup>1,†</sup>, Vijay Bharadwaj<sup>1,†</sup>, Charles Christoffer<sup>1</sup>, Genki Terashi<sup>2</sup>, Zicong Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Rashidedin Jahandideh<sup>1</sup>, Yuki Kagaya<sup>2</sup> & Daisuke Kihara<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Computer Science, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, 47907, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Biological Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, 47907, USA

† These authors contributed equally.

\* Corresponding author: E-mail: dkihara@purdue.edu

**Supplementary Table 1. Fold classification accuracy by 3DZD and the deep neural** 

**network.** 



Fold classification accuracy using different score cutoff values. The classifications were computed on a dataset of 167,872 protein pairs constructed from 2,521 protein domain structures from SCOPe. Positive and negative pairs were balanced. First, we made all possible protein pairs from the same fold, which turned out to be 83,936. Then we downsampled negative pairs to match the number of the positive pairs. Protein pairs were input to 3DZD-NN or 3DZD to obtain a probability (3DZD-NN) or a score (3DZD) that the protein pair belong to the same fold. In Table 3, we reported results obtained by using cutoff values of 0.6, 0.5, and 0.1 for 3DZD-NN mainchain, 3DZD-NN full-atom, and 3DZD, respectively, because these cutoffs gave the best F-scores among other cutoff values tried. In this table, cutoffs of 0.05 and 0.15 were used only for 3DZD to confirm that 0.1 is the best cutoff.





Fold recognition accuracy of 3DZD and 3DZD-NN were compared with SPalignNS. 5,000 protein pairs are randomly sampled with 2500 positive (i.e. the same fold pairs) and negative pairs, respectively. The pairs were ranked based on the scores of pairs computed by each method. The evaluation was made on 4,228 pairs where SPalignNS did not fail to run. For the rest of 772 cases, SPalignNS encountered an error and did not run.

**Supplementary Figure 2. Database search results for examples shown in Fig. 4.** 



From two structures presented as examples of false positives in Fig. 4, d2jj2f2 and 5mko-a, the entire PDB was searched using 3DZD-NN with the main-chain representation. All structures retrieved within the top 25 for each query have the same fold as the query. Thus, although particular structure pairs with these queries were misrecognized as the same fold by 3DZD-NN and 3DZD as shown in Fig. 4, such relatively weak false positives do not affect the top hits in a database search.

## **Supplementary Table 2: Top-10 folds of AlphaFold2 models for individual species.**







Commonly appeared folds with the SUPERFAMILY2.0 statistics shown in Supplementary Table 4 are underlined. Folds in  $\alpha$ -class has a SCOP ID stating from a., an ID of a  $\beta$ -class fold starts from b.,  $\alpha/\beta$  and  $\alpha+\beta$  class folds have ID with c. and d. respectively, folds with g. are small proteins.



### **Supplementary Table 3. Statistics of SUPERFAMILY 2.0 of the 21 species**.

The statistics from the SUPERFAMILY 2.0 database for the same 21 species in Table 1. The annotations were downloaded on December 10, 2021. The SCOP superfamily assigned for each domain by SUPERFAMILY was counted for individual species in the SCOP fold level.

# **Supplementary Table 4. Top-10 Folds in SUPERFAMILY 2.0 for individual species.**







The Genome ID used in SUPERFAMILY is noted after each species name. Folds commonly appeared in

the Alphafold2 models in Supplementary Table 2 and in this SUPERFAMILY database are underlined.



### **Supplementary Table 5. The top 10 most abundant folds by Gerstein (1998)**

The top 10 most abundant folds in the three species taken from Fig. 1. in the paper by M. Gerstein, Patterns of protein-fold usage in eight microbial genomes: a comprehensive structural census. *Proteins* **33**, 518-534, (1998). Among eight species analyzed in their work, three species that are common with Supplementary Table 2 are listed. Folds with underline are those which are in common with Supplementary Table 2. In the parentheses, SCOP codes are shown.

### **Supplementary Table 6. The top 5 most abundant folds by Kihara & Skolnick (2004).**



The top 5 most abundant folds in the two species from Table IIIB in the paper by D. Kihara & J. Skolnick, Microbial genomes have over 72% structure assignment by the threading algorithm PROSPECTOR\_Q, *Proteins,* **55**, 464-473, 2004. Only top 5 folds are listed here because their work only showed top 5. Among five species analyzed in their work, these two species were in common with Supplementary Table 2. Folds with underline are commonly appeared in Supplementary Table 2. In the parentheses, CATH codes are shown.