

Supporting Information

Francesca Cuturello¹, Guido Tiana², Giovanni Bussi¹

November 27, 2019

1 Supplementary Methods

1.1 Direct coupling analysis

The idea of direct coupling analysis is to infer a global statistical model $P(\sigma)$ that is able to generate the empirical data (single-site and two-sites frequency counts) [1], such that

$$F_i(\sigma_i) = \sum_{\{\sigma_k | k \neq i\}} P(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N) \equiv f_i(\sigma_i) \quad (1)$$

$$F_{ij}(\sigma_i, \tau_j) = \sum_{\{\sigma_k | k \neq i, j\}} P(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N) \equiv f_{ij}(\sigma_i, \tau_j) \quad (2)$$

Introducing a set of Lagrange multipliers $\boldsymbol{\theta} \equiv \{h_i(\sigma), J_{ij}(\sigma, \tau)\}$ to constrain the model averages $\boldsymbol{f} \equiv \{f_i(\sigma), f_{ij}(\sigma, \tau)\}$ to the observed frequencies \mathbf{F} , the maximum entropy distribution over the sequences takes the form

$$P(\{\sigma\}) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(\sum_i h_i(\sigma_i) + \sum_{ij} J_{ij}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) \right) \quad (3)$$

corresponding to a five-states fully connected Potts model, where

$$Z = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \exp \left(\sum_i h_i(\sigma_i) + \sum_{ij} J_{ij}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) \right) \quad (4)$$

is the partition function, $h_i(\sigma_i)$ are called *local fields*, while $J_{ij}(\sigma, \tau)$ are called *direct couplings* and can be interpreted as the direct interaction between nucleotides σ and τ at positions i and j , after disentangling them from the interaction with nucleotides sited at other positions. The partition function requires a sum to be done over all the possible sequences of a given length. For a multiple sequence alignment of length N nucleotides, this would amount to 5^N different sequences, where 5 includes the 4 nucleobases and the gap. Once parameters

$h_i(\sigma)$ and $J_{ij}(\sigma, \tau)$ have been determined, the Frobenius norm [2, 3, 4] of the coupling matrices can be used to obtain a scalar value for each pair of positions:

$$S_{ij} = \sqrt{\sum_{\{\sigma, \tau\}} J_{ij}(\sigma, \tau)^2} \quad (5)$$

We will discuss three different approaches that can be used to determine the parameters of the model: the mean-field approximation [1], the pseudo-likelihood maximization [4], and a Boltzmann-learning approach proposed here.

1.2 Mean field approximation

In the mean-field approximation, the effect of all nucleotides on any given one is approximated by a single averaged effect, reducing a many-body problem to a one-body problem. The mean-field approach is the one adopted in [1], by which coupling matrices are estimated as the inverse of the connected correlation matrices: $J_{ij}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) \simeq -C_{ij}^{-1}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j)$, where $C_{ij}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) = F_{ij}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) - F_i(\sigma_i)F_j(\sigma_j)$, and the local fields are estimated as $h_i(\sigma_i) \simeq \ln \frac{F_i(\sigma_i)}{F_i(\bar{\sigma}_i)} - \sum_{j, j \neq i} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i, \\ \sigma_i \neq \bar{\sigma}_i}} J_{ij}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j)F_j(\sigma_j)$, where $\bar{\sigma}$ is an arbitrarily chosen letter

of the alphabet, usually the one representing gaps. To make the matrix invertible and alleviate finite sample effects it is common to add pseudo-counts as $\hat{F}_i = (1 - \lambda)F_i + \frac{\lambda}{5}$ and $\hat{F}_{ij} = (1 - \lambda)F_{ij} + \frac{\lambda}{25}(1 - \delta_{ij}) + \frac{\lambda}{5}\delta_{ij}\delta_{\sigma_i\sigma_j}$, where $\lambda = 0.5$ [2].

1.3 Pseudo-likelihood maximization

An alternative approach to estimate the DCA inverse problem solution can be that of minimizing the negative pseudo-log likelihood function $l_{pseudo} = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_r \sum_{b=1}^B \log P(\sigma_r^b | \sigma_{\setminus r}^b)$. Here $\sigma_{\setminus r}^b$ denotes the identity of all the nucleotides *except* the one at position r , and thus $P(\sigma_r^b | \sigma_{\setminus r}^b)$ is the conditional probability of observing one variable σ_r given all the other variables. When data is abundant, maximizing the conditional likelihood tends to maximizing the full likelihood (see, e.g., [5, 6]). Pseudo-likelihood maximization allows to overcome the intractable evaluation of the full partition function, since calculating the normalization of the conditional probability only requires an empirical average over the dataset. In this paper we will exploit the asymmetric pseudo-likelihood maximization [4] as implemented at <https://github.com/magnusekeberg/plmDCA>.

1.4 Gauge invariance and regularization

The number of model parameters in Eq. 3 is $\frac{N(N-1)}{2}q^2 + Nq$ but the model is over-parametrized, in the sense that distinct parameter sets can describe the same probability distribution. This is because the consistency conditions (Eq. 1) are not independent, single-site marginals being implied by the two-sites

marginals and all distributions being normalized; thus the number of independent parameters turns out to be $\frac{N(N-1)}{2}(q-1)^2 + N(q-1)$ [7]. In order to remove the degeneracy of the mean-field solution so to obtain a unique and reproducible result, a possible *gauge* choice for the Potts model [8, 2] is the one minimizing the norm of couplings matrices (Eq. 5), namely $\sum_{\{\tau\}} J_{ij}(\sigma, \tau) = \sum_{\{\tau\}} J_{ij}(\tau, \sigma) = \sum_{\{\tau\}} h_i(\tau) = 0, \forall i, j, \sigma, \tau$. Another possible gauge is the one in which parameters relative to a specific letter of the alphabet $\bar{\sigma}$ (usually the one representing the gaps) are set to zero: $J_{ij}(\bar{\sigma}, \tau) = J_{ij}(\tau, \bar{\sigma}) = h_i(\bar{\sigma}) = 0, \forall i, j, \tau$. In the Boltzmann learning and pseudo-likelihood maximization frameworks, the degeneracy can alternatively be removed by minimizing a function obtained by the addition of an l_2 -regularization term to $l(\theta)$ [8], such that:

$$\theta = \arg \min_{\theta} \{l(\theta) + R(\theta)\} \quad (6)$$

where $R(\theta) = \frac{k}{2} \sum_p \theta_p^2$ and $p = \{1, \dots, \frac{N(N-1)}{2}q^2 + Nq\}$. For the Boltzmann learning approach we heuristically observed that a regularization is not necessary and that results are not sensitive to the choice of k , and we thus decided not to use any regularization term. For pseudo-likelihood we used a value of k depending on the alignment size, using the default options supplied by the employed software. Different prefactors were also tested (see Figure 12).

1.5 Mutual information

The mutual information between two positions i and j is defined as

$$MI_{ij} = \sum_{\sigma_i, \tau_j} F_{ij}(\sigma_i, \tau_j) \ln \frac{F_{ij}(\sigma_i, \tau_j)}{F_i(\sigma_i)F_j(\tau_j)} \equiv S_{ij} \quad (7)$$

and is a local measure of the mutual dependence between two random variables, quantifying how much the uncertainty about one of the two variables is reduced by knowing the other. It is the simplest possible way to assess covariance [9] and its capability to predict contacts in RNA has been reported to be surpassed by DCA-based methods [2].

Table 1: PDB, RFAMcode molecule name, alignment length and size, effective alignment size after reweighting of the data set.

PDB	RFAM	molecule name	length	size	size_{eff}
4L81	RF01725	SAM-I/IV variant riboswitch	97	693	128
2GDI	RF00059	TPP riboswitch	80	10858	1054
3F2Q	RF00050	FMN riboswitch	109	3144	1078
2GIS	RF00162	SAM riboswitch	93	4903	910
1Y26	RF00167	Purine riboswitch	71	2589	508
3DOU	RF00168	Lysine riboswitch	161	1870	832
4QLM	RF00379	ydaO/yuaA leader	108	2723	1067
2QBZ	RF00380	ykoK leader	153	850	240
5T83	RF00442	ykkC-yxkD leader	89	687	138
3OWI	RF00504	Glycine riboswitch	88	4602	985
3IRW	RF01051	Cyclic di-GMP-I riboswitch	91	2231	578
4FRG	RF01689	AdoCbl variant RNA	84	189	25
3VRS	RF01734	Fluoride riboswitch	52	1426	312
5DDP	RF01739	Glutamine riboswitch	61	1138	179
4XW7	RF01750	ZMP/ZTP riboswitch	64	1197	432
3SD3	RF01831	THF riboswitch	89	547	205
4RUM	RF02683	NiCo riboswitch	92	207	42

Table 2: \overline{MCC} with optimal covariance score threshold \overline{S} for Boltzmann learning DCA, pseudo-likelihood DCA, mean field DCA, mutual information for each of 17 RNA families, obtained through cross-validation procedure. Alignments are performed with *Infernal*.

PDB	Boltzmann learning DCA		Pseudo-likelihood DCA		mean field DCA		mutual information	
	\overline{MCC}	\overline{S}	\overline{MCC}	\overline{S}	\overline{MCC}	\overline{S}	\overline{MCC}	\overline{S}
3DOU	0.68	1.09	0.59	0.65	0.67	1.0	0.68	0.22
3F2Q	0.58	1.09	0.58	0.65	0.56	1.0	0.55	0.22
2QBZ	0.55	1.09	0.50	0.78	0.52	1.0	0.53	0.22
2GDI	0.55	1.09	0.51	0.65	0.57	1.0	0.48	0.22
1Y26	0.69	1.09	0.67	0.65	0.63	0.99	0.63	0.22
5T83	0.58	1.09	0.58	0.65	0.58	1.0	0.53	0.22
5DDP	0.65	1.09	0.63	0.65	0.66	1.0	0.65	0.22
4XW7	0.59	1.24	0.63	0.65	0.59	1.0	0.55	0.22
4RUM	0.60	1.19	0.39	0.78	0.54	1.06	0.55	0.22
4L81	0.46	1.09	0.45	0.78	0.43	1.0	0.35	0.22
4FRG	0.63	1.09	0.49	0.78	0.50	0.99	0.64	0.22
3SD3	0.67	1.05	0.69	0.65	0.67	1.0	0.63	0.22
2GIS	0.67	1.14	0.74	0.65	0.44	1.03	0.37	0.22
3OWI	0.73	1.11	0.73	0.65	0.67	1.0	0.29	0.24
3IRW	0.58	1.09	0.56	0.65	0.50	1.0	0.35	0.22
4QLM	0.56	1.05	0.58	0.65	0.49	1.0	0.43	0.22
3VRS	0.64	1.11	0.71	0.65	0.71	1.0	0.67	0.22

Table 3: Clustal alignment. \overline{MCC} with optimal covariance score threshold \overline{S} for Boltzmann learning DCA, pseudo-likelihood DCA, mean field DCA, mutual information for each of 17 RNA families, obtained through cross-validation procedure.

PDB	Boltzmann learning DCA		Pseudo-likelihood DCA		mean field DCA		mutual information	
	\overline{MCC}	\overline{S}	\overline{MCC}	\overline{S}	\overline{MCC}	\overline{S}	\overline{MCC}	\overline{S}
3DOU	0.47	1.07	0.45	0.43	0.42	0.82	0.47	0.20
3F2Q	0.48	0.99	0.45	0.43	0.32	0.80	0.31	0.20
2QBZ	0.49	1.07	0.46	0.51	0.45	0.80	0.39	0.20
2GDI	0.44	1.07	0.35	0.47	0.35	0.82	0.29	0.20
1Y26	0.57	1.07	0.50	0.43	0.51	0.82	0.32	0.20
5T83	0.41	1.07	0.38	0.43	0.32	0.82	0.44	0.20
5DDP	0.42	1.10	0.33	0.51	0.19	0.82	0.20	0.20
4XW7	0.38	1.07	0.42	0.43	0.22	0.80	0.19	0.20
4RUM	0.46	1.07	0.32	0.51	0.24	0.80	0.37	0.20
4L81	0.27	1.07	0.29	0.45	0.18	0.80	0.16	0.20
4FRG	0.59	1.07	0.44	0.57	0.34	0.82	0.40	0.20
3SD3	0.71	1.07	0.72	0.45	0.58	0.8	0.50	0.20
2GIS	0.54	0.99	0.54	0.43	0.40	0.82	0.34	0.20
3OWI	0.42	1.07	0.48	0.47	0.40	0.82	0.24	0.20
3IRW	0.55	1.07	0.37	0.44	0.39	0.80	0.25	0.20
4QLM	0.38	1.07	0.45	0.51	0.30	0.80	0.10	0.23
3VRS	0.55	1.08	0.42	0.43	0.42	0.82	0.34	0.20

Table 4: Average \overline{MCC} at optimal covariance score threshold for DCA methods with and without APC correction. Alignments are performed with *Infernal*.

	Boltzmann learning DCA		Pseudo-likelihood DCA		mean field DCA	
	APC	no APC	APC	no APC	APC	no APC
average \overline{MCC}	0.61	0.59	0.59	0.56	0.57	0.54

Table 5: Reweighting scheme: two sequences are considered similar if the fraction of positions with coincident nucleotides (*similarity*) is larger than a given similarity threshold x : $n_b = |\{s \in \{1, \dots, B\} : \text{similarity}(\sigma^s, \sigma^b) > x\}|$. The inverse of n_b , $\omega_b = \frac{1}{n_b}$, gives a weight for the sequence contribution to frequencies ($B_{eff} = \sum_{b=1}^B \omega_b$ is then the effective number of sequences in the alignment). In this table we report the average \overline{MCC} at optimal covariance score threshold for pseudo-likelihood DCA in the reweighting scheme adopting different similarity thresholds x . Alignments are performed with *Infernal*.

	x=0.7	x=0.8	x=0.9	x=1.0
average \overline{MCC}	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59

Table 6: Non-canonical tertiary contacts predicted via Boltzmann learning DCA on Infernal alignments.

PDB	Total non-canonical contacts	Predicted non-canonical contacts	Type of base pairing
1Y26	12	1	cSS
2GDI	14	1	tSS
2GIS	14	4	cSS,tSH,c.H,tWS
2QBZ	30	1	tSH
3DOU	21	5	t.H,tSS,tSH,tHS,tHS
3F2Q	17	3	tHS,cSS,cHW
3IRW	11	0	-
3OWI	11	1	tHS
3VRS	5	0	-
5SD3	10	1	tHS
4FRG	11	0	-
4L81	15	0	-
4RUM	7	0	-
4QLM	15	4	tSH,tSH,cSS,tHS
4XW7	5	0	-
5DDP	11	1	...
5T83	21	3	t.H, tSH,tHW

Table 7: Total stacked false positives (base atoms distance $< 3.5 \text{ \AA}$ in the pdb reference structure) over total false positives for all methods. (*Infernal* alignment).

	Boltzmann learning	Pseudo-likelihood DCA	Mean Field	Mutual Information
stacked FP / FP	0.43	0.46	0.39	0.39

Table 8: \overline{MCC} for each of 17 RNA families obtained through cross-validation procedure with optimal probability threshold \overline{S} . Base pairing probabilities are calculated from the RNAfold program available in the ViennaRNA package. We notice that for PDB 5T83 the MCC is zero for thresholds larger than ≈ 0.5 , leading to a very low \overline{S} whenever that system is included in the training set.

PDB	\overline{MCC}	\overline{S}
3DOU	0.51	0.25
3F2Q	0.52	0.25
2QBZ	0.52	0.25
2GDI	0.52	0.25
1Y26	0.51	0.25
5T83	0.58	0.72
5DDP	0.51	0.25
4XW7	0.51	0.25
4RUM	0.50	0.25
4L81	0.51	0.25
4FRG	0.53	0.26
3SD3	0.52	0.25
2GIS	0.51	0.25
3OWI	0.50	0.25
3IRW	0.53	0.25
4QLM	0.52	0.25
3VRS	0.54	0.25

Table 9: *Infernal* alignment. \overline{MCC} for each of 17 RNA families obtained through cross-validation procedure with optimal E-value threshold \overline{S} and MCC at default R-scape threshold (E-value=0.05). E-values for base pairs are calculated from the R-scape program.

PDB	\overline{S}	\overline{MCC} at \overline{S}	MCC at $S = 0.05$
3DOU	0.5	0.51	0.56
2GIS	0.5	0.59	0.55
1Y26	0.5	0.48	0.56
3VRS	0.1	0.4	0.4
2GDI	0.5	0.53	0.56
5T83	0.5	0.57	0.53
4FRG	0.5	0.64	0.62
4L81	0.5	0.41	0.42
2QBZ	0.5	0.54	0.53
3F2Q	0.5	0.60	0.52
4QLM	0.5	0.44	0.46
3IRW	0.5	0.40	0.44
5DDP	0.3	0.53	0.5
4RUM	0.5	0.64	0.62
3SD3	0.5	0.61	0.63
3OWI	0.5	0.58	0.60
4XW7	0.5	0.51	0.55

Table 10: *ClustalW* alignment. \overline{MCC} for each of 17 RNA families obtained through cross-validation procedure with optimal E-value threshold \overline{S} and MCC at default R-scape threshold (E-value=0.05). E-values for base pairs are calculated from the R-scape program. We notice that for PDB 5DDP and 2GIS the MCC is zero for E-value thresholds smaller than 10.

PDB	\overline{S}	\overline{MCC} at \overline{S}	MCC at $S = 0.05$
3DOU	1.3	0.40	0.45
2GIS	-	0.0	0.0
1Y26	1.3	0.35	0.16
3VRS	1.3	0.27	0.22
2GDI	1.3	0.44	0.44
5T83	1.3	0.42	0.42
4FRG	1.3	0.47	0.44
4L81	1.3	0.18	0.19
2QBZ	1.3	0.44	0.46
3F2Q	1.3	0.43	0.40
4QLM	1.3	0.16	0.20
3IRW	1.1	0.23	0.28
5DDP	-	0.0	0.0
4RUM	1.1	0.45	0.28
3SD3	1.3	0.58	0.58
3OWI	2.8	0.18	0.21
4XW7	1.3	0.32	0.25

Table 11: \overline{MCC} for each of 17 RNA families obtained considering as contact predictions the top $N/2$ coupling scores (where N is the sequence length). Average MCC is 0.53. Infernal alignments.

PDB	\overline{MCC}
4L81	0.58
2GDI	0.50
3F2Q	0.56
2GIS	0.49
1Y26	0.56
3DOU	0.43
4QLM	0.51
2QBZ	0.50
5T83	0.31
3OWI	0.53
3IRW	0.69
4FRG	0.56
3VRS	0.41
5DDP	0.49
4XW7	0.57
3SD3	0.61
4RUM	0.51

Table 12: Contact prediction via Boltzmann learning DCA on ribosomal RNA subunits 58S and 5S (PDB 1FFK and 2WW9), tRNA (PDB 1ASY) and U4 spliceosomal RNA (PDB 2N7M). MCC obtained at optimal score threshold 1.06. Infernal alignments.

PDB	RFAM	molecule name	length	size	MCC
1FFK	RF00001	5S ribosomal RNA	122	139785	0.49
2WW9	RF00002	58S ribosomal RNA	63	4727	0.35
1ASY	RF00005	tRNA	75	100000	0.74
2N7M	RF00015	U4 spliceosomal RNA	92	7670	0.38

Algorithm 1 Boltzmann learning direct coupling analysis

1. Initialization:

- Choose randomly 20 sequences from the MSA.
- Initialize model parameters $\{h, J\}$ to zero.

2. Learning: Loop over 100000 Monte Carlo sweeps. For each sweep:

- Loop over the 20 sequences. For each sequence k :
 - Loop over nucleotide of each sequence. For each nucleotide i :
 - * Propose a new random nucleotide at position i
 - * Compute the acceptance as $\alpha = \left(1, \frac{P_{new}}{P_{old}}\right)$, where P_{new} and P_{old} are the probabilities of old and new nucleotides at position i according to model parameters $\{h, J\}$.
 - * Accept/reject comparing α with a uniform random number in $[0, 1)$.
 - Compute frequencies on the 20 sequences.
- Update parameters $\{h, J\}$ estimating likelihood gradient based on current frequencies.

3. Validation: Repeat step 2 using parameters $\{h, J\}$ computed as averages over the last 5000 Monte Carlo sweeps of step 2.




Figure 1: Sensitivity of Boltzmann learning DCA, pseudo-likelihood DCA, mean-field DCA, mutual information and R-scape for all RNA families. Families are labeled using the PDB code of the representative crystallographic structure. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 2: Precision of Boltzmann learning DCA, pseudo-likelihood DCA, mean-field DCA, mutual information and R-scape for all RNA families. Families are labeled using the PDB code of the representative crystallographic structure. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 3: Sensitivity to contacts in stems (RNA secondary structure) of Boltzmann learning DCA, mean field DCA, mutual information and R-scape for all families. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 4: Number of correctly predicted (True Positives) tertiary contacts of Boltzmann learning DCA, mean field DCA, mutual information and R-scape for all RNA families. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 5: Number of incorrect predictions (False Positives) of Boltzmann learning DCA, pseudo-likelihood DCA, mean-field DCA, mutual information and R-scape for all RNA families. Families are labeled using the PDB code of the representative crystallographic structure. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 6: Clustal alignment. \overline{MCC} of Boltzmann learning DCA, pseudo-likelihood DCA, mean-field DCA, mutual information and R-scape for 17 RNA families at the threshold obtained through cross-validation procedure. Families are labeled using the PDB code of the representative crystallographic structure. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 7: Clustal alignment. Precision of Boltzmann learning DCA, pseudo-likelihood DCA, mean-field DCA mutual information and R-scape for all RNA families. Families are labeled using the PDB code of the representative crystallographic structure. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 8: Clustal alignment. Sensitivity of Boltzmann learning DCA, pseudo-likelihood DCA, mean-field DCA mutual information and R-scape for all RNA families. Families are labeled using the PDB code of the representative crystallographic structure. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 9: Clustal alignment. Sensitivity to contacts in stems (RNA secondary structure) of Boltzmann learning DCA, mean field DCA, mutual information and R-scape for all families. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 10: Clustal alignment. Number of correctly predicted (True Positives) tertiary contacts of Boltzmann learning DCA, mean field DCA, mutual information and R-scape for all RNA families. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 11: Clustal alignment. Number of incorrect predictions (False Positives) of Boltzmann learning DCA, pseudo-likelihood DCA, mean-field DCA, mutual information and R-scape for all RNA families. Families are labeled using the PDB code of the representative crystallographic structure. Average is reported in first column. Score threshold is obtained through cross-validation procedure. The recommended threshold 0.05 was used for R-scape.




Figure 12: Validation of the coupling parameters inferred via the l_2 -regularized pseudo-likelihood maximization method implemented at <https://github.com/magnusekeberg/plmDCA>, adopting different regularization strengths k . The validation is done running a parallel MC simulation on 20 sequences and calculating the root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) between the obtained frequencies and the empirical ones. The positive control is the statistical error due to the finite number of sequence, and the negative control is the RMSD between empirical sequences and a random sequence. Infernal alignment.




Figure 13: RF00167. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 14: RF00059. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 15: RF00162. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 16: RF00380. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 17: RF00168. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 18: RF00050. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 19: RF01051. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 20: RF00504. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 21: RF01734. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 22: RF01831. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 23: RF01689. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 24: RF01725. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 25: RF02683. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 26: RF00379. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 27: RF01750. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 28: RF01739. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.




Figure 29: RF00442. Red: native structure base pairs in upper triangle. Magenta: correctly predicted secondary contacts. Green: correctly predicted tertiary contacts. Black: false positives.

References

- [1] Faruck Morcos, Andrea Pagnani, Bryan Lunt, Arianna Bertolino, Debora S Marks, Chris Sander, Riccardo Zecchina, José N Onuchic, Terence Hwa, and Martin Weigt. Direct-coupling analysis of residue coevolution captures native contacts across many protein families. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 108(49):E1293–E1301, 2011.
- [2] Eleonora De Leonardis, Benjamin Lutz, Sebastian Ratz, Simona Cocco, Rémi Monasson, Alexander Schug, and Martin Weigt. Direct-coupling analysis of nucleotide coevolution facilitates RNA secondary and tertiary structure prediction. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 43(21):10444–10455, 2015.
- [3] Simona Cocco, Remi Monasson, and Martin Weigt. From principal component to direct coupling analysis of coevolution in proteins: Low-eigenvalue modes are needed for structure prediction. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 9(8):e1003176, 2013.
- [4] Magnus Ekeberg, Tuomo Hartonen, and Erik Aurell. Fast pseudolikelihood maximization for direct-coupling analysis of protein structure from many homologous amino-acid sequences. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 276:341–356, 2014.
- [5] Barry C Arnold and David Strauss. Pseudolikelihood estimation: some examples. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series B*, 53:233–243, 1991.

- [6] Pradeep Ravikumar, Martin J Wainwright, and John D Lafferty. High-dimensional ising model selection using l1-regularized logistic regression. *Ann. Stat.*, 38(3):1287–1319, 2010.
- [7] Martin Weigt, Robert A White, Hendrik Szurmant, James A Hoch, and Terence Hwa. Identification of direct residue contacts in protein–protein interaction by message passing. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 106(1):67–72, 2009.
- [8] Magnus Ekeberg, Cecilia Lövkvist, Yueheng Lan, Martin Weigt, and Erik Aurell. Improved contact prediction in proteins: using pseudolikelihoods to infer potts models. *Phys. Rev. E*, 87(1):012707, 2013.
- [9] Sean R Eddy and Richard Durbin. RNA sequence analysis using covariance models. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 22(11):2079–2088, 1994.