Mathematics is the champion of biomolecular data challenges Zixuan Cang, Duc Nguyen, Bao Wang, Chengzhang Wang, Menglun Wang, Guo-Wei Wei, Kedi Wu, and Zhixiong Zhao **Department of Mathematics, Michigan State University** 

## Feature functional theory (FFT)

**Goal:** To prediction microscopic and macroscopic relationships in biomolecular data **Basic assumptions:** 

• **Representability assumption**: there exists a microscopic feature vector that can uniquely characterize, and distinguish one molecule from another

 $\mathbf{v}_{i} = (\mathbf{x}_{i}; \mathbf{o}_{i}) = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, ..., x_{in}; o_{i1}, o_{i2}, ..., o_{il})$ 

microscopic features; macroscopic features

- **Similarity assumption**: molecules with similar microscopic features have similar macroscopic features.
- Feature-function relationship assumption: the macroscopic

Feature functional theory (FFT) **Microscopic features:** 

- □ Geometric: atomic surface areas, volume & curvatures
- Topological: Betti numbers
- Graph theory: discrete Laplacian, rigidity & flexibility
- Electrostatic: atomic charges, dipoles, quadrupoles & reaction filed energies (Poisson-Boltzmann equation)
- van der Waals: Lennard-Jones potentials

### **Macroscopic features:**

10000

<u>ଅ</u> 100 -

- Protein-ligand binding affinities
- Protein mutation energy changes (stability changes)
- Drug partition coefficients



features, i.e., solvation and binding free energies, of molecule A are functionals of microscopic feature vectors:

 $\Delta G_{\mathbf{A}} = f_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ 

- Drug solvation free energies
- Protein-DNA/RNA binding energies
- Protein-protein binding affinities





**Ճ** 0.

0.3

Graph theory modeling Weighted graph Laplacian, Flexibility rigidity index (FRI) FRI is about 20% more accurate than Gaussian network model (GNM) in B-factor prediction, based on 364 proteins.



# Physical modeling

**Explicit solvent models (***Molecular dynamics, QM/MM, MC***)** □Atomistic modeling of both solvent and solute molecules. □Accurate but time consuming and subjects to force field errors.

Integral equation models (Ornstein-Zernike, Percus-Yevick and hypernetted-chain equations, RISM, LDFT, etc.) □Continuous function modeling of solvent molecules, while atomistic modeling of the solute. □Still accurate but less time consuming.

#### Implicit solvent models (Image charge, Generalized Born, **Poisson-Boltzmann, Polarizable Continuum**)

Dielectric continuum modeling of solvent molecules, while atomistic modeling of the solute.

□A good trade off between accuracy and efficiency.



Variational multiscale models (*nonpolar, polar and QM*) □Couple polar and nonpolar components by variational surfaces. □Self-consistent surface, charge, polarization and energy.





# **Acknowledgement:** This work was supported in part by NSF, NIH, MSU and MBI.



IETEROCHRO