rMSA: A Sequence Search and Alignment Algorithm to Improve RNA structure modeling

Supplementary Information

Table of Content

Supplementary Text

Text S1. Number of effective sequence (*Nf*)

Text S2. Structure Conservation Index (*SCI*)

Text S3. Evaluation metrics for rSS prediction.

Text S4. Filtering of MSA for PETfold and RNAalifold.

Supplementary Figures

Figure S1. Comparison of alignment depths in log₁₀ scale between rMSA and RNAcmap.

Figure S2. rMSA running time versus sequence length.

- Figure S3. Scatter plot for F1-score of rSS prediction by R-scape, denoted as F1(Rscape), minus that of R-scape --RAFSp, denoted as F1(RAFSp), versus the *Nf* of rMSA alignments for each target.
- **Figure S4.** Scatter plot for F1-score of rSS prediction by PLMC versus rMSA *Nf* in log₂ and linear scale for each target RNA.

Figure S5. F1-score of rSS prediction by PLMC versus *Nf* of rMSA alignments.

Figure S6. Probabilities of base pairing for pairs of nucleotides within different PLMC score bins.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1. List of RNA structures in the benchmark dataset.

- **Table S2.** Average rSS prediction accuracies by different MSA construction and thermodynamics-based rSS prediction schema
- **Table S3.** Version number of third-party programs used in this study.
- **Table S4.** Average alignment depth of different MSA construction schemes after the alignment is filtered for PETfold and RNAalifold.
- **Table S5**. Impact of using different single sequence rSS predictions for covariance model construction on rMSA alignment quality.

Table S6. Average RNAcontact accuracies for different MSAs

References

Supplementary Text

Text S1. Number of effective sequence (*Nf*)

The number of effective sequence is calculated as in our previous work [1].

$$
Nf = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{m=1, m \neq n}^{N} I[S_{m,n} \ge S_{cut}]} \qquad \dots (S1)
$$

In Equation S1, *L* is the length of target RNA; *N* is the total number of sequences in the MSA; *m* and *n* are the index of sequences in the MSA; *Sm*,*ⁿ* is the sequence identity between the *m*-th and *n*-th sequences. When calculating the sequence identity, a gap is treated as an additional nucleotide type. *Scut* is the sequence identity cutoff above which two sequences are considered redundant to each other. We used *Scut*=80%, as described in a previous study [2]. *I*[] is an Iverson bracket operator, which equals to 1 if $S_{m,n} \geq S_{cut}$, or 0 otherwise. Mathematically, *Nf* is the number of non-redundant sequences in the MSA divided by square root of sequence length [3].

Text S2. Structure Conservation Index (*SCI*)

In addition to the MSAscore described by main text Equation 2, we also tested the usage of *Nf* (main text Equation 1) and the Structure Conservation Index (*SCI*) to select the final MSA from the set of 5 MSAs generated by rMSA for each target RNA. *SCI* was introduced by the work of RNAz [4], and is defined as:

$$
SCI = \frac{E_{MSA}}{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} E_n} \quad \dots (S2)
$$

Here, *N* is the total number of sequences in the MSA, and E_n is the score of RNA secondary structure (rSS) predicted by minimal free energy method for the *n*-th sequence in the MSA, *EMSA* is the score for the consensus rSS predicted by RNAalifold. A close to zero *SCI* indicates that RNAalifold is not able to find a consensus structure; a set of perfectly conserved structures has *SCI* close to 1. *SCI* may be slightly greater than 1, which means that the rSS is not only conserved across different sequences of the MSA, but also supported by consistent mutations, which contribute a covariance score to *EMSA*.

Text S3. Evaluation metrics for rSS assignment

To evaluate the accuracy of base pair prediction by covariance programs, predicted pairs are ranked in descending order of covariance scores from PLMC and R-scape or the base pairing score reported by option -r of PETfold and option -p of RNAalifold. The top *Ln* base pairs are considered, where *Ln* is the number of base pairs in the experiment structure. The accuracy of rSS prediction for each RNA can then be quantified by F1-score and Mathews Correlation Coefficient (MCC):

$$
F1 = \frac{2}{\frac{1}{PPV} + \frac{1}{TPR}} \dots (S3)
$$

$$
MCC = \frac{TP \cdot TN - FP \cdot FN}{\sqrt{(TP + FP)(TP + FN)(TN + FP)(TN + FN)}} \dots (S4)
$$

In the above equations, *TP* is the number of True Positive base pairs correctly predicted; *FP* is the number of False Positive base pairs predicted by covariance program and not in the experimental structure; *FN* is the number of False Negative base pairs in the experimental structure that are missed by rSS prediction; *TN* is the number of True Negative nucleotide pairs that are neither predicted nor in the experimental structure. *PPV* (Positive Predictive Value) and *TPR* (True Positive Rate) are the precision and sensitivity of prediction:

$$
PPV = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \dots (S5)
$$

$$
TPR = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \dots (S6)
$$

Since the number of predicted base pairs that we consider (*TP*+*FP*) is the same as the number of experimental base pairs, i.e., *Ln*=*TP*+*FN*, the above equations can be further simplified into:

$$
F1 = PPV = TPR = \frac{TP}{Ln} \dots (S7)
$$

$$
MCC = \frac{TP \cdot TN - (Ln - TP)^2}{Ln(TN + Ln - TP)} \dots (S8)
$$

The rSS in RNA refers to canonical base pairings, i.e., Watson-Crick and G:U Wobble base pairs. It is therefore equivalent to a contact map in protein and is different from protein secondary structure. Therefore, rSS prediction accuracy cannot be measured by metrics for protein secondary structure prediction such as Q3 and SOV. Similar to previous studies on covariance analysis in proteins [5-7] and RNAs [2], our assessment of covariance algorithm is on a given number of top predictions (*Ln*) rather than on predictions with score above a given threshold (e.g., score>0.5). This is because, even for the same target RNA and the same covariance algorithm, the prediction scores from alignments with different depths are not comparable. For example, on our dataset, the average PLMC scores for top *Ln* predicted pairs is 1.426 for rMSA, which is consistently higher than the average PLMC scores of 1.023, 0.553, 0.059, 0.012 for RNAcmap, Infernal, nhmmer, and blastn, respectively.

Text S4. Filtering of MSA for PETfold and RNAalifold

Unlike PLMC and R-scape, which can handle very deep MSAs, PETfold often fails to complete the computation for MSAs with lots of sequences, especially when the sequences have too many gaps. Indeed, when testing on rMSA and RNAcmap alignments, half of the RNAs in our benchmark dataset cannot generate PETfold prediction and report "Segmentation fault" instead. Similarly, when presented with very deep MSAs, RNAalifold often cannot predict any base pairs and reports "backtracking failed in repeat; string and structure have unequal length" instead. Therefore, for PETfold and RNAalifold, we filter the MSAs to exclude sequences for which >5% of its positions are gaps. If the resulting MSAs have >1500 sequences, only the top 1500 sequences are retained for PETfold and RNAalifold. This aggressive filtering allows PETfold and RNAalifold to complete prediction for 97.8% and 100% of the benchmark RNAs, respectively. For the remaining 8 RNAs whose alignments from rMSA (but not

from other programs) cannot complete PETfold computation, their rMSA alignments are further reduced to the top 1000 sequences. This filtering of MSAs is an inevitable step to ensure that PETfold and RNAalifold can run through. It is not meant to improve the quality of MSAs. In fact, the F1-score of rSS prediction by PLMC, R-scape and Rscape --RAFSp dropped from 0.648, 0.575, and 0.561, respectively, for the original rMSA alignments to 0.500, 0.507, and 0.540 for filtered rMSA alignments.

Supplementary Figures

Figure S1. Comparison of alignment depths in log₁₀ scale between rMSA and RNAcmap. **(A, C)** Head-to-head comparison of *Nf* **(A)** or *N* **(C)** of rMSA (y-axis) and that of RNAcmap (x-axis) for each target RNA. Figure legend shows the number of RNAs above (red) or below (blue) the diagonal line; RNAs on the diagonal line is in black. **(B, D)** Distribution of *Nf* **(B)** or *N* **(D)** for rMSA (red) and RNAcmap (blue). Figure legend shows the mean and standard deviations of *Nf* or *N*. Among the 51 RNAs whose rMSA *Nf* is lower than RNAcmap *Nf*, 34 and 8 are tRNAs and ribosomal large subunit RNAs, respectively.

Figure S2. rMSA running time versus sequence length. The length of boxplot whiskers equals to the Interquartile range. Numbers on the top of the figures are the values for the least square linear fit (red line) and the Pearson's Correlation Coefficient (PCC).

Figure S3. Scatter plot for F1-score of rSS prediction by R-scape using the default GTp statistics, denoted as F1(Rscape), minus that of R-scape --RAFSp, denoted as F1(RAFSp), versus the *Nf* of rMSA alignments for each target. The numbers in the plot show the number of targets in each of the four quadrants divided by F1(Rscape)- F1(RAFSp)=0 (horizontal grey dash line) and by *Nf*=22 (vertical grey dash line).

Figure S4. Scatter plot for F1-score of rSS prediction by PLMC versus rMSA *Nf* in log² **(A)** and linear scale **(B)** for each target RNA. Numbers on the top of the figures are the values for the least square linear fit (black line) and the Pearson's Correlation Coefficient (PCC).

Figure S5. F1-score of rSS prediction by PLMC (y-axis) versus *Nf* of rMSA alignments (x-axis). The length of boxplot whiskers equals to the Interquartile range. Outliers are plotted as black dots. The values inside each box are the median F1-scores (above) and the number of rMSA alignments (below) for each *Nf* bin.

PLMC score bins (*x*-axis) for rMSA alignments of 361 target RNAs. The Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients between base pairing probabilities and PLMC score are 0.969 (p-value=9.31E-8) and 0.988 (p-value=9.31E-8), respectively.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1. List of RNA structures in the benchmark dataset. Targets are ranked in descending order of length, which equals to the number of nucleotides with coordinates in the experimental structure. While this list may include several RNAs for the same RNA family, e.g., tRNA, all RNAs within the same family or among different families are all non-redundant with sequence identity <80%.

_P . rSS predictor	MSA [§]	F1	P-value	MCC	P-value
PETfold	rMSA	0.717	*	0.715	\ast
	rMSA (Nf)	0.716	$4.03E-1$	0.714	$4.00E-1$
	rMSA (SCI) 0.719		$6.66E-1$	0.717	$6.65E-1$
	RNAcmap	0.736	9.96E-1	0.735	9.96E-1
	Infernal	0.736	$9.95E-1$	0.734	9.95E-1
	nhmmer	0.730	$9.45E-1$	0.728	9.47E-1
	blastn	0.686	$1.17E-3$	0.684	$1.24E-3$
	RNAlien	0.695	$7.57E-3$	0.693	8.03E-3
	Single \ddagger	0.690	$2.60E-3$	0.688	$2.75E-3$
RNAalifold	rMSA	0.692	*	0.690	\ast
	rMSA (Nf)	0.693	$6.35E-1$	0.691	$6.33E-1$
	rMSA (SCI) 0.700		$9.36E-1$	0.698	9.37E-1
	RNAcmap	0.712	9.80E-1	0.710	9.80E-1
	Infernal	0.724	9.99E-1	0.723	9.99E-1
	nhmmer	0.692	5.28E-1	0.691	5.36E-1
	blastn	0.684	$2.62E-1$	0.682	2.69E-1
	RNAlien	0.673	$6.29E-2$	0.671	6.58E-2
	Single \ddagger	0.670	$4.51E-2$	0.668	$4.72E - 2$

Table S2. Average rSS prediction accuracies by different MSA construction and thermodynamics-based rSS prediction schema

* All p-values are calculated by one-tail t-test to check if rMSA is better (higher F1 and higher MCC) than the respective MSA schema. P-values<0.05 are in bold.

† Apart from canonical base pairs, a covariance analysis can also report other pairwise interactions, such as the coupling between nucleotide pairs adjacent to each other in the sequence. To exclude these non-canonical interactions, the output of covariance analysis is filtered by the following steps before calculating the accuracy: firstly, only Watson-Crick (A:U and G:C) and Wobble (G:U) base pairs are included; secondly, the two nucleotides must be separated by at least 4 positions in the sequence; thirdly, if a base is predicted to simultaneously paired to another two or more bases, only a single base pair with the best covariance score is reported.

‡ "Single" means the input MSA only includes the target sequence. The rSS prediction for a single sequence differs between PETfold and RNAalifold, despite both using the thermodynamics parameters from ViennaRNA. This is because PETfold uses the maximum expected accuracy (MEA) model while RNAalifold uses the minimum free energy (MFE). § Version number of all MSA and rSS prediction programs are listed in **Table S3**.

Table S3. Version number of third-party programs used in this study.

† RNAcontact used for RNA contact prediction is not included in this table because it does not have a version number.

Table S4. Average alignment depths of different MSA construction schemes before and after the alignments are filtered for PETfold and RNAalifold.

MSA	Before filtering		After filtering	
rMSA	77.YZ 5308.8	98 - 98.7		
rMSA (Nf)			1164.1	11.0
RNAcmap	23226.8 9177.0	70.8 21.9	769.6	18.0
Infernal			644.2	6.3
nhmmer	3111.3	2.9	104.7	0.7
blastn			10 6	

† "rMSA" is the standard rMSA pipeline where the final rMSA alignment is selected by covariance score. "rMSA (*Nf*)" is a modified rMSA pipeline where the final alignment is selected by alignment depth. All but one RNA (5voe Chain A) have different alignments before versus after filtering.

Table S5. Impact of using different single sequence rSS predictions for covariance model (CM) construction on rMSA alignment quality, as measured by F1-score and MCC of rSS prediction using the resulting alignment. The rSS predictions for CM construction tested here includes minimum free energy (MFE, default in RNAfold) prediction and maximum expected accuracy (MEA, default in PETfold) prediction, both using the thermodynamics parameters from ViennaRNA 2.4. As references, the single prediction accuracies of RNAfold and PETfold are also listed.

MSA	F1	P-value	MCC	P-value			
rMSA	0.296	*	0.233	\ast			
RNAcmap	0.282	$4.32E-3$	0.220	$1.57E-2$			
Infernal	0.283	$1.77E-3$	0.222	8.61E-2			
nhmmer	0.257	1.93E-13	0.195	1.30E-11			
blastn	0.234	1.94E-24	0.169	$1.64E-22$			
Single \dagger	0.236	1.55E-25 0.172		7.42E-23			

Table S6. Average RNAcontact accuracies for different MSAs

* All p-values are calculated by one-tail t-test to check if rMSA is better (higher F1 and higher MCC) than the respective MSA schema. P-values<0.05 are in bold.

Reference

[1] Zhang C, Zheng W, Mortuza SM, Li Y, Zhang Y. DeepMSA: constructing deep multiple sequence alignment to improve contact prediction and fold-recognition for distant-homology proteins. Bioinformatics. 2020;36:2105-12.

[2] Weinreb C, Riesselman AJ, Ingraham JB, Gross T, Sander C, Marks DS. 3D RNA and functional interactions from evolutionary couplings. Cell. 2016;165:963-75.

[3] Zhang C, Zheng W, Mortuza SM, Li Y, Zhang Y. DeepMSA: constructing deep multiple sequence alignment to improve contact prediction and fold-recognition for distant-homology proteins. Bioinformatics. 2020;36:2105-12.

[4] Washietl S, Hofacker IL, Stadler PF. Fast and reliable prediction of noncoding RNAs. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2005;102:2454-9.

[5] Shrestha R, Fajardo E, Gil N, Fidelis K, Kryshtafovych A, Monastyrskyy B, et al. Assessing the accuracy of contact predictions in CASP13. Proteins. 2019;87:1058-68. [6] Kamisetty H, Ovchinnikov S, Baker D. Assessing the utility of coevolution-based residue-residue contact predictions in a sequence- and structure-rich era. P Natl Acad Sci USA. 2013;110:15674-9.

[7] Jones DT, Buchan DWA, Cozzetto D, Pontil M. PSICOV: precise structural contact prediction using sparse inverse covariance estimation on large multiple sequence alignments. Bioinformatics. 2012;28:184-90.