Determining protein structures using deep mutagenesis
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Determining the three-dimensional structures of macromolecules is a major goal of biological research, because of the close relationship between structure and function; however, thousands of protein domains still have unknown structures. Structure determination usually relies on physical techniques including X-ray crystallography, NMR spectroscopy and cryo-electron microscopy. Here we present a method that allows the high-resolution three-dimensional backbone structure of a biological macromolecule to be determined only from measurements of the activity of mutant variants of the molecule. This genetic approach to structure determination relies on the quantification of genetic interactions (epistasis) between mutations and the discrimination of direct from indirect interactions. This provides an alternative experimental strategy for structure determination, with the potential to reveal functional and in vivo structures.

Despite years of effort and technological developments, thousands of protein domains still have unknown three-dimensional structures. Mutations within a protein or RNA can have non-independent effects on fitness (called genetic interactions or epistasis)1–5 and double mutants have been used to probe the energetic couplings between positions in a protein to understand determinants of protein folding and stability6–9. Early work revealed that at least some strongly interacting mutations within a protein are in direct structural contact10–12 (Fig. 1a). Deep mutational scanning (DMS) of proteins13–15 and RNAs16–18 has further revealed that some—but by no means all—epistatic interactions occur between structurally proximal mutations.

Support for the idea that non-independence between mutations provides structural information comes from the analysis of amino acid and nucleotide sequence evolution. Here, correlated pairs of amino acids or nucleotides in multiple sequence alignments identify co-evolving positions within proteins and RNAs19–21. These patterns of co-evolution have been used to identify energetically coupled positions and independently evolving ‘sectors’ within proteins22,23. Moreover, when very large numbers of homologous proteins and RNAs are available in sequence databases, the application of global statistical models can reveal direct structural contacts from patterns of co-evolution24–26, allowing the prediction of macromolecular structures and interactions27–29.

The question then becomes whether epistatic interactions quantified from DMS experiments can be used to determine macromolecular structures. If successful, structure determination by DMS would offer a number of advantages over established techniques. First, it requires no specialized equipment or expertise beyond the ability to mutate a molecule, select functional variants, and quantify enrichments by sequencing. Appropriate in vitro and in vivo selection assays already exist for many molecules of interest and generic assays based on folding, stability and physical interactions have also been developed30–32. Second, it could be applied to molecules for which structures are difficult to determine by physical techniques such as intrinsically disordered and membrane proteins. Third, unlike evolutionary coupling analysis there is no requirement for large numbers of homologous sequences33–35 and so it could be applied to fast-evolving, recently evolved and de novo designed proteins and RNAs. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it would provide a general strategy to determine the physiologically relevant structures of molecules while they are performing particular functions that can be selected for, including in vivo in cells. A potentially cheap and straightforward approach for studying macromolecular structures in vivo would be an exciting new frontier for cell and molecular biology.

Here we show that DMS of proteins can provide sufficient information to determine their three-dimensional backbone structures. Our statistical approach quantifies how often mutations between positions interact epistatically and how these epistatic interaction patterns correlate. These metrics accurately identify individual tertiary structure contacts as well as secondary structure elements within a protein. The same approach also identifies contacts between protein-interaction partners. DMS data alone suffice to determine backbone structures with accuracies of 1.9 Å Cα root mean square deviation (r.m.s.d.) compared to known reference structures. Moreover, we show that deep learning can further improve prediction performance, allowing the use of sparser and lower quality DMS datasets for structure determination. Our approach therefore provides an experimental strategy for structure determination that can reveal functional and in vivo structures.

Results

Epistasis is enriched in, but not exclusive to, structural contacts.

We first investigated the relationship between epistasis and structure for more than half a million mutant variants (55 × 19 = 1,045 single mutants plus nearly 55 × 54/2 × 19 × 19 = 536,085 double mutants) of the protein G B1 (GB1) domain36. For these variants, protein fitness was quantified using binding to an immunoglobulin G (IgG) fragment as a selection assay, resulting in a two-orders-of-magnitude measurement range with a median relative error of fitness estimates of 2.8% (Table 1 and Supplementary Fig. 1a).

We used a running median surface approach as a null model for the independence of the effects of double mutations (Fig. 1b) to account for nonspecific dependencies between mutants introduced by the fitness assay or nonspecific epistatic behavior from...
thermodynamic stability effects. Double mutants were classified as positive or negative epistatic if they have more extreme fitness than the 95th or 5th percentile fitness surfaces, respectively. Restricting the classification of epistasis to variants not impeded by measurement errors resulted in 80% and 55% of double mutants being suitable for positive or negative epistasis classification, respectively, with substantial variability across the position matrix (Table 1).

Consistent with previous observations, both positive and negative epistatic double mutants are enriched for proximal variants, for example, more than twofold at a distance of 8 Å (Fig. 1c, only considering position pairs separated by more than 5 amino acids in the linear sequence; closer positions are trivially also close in three-dimensional space and their proximity contributes little to successful structure prediction). However, about 75% of epistatic interactions are between positions that are not in direct contact in the protein (as judged by an 8 Å distance cut-off), suggesting that indirect effects often underlie specific epistatic interactions within a molecule. The challenge for structure determination therefore becomes how to infer direct structural contacts from the mixture of direct and indirect effects that underlie epistasis.

Likelihood of epistatic interactions and correlated interaction profiles predict tertiary structure contacts. To discriminate direct structural contacts from a list of thousands of epistatic double mutants, we used two measures. The first, which we refer to as the enrichment score, quantifies how often double mutants between each pair of positions interact with positive or negative epistasis (Fig. 2a). Calculating the fraction of epistatic interactions separately for either positive or negative interactions enriches for structural contacts, but for different regions of the domain (Fig. 2b and Supplementary Fig. 2). Combining the positive and negative epistatic fractions, while taking into account quantification errors, further enriches for direct contacts (precision...
Fig. 2 | Likelihood of epistatic interactions and correlated interaction profiles predict tertiary structure contacts. a, The enrichment score quantifies the fraction of positive and negative epistatic interactions per position pair (here positions 7 and 33). Gray shading indicates epistatic interactions that are not quantifiable (see Supplementary Fig. 1c–f). b, Structural distribution of top 28 epistatic interaction pairs (PDB entry 1PGA). Left, pairs with the highest positive (red) and negative (yellow) epistatic enrichments. Right, pairs with highest enrichment scores. c, The correlation score quantifies the similarity of epistatic interaction profiles between position pairs. Example of positive (top) and negative (bottom) epistatic interaction profiles for positions 7 and 33 (marked by gray horizontal bars) is shown. d, Structural distribution of top 28 pairs with highest positive (red) or negative (yellow) Pearson correlations (left), partial correlations (middle) or correlation scores (right) of interaction profiles. e, Distance of position pairs (>5 amino acids in linear sequence, n = 1,225) as a function of enrichment scores, merged Pearson correlation of epistasis interaction profiles or correlation scores. Box plots are spaced in intervals of 8 Å; boxes cover the first to third quartile of the data, with the middle bar indicating the median, whiskers extend to 1.5× the interquartile range away from the box. Dashed horizontal line indicates an 8 Å threshold. Pearson correlation coefficients are indicated. f, Distribution of top 55 position pairs (>5 amino acids in linear sequence, indicated by dotted lines) with highest enrichment score (black, bottom left triangle) or correlation scores (green, top right triangle) on contact map of the reference structure (gray shading). Reference secondary structure elements (wave, α-helix; arrow, β-strand) are shown on top. g, Precision of interaction scores to predict direct contacts (distance <8 Å) as a function of top scoring position pairs. There are 131 direct contacts out of 1,225 pairs (>5 amino acids in linear sequence), horizontal dashed line indicates random expectation.
for positive and negative interactions before merging them while correcting correlations for transitive signals—to better distinguish each pair of positions. The assumption that underlies this score is these contacts evenly distributed across the domain (Fig. 2b,f).

Finally, combining the enrichment and correlation scores into a combined score by simply summing normalized scores further improves contact predictions, especially when considering lower ranked predictions (PRC\(_{1/2}\) = 82%, PRC\(_{C}\) = 73%; Fig. 2g).

**Identification of secondary structure elements.** We hypothesized that the periodic geometrical arrangement of amino acid residues in secondary structures (3.6 residues per α-helical turn and alternating side-chain directions in β-strands) might result in periodic epistasis patterns in DMS data\(^{33-36}\) (Fig. 3a). We used a two-dimensional kernel smoothing approach to detect α-helical and β-strand periodicities (Fig. 3b) and found significant periodicities for one α-helix and four β-strands that coincide very well with secondary structure elements in the reference structure (Fig. 3c and Supplementary Fig. 3a). Moreover, stretches of off-diagonal, long-distance interactions show the expected alternating patterns for either parallel or anti-parallel β-sheets, with the top predictions corresponding to the known anti-parallel interactions of β1−β2 and β3−β4 as well as the parallel interaction of β1−β4 (Fig. 3d and Supplementary Fig. 3b,c). Furthermore, updating β-strand predictions according to inferred β-sheet pairings led to improved β-strand prediction, enforcing a split between β1 and β2 and correcting the length of β3 and β4 (Fig. 3c,d). Overall, these secondary structure element predictions achieve precision and recall values of about 90% when derived from correlation scores (or combined scores; Supplementary Fig. 3d). Predictions from enrichment scores are less precise, thus suggesting that eliminating transitive, indirect interactions is important for secondary structure prediction.

**Tertiary structure prediction.** We next tested whether the DMS data alone could be used to determine the structure of the protein domain. We performed structural simulations by simulated annealing using the XPLOR-NIH modeling suite\(^4\) with the top L scoring position pairs as distance constraints as well as dihedral angle constraints for predicted secondary structure elements and restrictive distance constraints for predicted β-sheet positions that form hydrogen bonds (Fig. 3e).

Comparing the structural models against the experimentally determined crystal structure of GB1 revealed that the combined scores provided the best predictions, with the top 5% of models (25 out of 500, evaluated on internal energy terms and constraint satisfaction) having an average C\(_r\) r.m.s.d. of 1.9 Å and an average template modeling score of 0.71 (Fig. 3f,g and Supplementary Fig. 3f), which is very close to the optimum achievable with our simulation protocol (using contacts, secondary structure elements and β-sheet interactions from the reference structure, C\(_r\) r.m.s.d. = 1.4 Å and template modeling score = 0.8). Consistent with the slightly lower precision of tertiary contact and secondary structure predictions, models generated with constraints from enrichment or correlation scores have—on average—a lower accuracy (C\(_r\) r.m.s.d. = 3.4 Å and C\(_r\) r.m.s.d. = 2.6 Å, respectively), although correlation score models performed consistently better.

Together, this shows that DMS alone is sufficient to accurately determine the backbone structure of a protein domain.

**Deep mutagenesis identifies protein interaction contacts and structures.** Epistatic interactions can also occur between different proteins, for example between physical interaction partners\(^5\). We tested whether epistasis between two proteins quantified using our metrics could predict their structural interactions. We used a dataset\(^6\) in which we had made all possible amino acid mutations at 32 positions in the products of the FOS and JUN proto-oncogenes and quantified the physical interaction of all single and (trans-)double mutants using a deep sequencing-based protein complementation assay (Fig. 4a and Table 1). Notably, enrichment scores show a binary all-or-none relationship with distance similar to the correlation scores in GB1 (Fig. 4b), with distant position pairs across the interaction surface contained in a low enrichment score peak and proximal interactions enriched for high enrichment scores. Indeed, the top 11 enrichment score pairs are all proximal interactions, and the precision of contact prediction is PRC\(_{1/2}\) = 75% and PRC\(_{C}\) = 66% (12-fold and 10.5-fold increase over expectation). Moreover, top enrichment score pairs are evenly distributed across the interaction surface (Fig. 4a,c).

Correlating the epistatic interaction profiles between columns of the epistatic enrichment matrices compares the epistatic interactions that two positions in FOS have with all positions in JUN. Therefore, the similarity of column-wise epistatic profiles identifies the cis relationships between positions in FOS, while row-wise interaction profiles identify cis relationships between positions in JUN (Supplementary Fig. 4a). The cis-interaction maps from correlation scores for both FOS and JUN are highly enriched in local interactions and applying our secondary structure prediction algorithms reveals strong α-helix propensities across the full lengths of both FOS and JUN, consistent with the coiled-coil structure of the complex (Fig. 4b and Supplementary Fig. 4b).

This shows that DMS of protein-interaction partners can accurately predict direct contacts across the interaction surface as well as reveal the underlying structural conformations of the interaction partners themselves.

**Generality and data requirements for successful protein structure prediction.** To test the generality of our approach, we analyzed two additional DMS of individual protein domains, the PAB1 RRM2 domain\(^7\) and the human YAP65 WW domain\(^8\) (Fig. 5a,b). These datasets contain only incomplete sets of double mutants (approximately 10%), were sequenced less deeply and have up to six times smaller measurement ranges, resulting in up to three times higher relative measurement errors and fewer double mutants that were suitable for quantification of epistasis (especially negative epistasis) (Table 1 and Supplementary Fig. 5a). Nonetheless, tertiary contacts can be predicted with good precision (combined score PRC\(_{1/2}\) = 57% (threefold higher than random expectation) and PRC\(_{C}\) = 59% (3.9-fold increase over expectation) for the RRM2 and WW domain, respectively; Fig. 5c,d and Supplementary Fig. 5b). Secondary structure predictions were inaccurate and underpowered (0% precision), but β-sheet pairing was inferred correctly (100% precision and recall for RRM2 domain), albeit off by one and two positions for the two anti-parallel sheet interactions in the WW domain (Fig. 5c,d).

We used the top L/2 predicted combined score contacts to model the structure of the secondary structure-rich central part of the WW domain (positions 6–29, 24 amino acids, see Methods). The top 5% of structural models have an average accuracy of 3.3 Å C\(_r\) r.m.s.d. compared to the reference structure (Fig. 5a), which is on
Fig. 3 | Secondary and tertiary structure prediction from DMS data. a, Local interactions (above diagonal, raw combined scores up to 7-amino-acid distance in linear sequence; below diagonal, scores smoothed with a Gaussian kernel) reveal signatures of secondary structure. Middle line is diagonal of interaction score map (rotated by 45°) and shows secondary structure elements of reference structure. b, Two-dimensional kernels with sinusoidal profile to detect stereotypical α-helical (left, period of 3.6) and β-strand (right, period of 2) interactions and perpendicular Gaussian profile to average over similar interaction patterns in adjacent positions. c, Secondary structure propensity P values derived from kernel smoothing (one-sided permutation test, see Methods) in comparison to reference structure secondary structures (wave, α-helix; arrow, β-strand). d, Structural predictions derived from combined score data compared to reference structure contact map (gray shading). Bottom left, top 55 non-local (>5 amino acids in linear sequence) tertiary contacts. Top right, predicted secondary structure elements. Fill indicates correct prediction. The β-strand predictions are derived by intersection of β-strand propensities (c) and β-sheet pairing predictions (Supplementary Fig. 3b,c). e, Schematic for the generation of three-dimensional structural models (see Methods for details). f, Overlay of top structural model of the GB1 domain generated with constraints from combined score (blue) and crystal structure (gold, PDB entry 1PGA). g, Accuracy (Cα r.m.s.d.) of top 5% structural models (n = 25) generated from interaction score-derived constraints (three right-most columns) compared to reference structure. Left, ‘no contacts’ indicates negative control with constraints only for secondary structure (predicted by PSIPRED)10. ‘True contacts’ indicates a positive control with constraints derived from 55 random tertiary contacts, secondary structure elements and β-sheet interactions of the reference structure. Box plots show boxes that cover the first to third quartile of the data, with the middle bar indicating the median, and whiskers that extend to 1.5x the interquartile range away from the box.
We could not make structural predictions if the measurement range of the selection assay relative to the median error of fitness estimates, which results in unquantifiability of negative epistasis, see Supplementary Figs. 1d–f and 5a), by using only positive epistasis information to calculate interaction scores. This also results in a drop of precision of about 20% (PRC = 55%). By contrast, only using negative epistasis information resulted in a drop to 33% precision, as low as a doped dataset with low sequencing read coverage.

Finally, we evaluated how differences in prediction performance of tertiary contacts affect structural modeling. Changes in accuracy of the top structural models scale with changes in contact prediction performance (Fig. 5f). Downsampling of sequencing reads in the complete dataset from 100% to 2.5% leads to a decrease in average accuracy from 2.5 Å to 4 Å Cᵣ.m.s.d., which is roughly also the accuracy of top structural models from the doped dataset and the dataset using only positive epistasis information.

Together, these results support the generality of our approach for extracting structural information from DMS data, including from sparser and lower quality datasets.

**Deep learning improves contact prediction.** Evolutionary coupling-based structural predictions have been successfully improved by machine-learning approaches that transform the two-dimensional interaction score maps after learning the stereotypical patterns between evolutionary coupling-predicted contact maps and experimentally determined contact maps. We tested whether machine learning could also improve DMS-derived contact predictions. We applied a convolutional neural network called DeepContact, which transforms a two-dimensional interaction score map based on the structural patterns it has previously learned on evolutionary coupling-derived contact predictions for representative families of the SCOPe database (Fig. 6a and Methods).

We first transformed the combined score interaction map of the GB1 domain using the DeepContact network. These transformations take as sole input our DMS-derived predictions and include no evolutionary coupling or otherwise-derived structural predictors for GB1. The scores on the transformed map are much less noisy, with high scores exclusively focused in areas of structural contacts, especially those of secondary structure element interactions, and areas
Fig. 5 | Generality and data requirements for successful protein structure prediction from DMS data. a. PAB1 RRM2 domain (PDB entry 1CVJ). The analyzed 25-amino acid segment is highlighted in blue. The top 12 combined score position pairs are connected with red lines, solid if distance <8 Å, dashed otherwise. b. Overlay of top structural model of the human YAP65 WW domain (positions 6–29) generated with constraints from combined score (blue) and solution NMR structure (gold, PDB entry 1K9Q). c. Structural predictions derived from combined scores in RRM2 domain. The top plot shows secondary structure propensities from kernel smoothing (one-sided permutation test) in comparison to secondary structures in the reference map. Map shows top 12 combined score position pairs in bottom left and secondary structure predictions in top right triangle, in comparison to reference contact map (gray shading). d. Structural predictions derived from combined scores in the WW domain. The top plot shows secondary structure propensities from kernel smoothing (one-sided permutation test) in comparison to secondary structures in reference. Map shows top 17 combined score position pairs in bottom left and secondary structure predictions in top right triangle, in comparison to the reference contact map (gray shading). Black diamonds indicate positions of β-sheet pairing in the reference map. e. Precision of top L combined score position pairs for different downsampled versions of the GB1 dataset (in terms of type of variants analyzed or sequencing coverage). f. Accuracy (average C<sub>r.m.s.d. </sub>) of top 5% structural models (n = 25) derived with tertiary contact constraints from downsampled GB1 datasets compared to the reference structure.

deed of structural contacts showing homogeneously low scores (Fig. 6b). The precision of top predicted contacts improves from 82% to 96% for L/2 and from 73% to 87% for L predicted contacts (Fig. 6c).

Predictions derived from the two other GB1 interaction scores (enrichment and correlation scores) as well as the interaction score maps for the other datasets (downsampled GB1, FOS–JUN, RRM2 and WW data) show similar improvements both in terms of cleaner interaction score maps that better resemble the reference contact maps as well as increases in contact prediction performance of up to 30% (Fig. 6c and Supplementary Fig. 6). By contrast, randomized interaction score maps show no changes in prediction performance over random expectation after transformation with DeepContact.

Finally, we tested whether DeepContact-transformed contact predictions could also improve structural modeling. On downsampled GB1 datasets, DeepContact-transformed predictions increased the accuracy of structural models by up to 2.6 Å (Fig. 6d). For the complete datasets with only 25% or 10% of sequencing reads, the top structural models have better accuracy than those from the complete dataset with full sequencing read coverage but untransformed scores. In addition, structural models based on DeepContact-transformed scores from the doped dataset with full or 25% sequencing coverage and those from the dataset using only positive epistasis information reach average accuracies of 3.2 Å C<sub>r.m.s.d. </sub>Only for the two datasets with 2.5% sequencing read coverage do structural simulations based on DeepContact-transformed scores not improve model accuracy.

This shows that machine learning can substantially improve contact map prediction from DMS data, thus allowing the use of even sparser and lower quality data for accurate structure prediction.

Discussion
We have shown here that simply quantifying the activity of a large number of single- and double-mutant variants of a macromolecule can provide enough information to reliably determine its three-dimensional fold.

Our analyses and previous work<sup>6–9,11–18</sup> have shown that many epistatic interactions occur between positions that are not in direct structural contact. Indeed, in the GB1 domain, the interactions are strikingly modular, with two mutually exclusive clusters of positive and negative epistatic interactions arising potentially from differential energetic couplings to protein stability and binding (Fig. 2b,d and Supplementary Fig. 2c), reminiscent of the concept of semi-independent energetically coupled protein sectors that have been identified from patterns of sequence co-evolution<sup>2,21</sup>.

Nonetheless, aggregating epistatic interactions on position pairs, merging of positive and negative epistasis information and partial
correlation analysis of epistasis interaction profiles can successfully discriminate direct from indirect structural contacts. Thus, mostly indirect epistatic couplings can be transformed to accurately predict secondary structure elements and tertiary contacts to reveal the protein fold.

We have shown that our approach works robustly across multiple protein domains and a protein interaction. Moreover, we have demonstrated that the application of a convolutional neural network previously trained on patterns of co-evolution in proteins of known structure both improves structure prediction and allows the use of much lower quality DMS datasets. We note that our approach is likely to be only one of several that could work.

We expect that development of the computational approach (consideration of the underlying physico-chemistry, better scoring methods and extracting side-chain information) as well as integration with other structural predictors and homology-driven structure modeling is likely to further improve accuracy and lower the data-quality requirements for structure determination by deep mutagenesis.

Whether it will be possible to determine the structures of larger molecules by deep mutagenesis remains to be investigated. It is currently unclear how the requirements for variant coverage scale with protein length or the complexity of folds. However, the fact that sparse double-mutant datasets can suffice for structure prediction, and the rapid development of DNA synthesis and sequencing technologies suggest that similar approaches may work for larger structures. Currently, DMS libraries for larger proteins could be created via fragment-based ligation or programmed mutagenesis and sequenced by linking variants to short barcodes to overcome the current size limitations of short-read sequencers.

A limitation of the current approach is that, similar to methods based on evolutionary couplings of residues, it identifies tertiary contacts but does not provide atom-level structural information. However, our finding that epistatic interactions contain information on the periodic arrangement of side-chain orientations in secondary structure elements and that tertiary contacts are better described by side-chain than backbone atom distances suggests that genetic interactions are mostly mediated by structural interactions of amino acid side chains and that it might be possible to extract additional information about their orientations to improve structural modeling.

Determining structures by DMS offers several practical advantages. The approach does not require the expensive scientific infrastructure that most physical techniques require and uses methods familiar to molecular biologists. Selection assays based on known functions or interaction partners already exist for many proteins and the development of generic assays for stability and activity should allow it to be applied to molecules of unknown function. The approach also potentially brings the power of high-throughput genomics to structural biology. For example, using the existing infrastructure of genomics institutes, a large-scale project to systematically determine the structures of all protein domains of unknown structure is a plausible endeavor. Finally, and perhaps most interestingly, DMS allows the structures of macromolecules to be studied in vivo in the cell. Ultimately, it is the structures of macromolecules as they perform a particular function in vivo that are of most interest. Deep mutagenesis, selection and sequencing provide a generic approach for in vivo structural biology.
In summary, DMS provides an experimental strategy for structure determination and opens up the possibility of low-cost and high-throughput determination of in vivo macromolecular structures, both by individual laboratories and by large-scale genomics projects.

Online content
Any methods, additional references, Nature Research reporting summaries, source data, statements of code and data availability and associated accession codes are available at https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0431-x.

Received: 9 October 2018; Accepted: 29 April 2019; Published online: 17 June 2019

References
1. Ovchinnikov, S. et al. Protein structure determination using metagenome sequence data. Science 355, 294–298 (2017).
2. Tokuriki, N. & Tanford, D. S. Stability effects of mutations and protein evolvability. Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol. 19, 596–604 (2009).
3. Lehner, B. Molecular mechanisms of epistasis within and between genes. Trends Genet. 27, 323–331 (2011).
4. Pachta, O. et al. Suppression scanning of an RRM domain of the Bacillus subtilis 70S ribosome. J. Mol. Biol. 422, 2643–2651 (2014).
5. Sahoo, A., Khare, S., Devanarayanan, S., Jain, P. C. & Varadarajan, R. Residue proximity information and protein model discrimination using saturation-suppressor mutagenesis. eLife 4, e09532 (2015).
6. Li, C. & Zhang, J. Multi-environment fitness landscapes of a tRNA gene. Nat. Ecol. Evol. 2, 1025–1032 (2018).
7. Li, C., Qian, W., Maclean, C. J. & Zhang, J. The fitness landscape of a tRNA gene. Science 352, 837–840 (2016).
8. Domingo, J., Isss, G. & Lehner, B. Pairwise and higher-order genetic interactions during the evolution of a tRNA. Nature 558, 117–121 (2018).
9. Puchta, O. et al. Network of epistatic interactions within a yeast snoRNA. Mol. Syst. Biol. 13, 801–807 (2014).
10. Starita, L. M. et al. Activity-enhancing mutations in an E3 ubiquitin ligase protein. Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 109, 10958–10962 (2012).
11. Schwieters, C. D., Kusweski, J. J., Tjandra, N. & Clore, G. M. The Xplor-NIH NMR molecular structure determination package. J. Magn. Reson. 160, 65–73 (2003).
12. Araya, C. L. et al. A fundamental protein property, thermodynamic stability, revealed solely from large-scale measurements of protein function. Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 109, 16858–16863 (2012).
13. Liu, Y., Palmedo, P. E., Ye, Q., Berger, B. & Peng, J. Enhancing evolutionary couplings with deep convolutional neural networks. Cell 6, 65–74 (2018).
14. Schrock, D. et al. Antisense strand mutagenesis of an E3 ubiquitin ligase protein. Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 109, 8370–8375 (2012).
15. Beall, F. J. & Elcock, R. Protein domains coevolve with function in viruses related to tobacco mosaic virus. J. Mol. Biol. 193, 693–707 (1987).
16. Gloor, G. B., Martin, L. C., Wahl, L. M. & Dunn, S. D. Mutual information in protein multiple sequence alignments reveals two classes of coevolving positions. Biochemistry 44, 7156–7165 (2005).
17. Altschuh, D., Desai, A. M., Bloomer, A. C. & Klug, A. Correlation of co-ordinated amino acid substitutions with function in viruses related to tobacco mosaic virus. J. Mol. Biol. 193, 693–707 (1987).
18. Halabi, N., Rivoire, O., Leibler, S. & Ranganathan, R. Protein sectors: evolutionary units of three-dimensional structure. Cell 138, 774–786 (2009).
19. Lockless, S. W. & Ranganathan, R. Evolutionarily conserved pathways of energetic connectivity in protein families. Science 286, 295–299 (1999).
20. Marcoux, F. et al. Direct-coupling analysis of residue coevolution captures native contacts across many protein families. Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 108, E1293–E1301 (2011).
Acknowledgements
We thank Y. Liu and J. Peng for making their DeepContact code available and for their advice; members of the Lehner laboratory, T. Gross, G. Mönke, M. Bolognesi and C. Camilloni for discussions and feedback. This work was supported by a European Research Council (ERC) Consolidator grant (616434), the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness (MEIC), the AXA Research Fund, the Bettencourt Schueller Foundation, Agencia de Gestió d' Ajuts Universitaris i de Recerca (AGAUR, 2017 SGR 1322), the EMBL-CRG Systems Biology Program and the CERCA Program/Generalitat de Catalunya. J.M.S. was supported by an EMBO Long-Term Fellowship (ALTF 857-2016). This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement 752809 (J.M.S.). We acknowledge support from the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness (MEIC) to the EMBL partnership and the Centro de Excelencia Severo Ochoa.

Author contributions
J.M.S. and B.L. conceptualized the study; J.M.S. developed the methods and carried out the study; J.M.S. and B.L. wrote the paper; B.L. supervised the study.

Competing interests
The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information
Supplementary information is available for this paper at https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-019-0431-x.

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to B.L.

Publisher's note: Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature America, Inc. 2019
Methods

Datasets and preprocessing. The GB1 domain. The DMS data for GB1 were obtained from the supplementary information of a previous study. The data consist of summed read counts of three replicate experiments assaying the binding affinity of GB1 variants to IgG.

Read frequencies of each single- or double-mutant variant in the input library and output library (after the binding affinity assay) were calculated as variant read counts relative to wild-type variant read counts. The fitness of a variant was calculated as the natural logarithm of the ratio of input to output read frequency, that is, 

\[ \log \left( \frac{n_{\text{in}} \cdot \text{exp}(f)}{n_{\text{out}} \cdot \text{exp}(f_{\text{WT}})} \right) \]

where \( n \) is the read counts, superscripts denote the input (in) or output (out) sequencing library and subscripts denoting variant i or wild-type (WT) variant.

The standard error of fitness estimates was calculated from read counts under Poissonian assumptions, that is, 

\[ \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{\text{in}}} + \frac{1}{n_{\text{out}}} + \frac{1}{\text{exp}(f)}}. \]

We note that this is a lower bound estimate of the actual error, owing to the lack of replicate information.

Each measurement assay has a lower measurement limit due to unspecific background effects (Supplementary Fig. 1c). In the case of the IgG-binding assay for GB1, this is presumably mainly due to unspecific carryover on beads. The fitness values derived from the measurement are therefore a convolution of the actual binding affinities to IgG and nonspecific carryover, that is, 

\[ \text{exp}(f) = \exp(f_{\text{exp}}) \]

and fitness values of variants close to the lower measurement limit of the assay are dominated by unspecific carryover effects. The lower measurement limit of the assay was estimated by two approaches that yielded similar estimates. The first used a kernel density estimate of the single-mutant fitness distribution (R function density with parameter bw set to 0.15), where the position of the lower mode of the data corresponded to \( f_{\text{exp}} = -5.85 \).

The second examined the fitness distribution of double mutants with expected fitness lower than \( -8 \) log-transformed units, that is, double mutants resulting from two lethal or nearly lethal single-mutant variants, for which the fitness values are thus expected to be dominated by background effects. The median of this background fitness distribution yielded an estimate of \( f_{\text{exp}} = -6.14 \). The mean of the two estimates, that is, 

\[ \text{exp}(f) = -6 \] (approximately 0.25% on a linear scale) was used for downstream analysis.

In addition, 7% of double-mutant variants were discarded because of a too low sequencing coverage in input or output libraries (Supplementary Fig. 1b). That is, variants with 10 or less input read counts were discarded because of too high errors in fitness estimates. Moreover, variants with less than 200 input reads and no output reads were discarded, because it is not possible to determine their fitness. Above 200 input reads, variants without output reads are certain to be dominated by nonspecific carryover effects. These variants were retained and their fitness was calculated by setting their output read count to 0.5.

Downsampling of the GB1 data. Downsampling of the full GB1 dataset was performed in three different ways. First, to downsample the sequencing read coverage, the read count of each variant was drawn from a binomial distribution with the number of sequencing reads in the full datasets as trials and the target down sampling rate (25%, 10% or 2.5%) as chance of success. Second, in the doped datasets, only amino acid changes created by one nucleotide mutation from the wild-type sequence (ESN entry M12823) were retained. For the read downsampled and doped datasets (and combinations of both), the analysis workflow for the full dataset was repeated.

For the downsampled datasets in which only positive or negative epistatic information was taken into account, enrichment and correlation scores were calculated from epistatic enrichment matrices and partial correlation matrices of only positive or negative epistatic information. Instead of inferring positive and negative matrices and then calculating z-scores, z-scores were calculated with the individual errors from only positive or negative epistatic information. The combined scores (for which results are reported) for each set were then calculated as for the full dataset by summing standardized enrichment and correlation scores.

The human YAP65 WW domain. Data for the human YAP65 WW domain were obtained from Sequence Read Arch (SRA) entry SRP015751. Paired-end reads were merged with USEarch and merged reads for which any base had a Phred base quality score below 20 were discarded. Read counts from the two technical sequencing replicates were merged and read counts for the same amino acid variants with at most one synonymous mutation in one other codon were summed. The dataset consists of an input library and three output libraries after consecutive rounds of selection in a phage display assay. Fitness was estimated as the slope of log-transformed frequency (variant counts divided by wild-type counts) changes over the rounds of selection experiment. For each variant at each selection step a Poissonian error of \( \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{\text{in}}} + \frac{1}{n_{\text{out}}} + \frac{1}{\text{exp}(f)}} \) was calculated, where \( x \) denotes the selection step. Slopes were calculated as weighted straight-line least-square fits. Comparison of library-wide changes in variant frequencies between selection rounds suggested differential selection pressures across the rounds. We thus applied a non-equidistant spacing of 0.6, 1.17 and 1.22 between selection rounds when calculating slopes. Only variants that have more than 10 reads in the input library and at least one read after the first selection were retained for further analysis (45% of constructed double mutants). The lower fitness limit was calculated as the weighted mean fitness of all variants that contained STOP codons (\( \sim 0.78 \) in log units).

PAB1 RRM2 domain. PAB1 RRM2 domain data were obtained from Supplementary Table 3 of a previous study. Reported variant read enrichment scoring was log-transformed to obtain fitness values. Output reads were deduced from the number of input reads times the read enrichment score and used to calculate a Poissonian error of the fitness estimate. Single-mutant count data are not provided and we thus estimated the error of single-mutant fitness estimates to be \( 0.01 \). The lower bound of the fitness assay was estimated as the weighted mean fitness of all double-mutant variants that contained STOP codons (\( \sim 3.1 \) log units).

In the human YAP65 WW domain, three 25-amino acid segments were mutated independently and we restricted analysis to the middle segment (position 26–50) containing a significant number of non-local contacts.

FOS-JUN interaction. Raw count tables were provided by G. Diss. The dataset consists of input and output sequencing libraries after selection for physical interactions between the two proteins in a protein complementation assay in three bilateral replicates. Per sequencing library, read counts from all synonymous variants were summed up. Only variants that had more than 10 reads in each of the three input libraries were used for further analysis (43% of double mutants).

Per input–output replicate, each variant was categorized as positive or negative epistatic, that is, fitness values transformed change in frequency compared to the wild-type variant (as for GB1). A Poissonian error for the fitness estimate of each variant was derived. The lower measurement bound of the fitness assay was estimated as the weighted mean fitness of all double STOP mutant variants (\( \sim 8.6 \) log units). A Bayesian estimator of fitness values was implemented to overcome variant dropout due to a large dynamic range in the fitness assay (see Supplementary Note).

Epistasis classification. Epistasis was calculated from a non-parametric null model—running quantile surfaces—to account for nonlinearity close to the lower limit of the measurement range of the fitness assay, nonspecific epistatic behavior resulting from, for example, thermodynamic stability thresholds as well as differential uncertainty of fitness measurements across the fitness landscape, due to lower read counts in the output for low fitness variants (Fig. 1b).

First, double-mutant fitness values were corrected by subtracting the average local fitness computed using a two-dimensional local polynomial regression (using the R function loess with span 0.2). This was necessary to avoid boundary effects of quantile-based fits in boundary regions with non-zero slopes. The 5th and 95th percentile surfaces were then fitted to these residual double-mutant fitness values, by computing for each double-mutant variant the 5th and 95th percentile of the fitness distribution made up of the 1% closest neighbors in single-mutant fitness space. Double-mutant variants with fitness values below the 5th or above the 95th percentile were categorized as negative or positive epistatic, respectively (Fig. 1b).

The evaluation of positive or negative epistasis was, however, restricted to specific subsets of the data for which measurement errors do not impede epistasis classification (see Supplementary Note and Supplementary Fig. 1c). As a result of these restrictions as well as differences in initial coverage, the number of double-mutant variants that can be used to assess positive and negative epistasis varies substantially across position pairs and datasets (see Table 1 and Supplementary Figs. 1–4, 5c, 5a).

Interaction scores. Several interaction scores were derived to estimate which position pairs are in close contact in the tertiary structure (Fig. 2a,c; see Supplementary Fig. 8 for an overview of the workflow). These scores are based on summarizing epistasis information on the position pair level and accounting for the varying uncertainty of the summarized estimates due to differential error of fitness estimates across the measurement range as well as varying numbers of double mutants amenable to epistasis classification (see Table 1 and Supplementary Figs. 1d–f, 4c, 5a). To summarize epistasis information on the position pair level, the fraction of positive or negative epistatic variants per position pair was calculated (number of epistatic variants divided by the number of variants amenable for epistasis classification; Supplementary Fig. 8, step 5b). Because enrichments with positive and negative epistatic interactions per position are anti-correlated (Supplementary Fig. 2a), positive and negative enrichments were treated separately and only aggregated to derive the final interaction scores. The uncertainty of interaction scores was calculated from a resampling procedure in which fitness values for the variants as well as the resulting epistatic fractions were drawn from appropriate probability distributions (see Supplementary Note for details and Supplementary Fig. 1c).

Enrichment scores, which quantify how often positions interact epistatically, were derived by merging positive and negative epistatic fractions by weighted averaging, that is, 

\[ e_{xy} = \frac{x_{xy} + y_{xy} \times c_{xy}}{x_{xy} + y_{xy}} \]

where \( c_{xy} = \text{the mean positive/negative epistatic fraction and } \sigma_{xy} \) is the standard deviation of positive/negative epistatic
fractures across resampling runs. These merged epistatic fractions were further normalized by their uncertainty, that is, \( E_{xy} = \sqrt{p_{xy}} / \sqrt{r_{xy}} \), with \( r_{xy} = (\sigma_{xy}^2 + \sigma_{yx}^2)^{-1/2} \) to arrive at the final enrichment score (Supplementary Fig. 8, step 6).

Correlation scores are derived from the similarity of epistatic interaction profiles between position pairs. The rationale behind this score is that proximal positions in the protein should have similar distances and geometrical arrangements towards all other positions in the protein and should therefore also have similar profiles of epistatic interactions with all other positions. First, symmetric matrices (of size mutated amino acid positions \( \times \) mutated amino acid positions) of positive and negative epistatic enrichments were constructed (Supplementary Fig. 8, step 5c). Missing values (position pairs without observed variants) were imputed by drawing a random value from the overall distribution of epistatic fractions. A pseudo-count equal to the first quartile of the epistatic fraction distribution was added to all matrix entries. Diagonal elements (epistatic fractions of a position with itself) were set to 1. The matrix values were transformed by the natural logarithm and for each pair of columns, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to arrive at the correlation matrix (Supplementary Fig. 8, step 5d). The correlation matrix was regularized using a shrinkage approach to minimize the mean-squared error between the estimated and true correlation matrix and to obtain a positive definite and well-conditioned correlation matrix suitable for inversion (R package copula). Next, partial correlations of epistatic interaction profiles between each position pair were calculated by inverting the regularized correlation matrix and normalizing each off-diagonal entry of the inverted matrix by the geometric mean of the two respective diagonal entries, that is \( r_{xy} = \frac{\sigma_{xy}^2}{\sigma_{xx}^2 \times \sigma_{yy}^2} \) as the \((x,y)\) entry of the inverted correlation matrix (Supplementary Fig. 8, step 5d). We note that this approach is similar to the mean-field approach used to deduce interaction direct from indirect evolutionary couplings in multiple-sequence alignments (Supplementary Fig. 8, step 6).

Equivalent to the enrichment score, positive and negative partial correlation estimates were merged by calculating weighted averages of their mean estimates across resampling runs, with weights as the inverse variances across resampling runs, that is \( a_{xy} = \frac{p_{xy}}{\sigma_{xy}^2} + \frac{p_{yx}}{\sigma_{yx}^2} \) and the final correlation score was obtained by normalizing the combined uncertainty \( r_{xy} = \sqrt{p_{xy}^2 + \sigma_{xy}^2} \) with \( \sigma_{xy} = (\sigma_{xy}^2 + \sigma_{yx}^2)^{-1/2} \) (Supplementary Fig. 8, step 6).

Finally, a combined score was derived by summing the standardized enrichment and correlation scores, that is \( C_{xy} = \frac{\sigma_{xy}}{\sigma_{xy}} + \frac{\sigma_{yx}}{\sigma_{yx}} \), to prioritize position pairs that are enriched for epistatic interactions and have similar epistasis profiles. We note that this is a naive approach to computing the information from these two complementary sources, and surely more sophisticated approaches that further improve proximity estimates can be developed in the future.

**Protein distance metrics.** The minimal distance between side-chain heavy atoms of two residues (in the case of glycine, C\(_{\beta}\)) was used as the distance metric. Only direct contact was defined as a minimal side-chain heavy atom distance < 8 Å. Only position pairs with linear sequence separation greater than 5 amino acids were considered when evaluating tertiary contact predictions. Evaluating contact predictions only on side-chain heavy atom distance instead of all heavy atoms increases true-positive rates over random expectation, thus suggesting that epistatic interactions are accurately mediated by structural interactions of amino acid side chains (Supplementary Fig. 7).

We used the following reference structures for comparison:

- **GB1 domain:** PDB entry 1PGA, X-ray diffraction structure
- **WW domain:** PDB entry 1K9Q, solution NMR structure
- **RRM2 domain:** PDB entry 1CVJ (chain A), X-ray diffraction structure
- **GB1 domain:** PDB entry 1PGA, X-ray diffraction structure
- **FOS–JUN interaction:** PDB entry 1FOS (chains E and F), X-ray diffraction structure

We found that precision or accuracy calculated against other reference structures differed only marginally, thus we have limited reporting to the aforementioned PDB entries.

**Secondary structure prediction.** Secondary structure elements were predicted using a two-dimensional kernel smoothing approach on the interaction score matrices (Fig. 3a–c). For a given amino acid position in the linear chain (on the diagonal of the interaction score matrix), the perpendicular dimension of the kernels define how interactions with adjacent positions (off-diagonal entries close to the diagonal) should be integrated given the interaction patterns expected from the stereotypical periodicities of secondary structures, that is, 3.6 amino acids in \( \alpha \)-helices and 2 amino acids in \( \beta \)-strands. Moreover, the diagonal dimension of the kernels averages the stereotypical interaction patterns of secondary structures across several adjacent positions. Similarly, modified \( \beta \)-strand kernels were used to detect \( \beta \)-sheet interactions for all pairs of positions. Significance of secondary structure element predictions was assessed from a permutation test, for which kernel smoothing was performed on 10\(^4\) randomly permuted interaction score maps. More details on secondary structure predictions are provided in the Supplementary Note.

**Protein structure prediction.** Protein structures were modeled ab initio with structural constraints derived from the DMS data using simulated annealing molecular dynamics (XPLOR-NIH modeling suite, see Supplementary Note for details).

**DeepContact learning.** DeepContact software was obtained from GitHub (https://github.com/largelymfs/deepcontact). We are grateful to Y. Liu and J. Peng for also making their basic DeepContact network architecture available on their GitHub repository and helping us with the implementation. The DeepContact architecture used here only takes one two-dimensional input of predicted contact scores and returns a two-dimensional map of transformed scores (denoted as 'DeepContact CCMPred only' in the previous study and described in the first paragraph of the results section therein). The DeepContact architecture that was used came with a pre-trained network model that had been trained by comparing tertiary contact predictions from correlated evolution (using CCMpred\(^{44}\)) to experimentally determined structures of proteins in the 40% homology-filtered ASTRAL SCOPe v.2.56 dataset (see GitHub repository and the previous study\(^{44}\)). Because CCMpred scores\(^{32}\) are distributed in the range of 0 to 1, DMS-derived interaction scores were pre-normalized to a range between 0 and 1 before providing them as an input to DeepContact. As negative control, we created, for each dataset, three random permutations of combined score matrices (while preserving matrix symmetry; in the case of the FOS–JUN dataset, non-symmetric enrichment score matrices were permuted), which were transformed by the DeepContact algorithm. These control datasets show no increased precision over random expectation (Fig. 6c).

**Reporting Summary.** Further information on research design is available in the Nature Research Reporting Summary linked to this article.

**Data availability** No primary data were generated in this study. Data sources are listed in the Methods at appropriate places. Processed interaction scores for all datasets are included in Supplementary Table 1. All intermediate steps of data processing can be recaptured with the scripts provided at https://github.com/lehner-lab/DMS2structure.

**Code availability** Paired-end sequencing reads were merged with USEarch v.10.0.240. Data were analyzed with custom scripts written and executed in the R programming language, v.3.4.3. Structural simulations were performed with Xplor-NIH modeling suite v.2.64. TM-Score\(^{22}\) (update 23 March 2016) was used to evaluate accuracy of structural models. PSIPRED v.3.3 was used to predict secondary structure elements from amino acid sequences. PyMOL v.1.8.6.0\(^{60}\) was used to visualize protein structures. All custom scripts needed to repeat the analyses are available at https://github.com/lehner-lab/DMS2structure.
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**Study design**
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| Sample size | All published deep mutational scanning datasets of proteins in which at least 25 amino acid positions were assayed with more than 2% of amino acid double mutant coverage were analysed (n = 4). |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data exclusions | Sequencing read mapping (only applies to WW domain data): Reads were discarded if they had any base call with lower than Phred quality score 20 after merging paired-end reads. Double mutants were excluded from further analyses if the expected errors of their fitness estimates were too high or if fitness was not determinable. GB1 - variants equal or less than 10 input read counts or those with less than 200 input read counts and 0 output read counts. WW - variants with equal or less than 10 input read counts or zero read counts in after the first selection round. RRM - variants with equal or less than 10 read counts. FOS-JUN - variants with equal or less than 10 input read counts. The following data exclusion rules were applied to epistasis classification in order to prevent classification being dominated by noise in fitness measurement: Positive epistasis classification: Double mutants were not considered for positive epistasis classification if the 95th percentile fitness surface at their location is equal to or above wild-type fitness; if not at least one single mutant fitness value is significantly smaller than wild-type fitness at two standard errors of fitness estimate; if the expected fitness (sum of single mutant fitness values) is not significantly lower than wild-type fitness at two standard errors. Negative epistasis classification: Double mutants were not considered for negative epistasis classification if the 5th percentile fitness surface at their location is equal to or below the 95th percentile of the background effect distribution; if at least one single mutant fitness value is not significantly higher than the lower measurement limit of the fitness assay at two standard errors; if the expected fitness is significantly higher than wild-type fitness at two standard errors. |
| Replication | Workflow was developed on protein G B1 domain and replicated on WW and RRM domain datasets as well as FOS-JUN interaction dataset and downsampled versions of protein G B1 domain. |
| Randomization | No samples were allocated into experimental groups. |
| Blinding | No blinding was performed as there was no group allocation. |
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