

Pre-Training of Deep Bidirectional Protein Sequence Representations with Structural Information

Seonwoo Min,¹ Seunghyun Park,² Siwon Kim,¹ Hyun-Soo Choi,¹ Sungroh Yoon^{1, 3, †}

¹Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Seoul National University, Seoul 08826, Korea

²Clova AI Research, NAVER Corp., Seongnam 13561, Korea

³Interdisciplinary Program in Bioinformatics, ASRI, INMC, and ISRC, Seoul National University, Seoul 08826, Korea

[†]Correspondence to: sryoon@snu.ac.kr

Abstract

A structure of a protein has a direct impact on its properties and functions. However, identification of structural similarity directly from amino acid sequences remains as a challenging problem in computational biology. In this paper, we introduce a novel BERT-wise pre-training scheme for a protein sequence representation model called **PLUS**, which stands for **P**rotein sequence representations **L**earned **U**sing **S**tructural information. As natural language representation models capture syntactic and semantic information of words from a large unlabeled text corpus, PLUS captures structural information of amino acids from a large weakly labeled protein database. Since the Transformer encoder, BERT’s original model architecture, has a severe computational requirement to handle long sequences, we first propose to combine a bidirectional recurrent neural network with the BERT-wise pre-training scheme. PLUS is designed to learn protein representations with two pre-training objectives, *i.e.*, masked language modeling and same family prediction. Then, the pre-trained model can be fine-tuned for a wide range of tasks without training randomly initialized task-specific models from scratch. It obtains new state-of-the-art results on both (1) protein-level and (2) amino-acid-level tasks, outperforming many task-specific algorithms.

Introduction

Proteins consisting of linear chains of amino acids are the most versatile molecules in living organisms. They serve vital functions in almost every biological mechanism, *e.g.*, transmitting nerve pulses, storing and transporting other molecules, and providing immune protection (Berg, Tymoczko, and Stryer 2006). The versatility of proteins is generally attributed to their diverse structures. Proteins naturally fold up into three-dimensional structures depending on the sequence of amino acids. Then, their structures have a direct impact on the functions of proteins.

With the advent of next-generation sequencing technologies, obtaining protein sequences have become relatively more accessible and affordable. However, conducting biochemical experiments to identify structural information of

each protein is a different story. It still requires a considerable amount of time, effort, and cost. Thus, a significant number of proteins have been newly sequenced, but their structures remain still unknown, demanding computational approaches for *in silico* predictions (El-Gebali et al. 2018).

Identification of structural similarity directly from amino acid sequences is one of the most challenging problems in computational biology (Holm and Sander 1996). A variety of computational algorithms have been proposed based on capturing sequence patterns via hidden Markov models (HMMs) (Söding, Biegert, and Lupas 2005) or sequence alignments (Needleman and Wunsch 1970). However, their major limitation is, in reality, sequence and structure similarities are only loosely connected. Distant proteins with low sequence similarity can form into similar structures as well (Gan et al. 2002). As a result, instead of a raw amino acid sequence, we need a better representation of a protein to infer and compare structural information.

Recently, BERT (Devlin et al. 2018) has been a new sensation in natural language processing (NLP) community. As the development of computer vision field was accelerated with transfer learning, BERT has widely opened a way to do transfer learning in NLP as well. The key idea of BERT is the pre-training scheme, consisting of masked language modeling (MLM) and next sentence prediction (NSP). It enabled learning bidirectional representations and more effective use of substantial unlabeled text corpus. Leveraging the pre-trained BERT representations, it has been fine-tuned and obtained new state-of-the-art results on numerous NLP tasks (Nogueira and Cho 2019).

As humans use languages to communicate, people say living organisms use biological sequences as “language of life” to convey information within our body. Inspired by the conceptual analogy, there have been many attempts to properly transform and adopt NLP methodologies for biological sequences (Min, Lee, and Yoon 2017). In this paper, we introduce a novel BERT-wise pre-training scheme for a protein sequence representation model called **PLUS**, which stands for **P**rotein sequence representations **L**earned **U**sing **S**tructural information. As natural language representation models capture syntactic and semantic information of words from a large unlabeled text corpus, PLUS captures structural




Figure 1: Overview of the pre-training scheme for PLUS. (A) We mask 15% of amino acids in each protein sequence at random. (B) PLUS model learns to transform the amino acids into sequences of representations. (C) PLUS is pre-trained with two objectives. Masked language modeling objective trains the model to predict the masked amino acids given their contexts. Same family prediction objective trains the model to predict whether a pair of proteins belong to the same protein family.

information of amino acids from a large weakly labeled protein database. We use protein families (Pfam) dataset, where 17 million protein sequences are semi-automatically classified into over 1,600 families (El-Gebali et al. 2018). To elevate severe computational requirements to handle long protein sequences, we first propose to combine a bidirectional recurrent neural network (BiRNN) with the BERT-wise pre-training scheme. PLUS is designed to learn structurally contextualized protein sequence representations with two pre-training objectives, *i.e.*, MLM and same family prediction (SFP) (Figure 1). Then, the pre-trained model can be fine-tuned for a wide range of tasks without training randomly initialized task-specific models from scratch. It obtains new state-of-the-art results on both (1) protein-level and (2) amino-acid-level tasks, outperforming many task-specific algorithms.

To recapitulate briefly, the contributions of our paper are as follows:

- We introduce PLUS, a protein sequence representation model, which captures structural information of amino acids.
- We propose a novel weakly supervised pre-training scheme for the protein sequence representation model based on MLM and SFP. To the best of our knowledge, this is not only the first work to use the BERT-wise pre-training scheme on a biological sequence but also one of the first works on any non-NLP tasks.
- PLUS advances the state-of-the-arts for both (1) protein-level and (2) amino-acid-level tasks. The code and pre-trained model will be available at <https://github.com/> at the time of publication.

Related Work

Pre-training natural language representations

Early natural language pre-training approaches are unsupervised feature-based methods which extract fixed word embeddings. For example, traditional word2vec learns context-independent embeddings with a skip-gram model (Mikolov et al. 2013). ELMo learns contextualized embeddings by making them functions of the entire input sequence (Peters et al. 2018). It pre-trains forward and reverse RNN LMs and uses their hidden states as the embeddings.

The current trend for pre-training language representations is unsupervised fine-tuning. Going beyond the fixed embeddings, entire LMs are both pre-trained and fine-tuned (Radford et al. 2018). Most notably, BERT introduced bidirectional representations pre-trained with two objectives. The previous problem of using a multi-layer bidirectional model was that it allows each word to indirectly see itself so that it cannot be pre-trained with the conventional LM. BERT resolved the problem by adopting the MLM objective, where a model is trained to predict some randomly masked words given their contexts. In addition, its NSP objective enables learning sentence relationships by training a model to predict whether a given pair of sentences is consecutive.

There are two key obstacles for the adoption of BERT for protein sequences. First, it has a severe computational requirement which scales quadratically with the input length (Sukhbaatar et al. 2019). This is especially problematic where a protein often contains over a thousand amino acids. Second, it requires customized pre-training objectives. As only few researchers adopted BERT for a non-NLP domain (Trinh, Luong, and Le 2019), finding the right pre-training tasks is not a trivial problem. In particular, in order to incorporate structural information, we need to devise pre-training objectives tailored for protein sequence modeling.

Pre-training biological sequence representations

Although biological sequences seem different from natural language, they share some very similar characteristics, *e.g.*, both local and long-range contexts are crucial for a thorough understanding of their semantic or structural significance. Taking advantage of the similarities, there is a long history of NLP methodologies modulated for the biological sequences (Alipanahi et al. 2015).

In contrast to the NLP domain, the key limitation is that they have yet to see the full benefit of transfer learning. For instance, DeepCpf1 (Kim et al. 2018) have adopted pre-training for CRISPR-Cpf1 activity prediction, but it is limited to its task-specific model and cannot be used for other tasks. A few previous works have also proposed to learn general representations (Asgari and Mofrad 2015). However, based on unsupervised feature-based word2vec, they are only able to learn fixed context-independent k-mer embeddings.

Pre-training contextualized protein representations

The most closely related previous work to our paper is P-ELMo (Bepler and Berger 2019), which proposed a two-phase pre-training scheme for contextualized protein embeddings. Inspired by ELMo, it first pre-trains tied forward and reverse RNN LMs using the Pfam dataset. Then, it adopts another BiRNN embedding model that transforms combined one-hot and LM representations into protein embeddings. To pre-train the embedding model with structural information, P-ELMo uses expertly curated SCOPe ASTRAL dataset (Fox, Brenner, and Chandonia 2013) with two supervised objectives. Protein-level structural similarity objective trains the model to predict shared level in the SCOPe protein structure hierarchy of a protein pair (Appendix Figure ??). Amino-acid-level contact objective trains the model to predict whether an amino acid pair within a protein makes contact in the three-dimensional structure. The pre-trained P-ELMo representations can be integrated with additional task-specific models and have shown state-of-the-art results in numerous tasks.

P-ELMo has three major limitations. First, it only pre-trains the fixed embeddings and requires training a randomly initialized task-specific model for downstream applications. As the recent trend of pre-training algorithms in NLP, we should be able to benefit from fine-tuning the entire pre-trained model. Second, P-ELMo shows an inefficient use of parameters. Due to the adoption of two separate RNN models for LM and embedding, it has a considerable number of parameters which inevitably increase the required memory and time for the model. The last and most critical limitation is that it shows ineffective use of the Pfam dataset. P-ELMo only utilizes protein sequences from Pfam and relies on expertly curated SCOPe for incorporating structural information. Not only it does not make a full use of Pfam, but exploiting highly refined database also deviates from the goal of pre-training to employ a low human-effort database.

Table 1: Pfam dataset statistics

| Dataset | Counts | Sequence Length | | | |
|---------|------------|-----------------|-----------|-----|-------|
| | Sequence | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| Train | 14,670,860 | 161 | 112 | 20 | 1,663 |
| Dev | 4,337,587 | 161 | 113 | 20 | 1,960 |

Table 2: SCOPe ASTRAL dataset statistics

| Dataset | Counts | Sequence Length | | | |
|------------|----------|-----------------|-----------|-----|-------|
| | Sequence | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| 2.06 Train | 20,168 | 176 | 111 | 20 | 1,449 |
| 2.06 Dev | 2,240 | 174 | 103 | 23 | 689 |
| 2.06 Test | 5,602 | 180 | 114 | 21 | 1,500 |
| 2.07 Test | 688 | 190 | 149 | 25 | 1,664 |

Methods

We introduce PLUS for learning deep bidirectional protein sequence representations with structural information. In contrast to P-ELMo, we pre-train a single unified model with the Pfam dataset utilizing both protein sequence and family information. Then, the entire pre-trained model is fine-tuned for each downstream task without substantial task-specific architecture modifications.

Pre-training data

The Pfam dataset (Table 1) contains 17 million protein sequences grouped into over 1,600 protein families. Each protein family is semi-automatically constructed by comparing their sequence similarities rather than thoroughly looking into their true structures. Due to the loose connection between sequence and structure similarities, the protein family labels do not provide complete structural information and can be considered as weak labels. Nonetheless, considering that Pfam holds about three orders of magnitude more protein sequences than SCOPe (Table 2), weakly labeled Pfam could provide even better supervision for assimilating structural information.

Model architecture

The model architecture for BERT is the Transformer encoder. Albeit its ability to capture long term dependencies, it places a huge computational burden scaling quadratically with the input sequence length. Pre-training BERT from scratch is already computationally expensive and even considered to be the preserve of big research groups with tremendous resources (Liu et al. 2019). Thus, simply extending the current context size of 512 tokens to deal with longer protein sequences is extremely difficult.

In this work, we propose an alternative approach to use a BiRNN for the model architecture of PLUS, denoted as PLUS-RNN. It combines the advantage of a BiRNN with the BERT-wise pre-training to learn deep bidirectional representations of protein sequences even up to a couple thousand amino acids.

Table 3: PLUS-RNN_{BASE} and P-ELMo model comparison

| PLUS-RNN _{BASE} | Layer Description | P-ELMo |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 462 | Embedding to 21-dim vector | 462 |
| | | 4,288,512 |
| | Tied Fwd-Rvs LM RNN | 8,396,800 |
| 21,525 | LM decoder | 21,525 |
| | LM hiddens to 512-dim vector | 2,097,664 |
| | Embedding to 512-dim vector | 10,752 |
| 2,191,360 [†] | | 4,202,496 [†] |
| 6,299,648 | Bidirectional EM RNN | 6,299,648 |
| 6,299,648 | | 6,299,648 |
| 102,500 | Projection to 100-dim vector | 102,500 |
| 14,915,143 | Total Parameter Counts | 31,720,007 |

[†] Counts gap exists due to the input dimension differences

Specifically, given a protein sequence of T amino acids $\mathbf{s} = [s_1, \dots, s_T]$ where $s_i \in \{21 \text{ amino acid types}\}^1$, PLUS-RNN transforms it into a sequence of representations. First, an input embedding layer EM embeds each amino acid into a d_x -dimensional dense vector:

$$\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_T], \quad \mathbf{x}_i = \text{EM}(s_i). \quad (1)$$

Then, a BiRNN of L -layers obtains bidirectional representations as a function of the entire sequence. We use long short-term memory (LSTM) as the basic unit of the BiRNN. In each layer, it computes d_h -dimensional forward and backward hidden states ($\vec{\mathbf{h}}_i^l$ and $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_i^l$) and combines them into a hidden state \mathbf{h}_i^l with a non-linear transformation:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\mathbf{h}}_i^l &= \sigma(\vec{\mathbf{W}}_x^l \mathbf{h}_i^{l-1} + \vec{\mathbf{W}}_h^l \mathbf{h}_{i-1}^l + \vec{\mathbf{b}}^l), \\ \overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_i^l &= \sigma(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{W}}_x^l \mathbf{h}_i^{l-1} + \overleftarrow{\mathbf{W}}_h^l \mathbf{h}_{i+1}^l + \overleftarrow{\mathbf{b}}^l), \\ \mathbf{h}_i^l &= \sigma(\mathbf{W}_h^l [\vec{\mathbf{h}}_i^l; \overleftarrow{\mathbf{h}}_i^l] + \mathbf{b}^l) \quad \text{for } l = 1, \dots, L, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_i^0 = \mathbf{x}_i$; \mathbf{W} and \mathbf{b} are weight and bias vectors, respectively. We use the final hidden states \mathbf{h}_i^L as high-dimensional representations \mathbf{r} of each amino acid:

$$\mathbf{r} = [\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_T], \quad \mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{h}_i^L. \quad (3)$$

We adopt an additional projection layer to obtain smaller d_z -dimensional representations \mathbf{z} of each amino acid with a linear transformation:

$$\mathbf{z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_T], \quad \mathbf{z}_i = \text{Proj}(\mathbf{r}_i). \quad (4)$$

During pre-training, in order to reduce computational complexity, we use \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{z} for computing the MLM and SFP objectives, respectively. During fine-tuning, we can either use \mathbf{r} or \mathbf{z} which performs the best on the development set or based on computational constraints.

¹20 proteinogenic and [X] for unspecified amino acids

In this work, we primarily use two model sizes while fixing the input embedding dimension d_x and the projection dimension d_z as 21 and 100, respectively:

- PLUS-RNN_{BASE}: $L = 3$, $d_h = 512$
- PLUS-RNN_{LARGE}: $L = 3$, $d_h = 1024$

PLUS-RNN_{BASE} is chosen to match the embedding model architecture of P-ELMo (Table 3). However, since PLUS uses a single BiRNN model, it has less than half the total number of parameters of P-ELMo.

Pre-training PLUS

Now, we explain the pre-training scheme of PLUS for protein sequence modeling (Figure 1). In contrast to P-ELMo, we exploit both protein sequence and family labels to better incorporate structural information by devising a novel BERT-wise pre-training scheme. For the complete pre-training loss, we use pre-training loss lambda to control the relative importance of each objective.

Task #1: Masked Language Modeling (MLM)

For the MLM objective, we generally follow the procedures used in BERT. Given a protein sequence \mathbf{s} , we randomly select 15% of the input amino acids. Then, for each selected amino acid s_i , we perform one of the following random masking actions. For 80% of the time, we replace s_i with [X] which denotes the unspecified amino acid. For 10% of the time, we randomly replace s_i with one of the 20 proteinogenic amino acids. For the left 10%, we keep s_i intact.

Given a masked protein sequence $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$, PLUS-RNN produces bidirectional representations and its MLM decoder computes log probabilities $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$ over 20 amino acid types. The MLM objective trains the model to maximize those corresponding to the masked ones. As PLUS-RNN is asked to predict randomly masked amino acids given their contexts, the MLM objective enables the model to learn contextual representations throughout the entire protein sequence.

Task #2: Same Family Prediction (SFP)

Although protein sequences contain structural information, MLM objective is not enough to provide a proper supervision for training a model to learn structurally contextualized representations. Therefore, we propose a novel weakly supervised SFP objective leveraging the protein family labels from the Pfam dataset. To put it simply, this is a binary classification task of predicting whether a given pair of protein sequences belong to the same protein family or not.

In order to pre-train PLUS-RNN with the SFP objective, we sample two protein sequences \mathbf{s}^1 and \mathbf{s}^2 from the Pfam dataset. For 50% of the time, the two sequences are sampled within a same protein family. For the other 50%, they are randomly sampled from different protein families. Note that, in contrast to BERT pre-training, we do not need to consider the lengths of the input sequences during the sampling process since we use a BiRNN instead of the Transformer encoder.

PLUS-RNN transforms a protein pair into sequences of representations $\mathbf{z}^1 = [\mathbf{z}_1^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{T_1}^1]$ and $\mathbf{z}^2 = [\mathbf{z}_1^2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{T_2}^2]$. Then, we use soft-align comparison (Bepler and Berger

Table 4: Structural similarity prediction performance

| Model | 2.06 Test Set | | | | | | 2.07 Test Set | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Overall | | Per-Level Average Precision | | | | Overall | | Per-Level Average Precision | | | |
| | Acc | r | Class | Fold | Sfam | Fam | Acc | r | Class | Fold | Sfam | Fam |
| NW-align [†] | 0.785 | 0.189 | 0.309 | 0.409 | 0.584 | 0.527 | 0.808 | 0.377 | 0.440 | 0.701 | 0.866 | 0.824 |
| HHalign [†] | 0.789 | 0.368 | 0.404 | 0.621 | 0.864 | 0.522 | 0.809 | 0.688 | 0.478 | 0.839 | 0.941 | 0.823 |
| TMalign [†] | 0.789 | 0.617 | 0.549 | 0.851 | 0.833 | 0.571 | 0.813 | 0.814 | 0.593 | 0.916 | 0.939 | 0.823 |
| P-ELMo [†] | 0.951 | 0.910 | 0.915 | 0.902 | 0.953 | 0.648 | 0.932 | 0.929 | 0.894 | 0.940 | 0.963 | 0.866 |
| P-ELMo [‡] | 0.949 | 0.897 | 0.898 | 0.883 | 0.943 | 0.652 | 0.932 | 0.927 | 0.901 | 0.942 | 0.964 | 0.869 |
| PLUS-TFM _{BASE} | 0.962 | 0.927 | 0.935 | 0.912 | 0.954 | 0.674 | 0.945 | 0.938 | 0.914 | 0.950 | 0.963 | 0.860 |
| PLUS-RNN _{BASE} | 0.960 | 0.923 | 0.938 | 0.905 | 0.943 | 0.663 | 0.945 | 0.940 | 0.923 | 0.952 | 0.967 | 0.874 |
| PLUS-RNN _{LARGE} | 0.966 | 0.934 | 0.950 | 0.920 | 0.961 | 0.657 | 0.948 | 0.942 | 0.929 | 0.941 | 0.963 | 0.856 |

[†] Excerpted from (Bepler and Berger 2019)

[‡] Reproduced results

2019) to compute their similarity score \hat{c} as a negative weighted sum of $l1$ -distances between every \mathbf{z}_i^1 and \mathbf{z}_j^2 pair:

$$\hat{c} = -\frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^{T_1} \sum_{j=1}^{T_2} \omega_{ij} \|\mathbf{z}_i^1 - \mathbf{z}_j^2\|_1, \quad C = \sum_{i=1}^{T_1} \sum_{j=1}^{T_2} \omega_{ij}, \quad (5)$$

where the weight ω_{ij} of each $l1$ -distance is computed by

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{ij} &= 1 - (1 - \alpha_{ij})(1 - \beta_{ij}), \\ \alpha_{ij} &= \frac{\exp(-\|\mathbf{z}_i^1 - \mathbf{z}_j^2\|_1)}{\sum_{k=1}^{T_2} \exp(-\|\mathbf{z}_i^1 - \mathbf{z}_k^2\|_1)}, \\ \beta_{ij} &= \frac{\exp(-\|\mathbf{z}_i^1 - \mathbf{z}_j^2\|_1)}{\sum_{k=1}^{T_1} \exp(-\|\mathbf{z}_k^1 - \mathbf{z}_j^2\|_1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Intuitively, we can understand the soft-align comparison as computing an *expected alignment score*, where the expectations is over all possible alignments. Let α_{ij} be a probability that \mathbf{z}_i^1 is aligned to \mathbf{z}_j^2 considering the distances between all the embeddings of each amino acid from \mathbf{z}^2 (vice versa for β_{ij}). Then, \hat{c} is the expected alignment score over all possible alignments with probabilities ω_{ij} . The negative signs are for converting distances into scores.

Given the similarity score, the output layer finally computes a probability of belonging to the same protein family. The SFP objective trains the model to minimize cross entropy loss between the true label and the predicted probability. As PLUS-RNN is trained to produce higher similarity scores for proteins from the same families, the SFP objective enables the model to assimilate structural information from the weak labels of the Pfam dataset.

Fine-tuning PLUS

Fine-tuning PLUS-RNN is straightforward following the conventional usage of BiRNN-based prediction models. For each downstream task, we only add one or two additional classification layers on top of the pre-trained model. Then, all the parameters are fine-tuned with task-specific datasets and loss functions. For the complete fine-tuning loss, we use

fine-tuning loss lambda to control the relative importance of classification and regularization losses.

For tasks involving protein sequence pairs, we use the same framework used in the SFP pre-training objective. Specifically, we only replace the SFP output layer with a task-specific classification layer. For amino-acid-level tasks, the output layer is composed of a hidden layer with 100 units in addition to the classification layer. Given a protein, it is transformed into a sequence of representations as in the pre-training, then each representation vector of an amino acid is fed into the output layers. Although we do not cover single protein classification tasks in this work, it would not be much different from other tasks. We can either use soft-align comparison with two identical proteins or adopt an attention layer to aggregate variable-length representations along with a classification layer.

Experiments

We present PLUS fine-tuning results on three tasks. The first is a protein-level task, *i.e.*, structural similarity prediction of protein pairs. Since our motivation stems from comparing structural information directly from protein sequences, we use it as our primary task to evaluate and understand each aspect of the PLUS framework. Then, we further show results on two amino-acid-level tasks, *i.e.*, secondary structure prediction and transmembrane domain prediction.

We benchmark PLUS-RNN models against task-specific state-of-the-art algorithms for each task. Furthermore, we also compare our model with two alternative pre-training methods, P-ELMo and PLUS-TFM_{BASE}. The latter is a Transformer encoder model, analogous to BERT_{BASE}, pre-trained with PLUS pre-training scheme. We use sinusoidal position encoding (Vaswani et al. 2017) instead of learned positional embeddings to allow the model to extrapolate to longer sequences than those encountered during the training.

All of the models are implemented in PyTorch (Paszke et al. 2017) and trained on either NVIDIA V100 or P40 GPUs. Additional pre-training and fine-tuning details are provided in Appendix A.1.




Figure 2: Correlation between predicted similarity scores and true similarity levels for SCOPe 2.06 test dataset.

Table 5: Comparison of different pre-training loss lambda

| | Loss Lambda | | Overall Performance | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----|---------------------|--------------|
| | SFP | MLM | Accuracy | r |
| PLUS-RNN _{BASE} | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.965 | 0.932 |
| (PT-A) | 1.0 | - | 0.940 | 0.885 |
| (PT-B) | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.960 | 0.925 |
| (PT-C) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.960 | 0.924 |
| (PT-D) | - | 1.0 | 0.958 | 0.920 |

Note: All the other training details are set to the default value.

Table 6: Comparison of different fine-tuning loss lambda

| | Loss Lambda | | | Overall Performance | |
|--------------------------|-------------|------|------|---------------------|--------------|
| | SSP | MLM | CMP | Accuracy | r |
| PLUS-RNN _{BASE} | 0.7 | 0.3 | - | 0.965 | 0.932 |
| (FT-A) | 1.0 | - | - | 0.955 | 0.914 |
| (FT-B) | 0.5 | 0.5 | - | 0.959 | 0.921 |
| (FT-C) | 0.7 | - | 0.3 | 0.958 | 0.919 |
| (FT-D) | 0.5 | - | 0.5 | 0.962 | 0.923 |
| (FT-E) | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.960 | 0.921 |

Note: All the other training details are set to the default value.

Protein-level task: Structural similarity prediction

Structural similarity prediction (SSP) is a five-class classification task. Given a pair of proteins, the goal is to classify it into a shared level within the SCOPe structure hierarchy (Table 2, Appendix Figure ??). The compared previous state-of-the-art algorithms are NW-align (Needleman and Wunsch 1970), HAlign (Söding, Biegert, and Lupas 2005), and TAlign (Zhang and Skolnick 2005). We use the same experiment settings as in P-ELMo. Please see Appendix A.2 for details on the SCOPe dataset and the compared algorithms.

For evaluating the overall performance of the prediction algorithms, we use accuracy and Pearson correlation between the predicted similarity scores and the true similarity level. We also report the average precision for each similarity level (Table 4). Both PLUS-RNN and PLUS-TFM_{BASE} models outperform all previous state-of-the-art algorithms, while PLUS-RNN_{LARGE} shows the best overall performance. The correlation differences between P-ELMo,




Figure 3: Prediction performance for protein pairs of different lengths on SCOPe 2.06 development dataset.

PLUS-TFM_{BASE}, and PLUS-RNN_{LARGE} are all statistically significant with p-values less than 10^{-15} (Steiger 1980). Compared with the sequence similarity based NW-align, we can see that the predicted similarity scores by PLUS-RNN_{LARGE} model clearly differentiate the true structural similarity levels (Figure 2).

In the following subsections, we show various ablation studies to better understand each aspect of the PLUS framework. We use the PLUS-RNN_{BASE} model and the SCOPe 2.06 development dataset unless explicitly stated otherwise.

SFP pre-training improves protein representations

We explore the effect of using different pre-training loss lambda (Table 5). We can see that removing either loss hurts the structural similarity prediction performance. It demonstrates the importance of both pre-training tasks for learning protein representations. In particular, considering the recent paper claiming that NSP task does not show consistent improvements in NLP (Yang et al. 2019), the performance improvement brought by SFP loss holds great significance.

MLM fine-tuning serves as a better regularization

We explore the effect of using different fine-tuning loss lambda. In addition to SSP loss, we can simultaneously minimize different regularization losses. Specifically, we tried using additional MLM and contact map prediction (CMP) losses (Table 6). The results show that using SSP and MLM losses with proper lambda performs the best. The CMP loss, which was proposed in P-ELMo to further incorporate structural information, provides only small improvements compared to the MLM loss. It indicates that PLUS has already sufficiently learned structural information from the pre-training, and the MLM loss serves as a better regularization method during the fine-tuning.

PLUS-TFM_{BASE} fails to generalize for longer proteins

We compare the performances of PLUS-TFM_{BASE} and PLUS-RNN_{LARGE} for protein pairs of different lengths (Figure 3). We denote *Long* for protein pairs longer than 512 amino acids and *Short* otherwise. Since PLUS-TFM_{BASE} uses sinusoidal position encoding, we can simply use it for *Long* protein pairs (PLUS-TFM_{BASE}-A). However, the performance of PLUS-TFM_{BASE} deteriorates for longer sequences than those encountered during the training. If we rather truncate them to 512 amino acids, it shows less performance degradation. On the other hand, PLUS-RNN_{LARGE} consistently provides great performances regardless of the

protein lengths (PLUS-TFM_{BASE}-B).

The results clearly show the context size limitation of the Transformer encoder. Although the number of *Long* protein pairs is relatively small (13.4%) in the current dataset, it is indispensable to deal with long protein sequences for analyzing complex proteins that are found in nature. While in this work, we adopted a BiRNN to resolve the limitation, we expect recently proposed adaptive attention span for the Transformer will be able to help improve PLUS-TFM_{BASE} as well (Sukhbaatar et al. 2019).

Amino-acid-level tasks

We next evaluate PLUS on two amino-acid-level tasks. To put it simply, both secondary structure and transmembrane domain prediction tasks can be understood as sequence-to-sequence problems where each amino acid within a protein is classified into their corresponding classes.

In the following subsections, we first introduce the basic information of each task and provide a comprehensive discussion of the results in aggregate. Please see Appendix A.3 and A.4 for details on the datasets and the compared algorithms for each task, respectively.

Secondary structure prediction The goal of the secondary structure prediction task is to classify each amino acid into eight or three classes describing the local structure. We use CB6313 from CullPDB as the training dataset and report eight and three class prediction accuracies for CASP10 and CASP11 datasets (Moult et al. 2014). The compared previous state-of-the-arts algorithms are SSPro (Magnan and Baldi 2014) and DCRNN (Li and Yu 2016).

Transmembrane domain prediction A transmembrane (TM) protein refers to those integrated into the cell membrane. The goal of TM domain prediction is to classify each amino acid into four domains: a membrane, the inside or the outside of the membrane, and a signal peptide. Although this is an amino-acid-level prediction task, the evaluation is done in protein-level following the guidelines from TOPCONS (Tsirigos et al. 2015). Additionally, we also report the amino-acid-level evaluation results for the PLUS models. We compare the predictions with Phobius (Reynolds et al. 2008) and TOPCONS using benchmark datasets (TM, SP+TM, GB, GB+SP) provided by the latter.

Result analysis The evaluation results for each task are provided in the Table 7 and 8, respectively. For both tasks, we can see that PLUS-RNN models outperform all the compared state-of-the-art algorithms. One notable thing is that the performances of PLUS-TFM_{BASE} model are worse than the baseline models. This is different from the results in the previous protein-level task. We suppose that this is because the Transformer encoder places the same importance on every position. It is reasonable for protein-level tasks such as the global structural similarity prediction. However, considering that locality is more important for fine-grained amino-acid-level tasks, it is necessary to put more focus on the local contexts as a BiRNN model naturally does. On the other hand, we expect that for tasks where long term dependencies are more important within the 512 context size limit, the

Table 7: Secondary structure prediction performance

| Model | CASP10 | | CASP11 | |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 8-class | 3-class | 8-class | 3-class |
| SSPro [†] | 0.759 | 0.842 | 0.667 | 0.784 |
| DCRNN [†] | 0.769 | 0.878 | 0.731 | 0.853 |
| P-ELMo | 0.856 | 0.899 | 0.841 | 0.890 |
| PLUS-TFM _{BASE} | 0.641 | 0.762 | 0.626 | 0.747 |
| PLUS-RNN _{BASE} | 0.865 | 0.907 | 0.847 | 0.894 |
| PLUS-RNN _{LARGE} | 0.870 | 0.913 | 0.853 | 0.898 |

[†] Excerpted from (Li and Yu 2016)

Table 8: Transmembrane prediction accuracy

| Model | TM | SP+TM | GB | GB+SP |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Protein-Level Evaluation | | | | |
| Phobius [†] | 0.550 | 0.830 | 0.950 | 0.940 |
| TOPCONS [†] | 0.800 | 0.800 | 0.970 | 0.910 |
| P-ELMo [†] | 0.770 | 0.850 | 1.000 | 0.940 |
| P-ELMo [‡] | 0.746 | 0.844 | 0.998 | 0.935 |
| PLUS-TFM _{BASE} | 0.805 | 0.444 | 1.000 | 0.802 |
| PLUS-RNN _{BASE} | 0.802 | 0.908 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| PLUS-RNN _{LARGE} | 0.833 | 0.909 | 1.000 | 0.996 |
| Amino-Acid-Level Evaluation | | | | |
| PLUS-TFM _{BASE} | 0.759 | 0.945 | 1.000 | 0.996 |
| PLUS-RNN _{BASE} | 0.839 | 0.965 | 1.000 | 0.996 |
| PLUS-RNN _{LARGE} | 0.846 | 0.970 | 1.000 | 0.999 |

[†] Excerpted from (Bepler and Berger 2019)

[‡] Reproduced results

PLUS-TFM_{BASE} model would provide comparable or even higher performances.

Concluding Remarks

In this work, we presented PLUS, a protein sequence representation model which captures structural information of amino acids. Our major contribution is proposing a novel BERT-wise pre-training scheme for protein sequence modeling. Consisting of the unsupervised MLM and weakly supervised SFP objectives, the proposed PLUS pre-training scheme enables leveraging both protein sequences and weak structural information from a large protein database.

As the recent language models have demonstrated that pre-training bidirectional language representations can help tackle a broad set of NLP tasks, we showed pre-training bidirectional protein representations can also advance the state-of-the-arts for both protein-level and amino-acid-level tasks.

We are excited about the future of PLUS and plan to extend the work in several directions. We are interested in a more thorough evaluation of PLUS models on diverse protein biology tasks such as the recently introduced TAPE benchmark (Rao et al. 2019). In addition, we also plan to explore more attention-based models such as the adaptive span Transformer to better deal with longer protein sequences.

References

- Alipanahi, B.; Delong, A.; Weirauch, M. T.; and Frey, B. J. 2015. Predicting the sequence specificities of dna-and rna-binding proteins by deep learning. *Nature biotechnology* 33(8):831.
- Asgari, E., and Mofrad, M. R. 2015. Continuous distributed representation of biological sequences for deep proteomics and genomics. *PLoS one* 10(11):e0141287.
- Bepler, T., and Berger, B. 2019. Learning protein sequence embeddings using information from structure. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Berg, J. M.; Tymoczko, J. L.; and Stryer, L. 2006. Biochemistry. 5th. New York: WH Freeman 38(894):76.
- Devlin, J.; Chang, M.-W.; Lee, K.; and Toutanova, K. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- El-Gebali, S.; Mistry, J.; Bateman, A.; Eddy, S. R.; Luciani, A.; Potter, S. C.; Qureshi, M.; Richardson, L. J.; Salazar, G. A.; Smart, A.; et al. 2018. The pfam protein families database in 2019. *Nucleic acids research* 47(D1):D427–D432.
- Fox, N. K.; Brenner, S. E.; and Chandonia, J.-M. 2013. Scope: Structural classification of proteins extended, integrating scop and astral data and classification of new structures. *Nucleic acids research* 42(D1):D304–D309.
- Gan, H. H.; Perlow, R. A.; Roy, S.; Ko, J.; Wu, M.; Huang, J.; Yan, S.; Nicoletta, A.; Vafai, J.; Sun, D.; et al. 2002. Analysis of protein sequence/structure similarity relationships. *Biophysical journal* 83(5):2781–2791.
- Holm, L., and Sander, C. 1996. Mapping the protein universe. *Science* 273(5275):595–602.
- Kim, H. K.; Min, S.; Song, M.; Jung, S.; Choi, J. W.; Kim, Y.; Lee, S.; Yoon, S.; and Kim, H. H. 2018. Deep learning improves prediction of crispr–cpf1 guide rna activity. *Nature biotechnology* 36(3):239.
- Li, Z., and Yu, Y. 2016. Protein secondary structure prediction using cascaded convolutional and recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2560–2567. AAAI Press.
- Liu, Y.; Ott, M.; Goyal, N.; Du, J.; Joshi, M.; Chen, D.; Levy, O.; Lewis, M.; Zettlemoyer, L.; and Stoyanov, V. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- Magnan, C. N., and Baldi, P. 2014. Sspro/accpro 5: almost perfect prediction of protein secondary structure and relative solvent accessibility using profiles, machine learning and structural similarity. *Bioinformatics* 30(18):2592–2597.
- Mikolov, T.; Sutskever, I.; Chen, K.; Corrado, G. S.; and Dean, J. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 3111–3119.
- Min, S.; Lee, B.; and Yoon, S. 2017. Deep learning in bioinformatics. *Briefings in bioinformatics* 18(5):851–869.
- Moult, J.; Fidelis, K.; Kryshchak, A.; Schwede, T.; and Tramontano, A. 2014. Critical assessment of methods of protein structure prediction (casp) round x. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics* 82:1–6.
- Needleman, S. B., and Wunsch, C. D. 1970. A general method applicable to the search for similarities in the amino acid sequence of two proteins. *Journal of molecular biology* 48(3):443–453.
- Nogueira, R., and Cho, K. 2019. Passage re-ranking with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.04085*.
- Paszke, A.; Gross, S.; Chintala, S.; Chanan, G.; Yang, E.; DeVito, Z.; Lin, Z.; Desmaison, A.; Antiga, L.; and Lerer, A. 2017. Automatic differentiation in PyTorch. In *NIPS Autodiff Workshop*.
- Peters, M. E.; Neumann, M.; Iyyer, M.; Gardner, M.; Clark, C.; Lee, K.; and Zettlemoyer, L. 2018. Deep contextualized word representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05365*.
- Radford, A.; Narasimhan, K.; Salimans, T.; and Sutskever, I. 2018. Improving language understanding with unsupervised learning. Technical report, Technical report, OpenAI.
- Rao, R.; Bhattacharya, N.; Thomas, N.; Duan, Y.; Chen, X.; Canny, J.; Abbeel, P.; and Song, Y. S. 2019. Evaluating protein transfer learning with tape. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*.
- Reynolds, S. M.; Käll, L.; Riffle, M. E.; Bilmes, J. A.; and Noble, W. S. 2008. Transmembrane topology and signal peptide prediction using dynamic bayesian networks. *PLoS computational biology* 4(11):e1000213.
- Söding, J.; Biegert, A.; and Lupas, A. N. 2005. The hhpred interactive server for protein homology detection and structure prediction. *Nucleic acids research* 33(suppl_2):W244–W248.
- Steiger, J. H. 1980. Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological bulletin* 87(2):245.
- Sukhbaatar, S.; Grave, E.; Bojanowski, P.; and Joulin, A. 2019. Adaptive attention span in transformers. In *ACL*.
- Trinh, T. H.; Luong, M.-T.; and Le, Q. V. 2019. Selfie: Self-supervised pretraining for image embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02940*.
- Tsirigos, K. D.; Peters, C.; Shu, N.; Käll, L.; and Elofsson, A. 2015. The topcons web server for consensus prediction of membrane protein topology and signal peptides. *Nucleic acids research* 43(W1):W401–W407.
- Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, Ł.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 5998–6008.
- Yang, Z.; Dai, Z.; Yang, Y.; Carbonell, J.; Salakhutdinov, R.; and Le, Q. V. 2019. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.08237*.
- Zhang, Y., and Skolnick, J. 2005. Tm-align: a protein structure alignment algorithm based on the tm-score. *Nucleic acids research* 33(7):2302–2309.