

## Sequence analysis

# TemStaPro: protein thermostability prediction using sequence representations from protein language models

Ieva Pudžiuvėlytė <sup>1,2</sup>, Kliment Olechnovič <sup>1</sup>, Egle Godliauskaite <sup>3</sup>, Kristupas Sermokas <sup>3</sup>, Tomas Urbaitis <sup>3</sup>, Giedrius Gasiunas <sup>1,3</sup>, Darius Kazlauskas <sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Biotechnology, Life Sciences Center, Vilnius University, LT-10257 Vilnius, Lithuania

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Computer Science, Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics, Vilnius University, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania

<sup>3</sup>CasZyme, LT-10257 Vilnius, Lithuania

\*Corresponding author. Institute of Biotechnology, Life Sciences Center, Vilnius University, Saulėtekis av. 7, LT-10257 Vilnius, Lithuania.

E-mail: [darius.kazlauskas@bti.vu.lt](mailto:darius.kazlauskas@bti.vu.lt) (D.K.)

Associate Editor: Lenore Cowen

## Abstract

**Motivation:** Reliable prediction of protein thermostability from its sequence is valuable for both academic and industrial research. This prediction problem can be tackled using machine learning and by taking advantage of the recent blossoming of deep learning methods for sequence analysis. These methods can facilitate training on more data and, possibly, enable the development of more versatile thermostability predictors for multiple ranges of temperatures.

**Results:** We applied the principle of transfer learning to predict protein thermostability using embeddings generated by protein language models (pLMs) from an input protein sequence. We used large pLMs that were pre-trained on hundreds of millions of known sequences. The embeddings from such models allowed us to efficiently train and validate a high-performing prediction method using over one million sequences that we collected from organisms with annotated growth temperatures. Our method, TemStaPro (Temperatures of Stability for Proteins), was used to predict thermostability of CRISPR-Cas Class II effector proteins (C2EPs). Predictions indicated sharp differences among groups of C2EPs in terms of thermostability and were largely in tune with previously published and our newly obtained experimental data.

**Availability and implementation:** TemStaPro software and the related data are freely available from <https://github.com/ievapudz/TemStaPro> and <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7743637>.

## 1 Introduction

Biotechnological research and development often involves searching for proteins that can remain stable (maintain their spatial structures) in a high-temperature setting. In many cases, the only information initially known about a protein is its sequence of amino acids. Therefore, it is beneficial to have computational tools that can efficiently predict protein thermostability from a protein sequence alone. Several machine learning-based methods were developed for that in the past (Gromiha and Suresh 2008, Lin and Chen 2011, Fan *et al.* 2016) and in recent years (Feng *et al.* 2020, Charoenkwan *et al.* 2021, 2022, Ahmed *et al.* 2022, Zhao *et al.* 2023), but these efforts did not focus on drastically increasing the amount of data used for training and validation, which could potentially lead to better-performing methods with an ability to distinguish multiple levels of thermostability.

In general, most of the current state-of-the-art sequence-based methods (Feng *et al.* 2020, Charoenkwan *et al.* 2021, 2022, Ahmed *et al.* 2022) were trained and tested using protein sequences taken from datasets of proteins annotated with experimentally determined thermal stability information. Such datasets are inevitably small because gathering experimental data on a per-protein basis is usually very expensive and time-consuming. There is an alternative way of

collecting protein thermostability data—taking the available information about optimal growth temperatures of organisms that have sequenced genomes converted to proteomes, grouping the proteomes by the corresponding growth temperature intervals, collecting the protein sequences, and annotating them with temperature values (Engqvist 2018a, Zhao *et al.* 2023). This approach is not as precise as gathering experimental data for every protein separately, but the optimal growth temperature of an organism provides a reliable lower bound for the melting temperature of proteins in that organism (Dehouck *et al.* 2008). Most importantly, the proteomes-based data gathering can provide millions of sequences for machine learning. Nevertheless, even one of the most recent deep learning-based methods (Zhao *et al.* 2023) that used such data was trained only on a small subset (less than 1%) of sequences from available proteomes with known growth temperatures.

Training using big data when starting from raw amino acid sequences is extremely challenging due to the need to construct or learn a complex protein representation suitable for making predictions. However, there is a possibility to take a shortcut and apply a transfer learning approach—use protein representations generated by other methods trained for different tasks. More specifically, it is possible to use protein

Received: 31 July 2023; Revised: 28 February 2024; Editorial Decision: 12 March 2024; Accepted: 18 March 2024

© The Author(s) 2024. Published by Oxford University Press.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

sequence embeddings generated by encoders of protein language models (pLMs) that were trained on hundreds of millions of natural protein sequences, e.g. ESM (Rives *et al.* 2021, Lin *et al.* 2023) and ProtTrans (Elnaggar *et al.* 2022). Such pLM embeddings are rich representations that were already shown to be suitable inputs for various predictive tasks (Fenoy *et al.* 2022). It was only a matter of time before pLM embeddings were also applied for the identification of thermostable proteins. To the best of our knowledge, BertThermo (Pei *et al.* 2023) was the first such method that was published. However, BertThermo was trained using only 2803 sequences and was based on a binary classifier for only a single temperature threshold. Another recently published method, ProLaTherm (Haselbeck *et al.* 2023), was not substantially superior in this regard, it used only 7409 sequences split into just two classes of thermostability.

In this work, we propose a large-scale comprehensive approach to using pLM embeddings for predicting whether a protein remains stable above some temperature threshold. We collected over one million of protein sequences from organisms with known optimal growth temperatures and we used that data to train, validate, and test multiple binary classifiers for multiple temperature thresholds. We showed that our classifiers perform exceedingly well both on our newly introduced test sets and on previously published benchmark datasets. We combined the classifiers into a software tool that, given a protein sequence as input, predicts protein stability for multiple temperature thresholds and checks if the predictions are not contradicting each other. The resulting method, *TemStaPro* (Temperatures of Stability for Proteins), is freely available as a standalone program.

We tested *TemStaPro* software to predict thermostability of CRISPR-Cas Class II effector proteins (C2EPs). C2EPs are usually found in bacteria that grow best in moderate temperatures (20°C–45°C). However, there are few Cas9 and Cas12b variants that can function at temperatures above 60°C (Gasiunas *et al.* 2020, Nguyen *et al.* 2022). Thermostable C2EPs are important because they can be: used in conjunction with nucleic acid amplification methods to detect SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern in a single reaction (Nguyen *et al.* 2022); used in other CRISPR-based diagnostics methods (Ghounemy *et al.* 2023); used for genome engineering of thermophilic organisms (Adalsteinsson *et al.* 2021); used in aid to increase lifetime of gene editing tools in human plasma (Harrington *et al.* 2017). Our results indicate that thermostability differs among groups of C2EPs, for example Cas12f and TnpB-like proteins are more likely to function at higher temperatures than ones from Cas9 and Cas13 groups.

## 2 Materials and methods

### 2.1 Data preparation

The data source that was used to construct training, validation, and testing datasets was composed of 21 498 annotated organisms (Engqvist 2018a,b). The taxonomy identifiers given in the data source were used to fetch UniParc (Leinonen *et al.* 2004) identifiers for the corresponding proteome. UniParc identifiers were used to download FASTA files with proteins composing the proteomes. The set of proteomes was filtered so that only non-eukaryotic proteomes with non-duplicated taxonomy identifiers remained.

The sequences of the final 5491 proteomes were clustered with CD-HIT (Fu *et al.* 2012) using 30% sequence identity threshold. The clustering results were later utilized to ensure that the training, validation, and testing sets (employed for machine learning) would always consist of sequences from different clusters, preventing any overlap of sequences within the same cluster across such sets.

The collection of datasets that were used to train, validate, and test the tool is summarized in Table 1. The collected and clustered proteomic sequences were used to construct two different-sized datasets for machine learning, *TemStaPro-Minor-30* (derived from randomly selected 162 proteomes) and *TemStaPro-Major-30* (derived from all downloaded proteomes).

The smaller dataset, *TemStaPro-Minor-30*, was designated for the single-threshold binary classifier design process in a 10-fold cross-validation setting. The smaller data size was crucial to rapidly iterate through different inputs as well as different machine learning model architectures and hyperparameters. To be processable with length-limited pLMs such as ESM-1b (Rives *et al.* 2021), the dataset was restricted to sequences no longer than 1022 amino acids. With *TemStaPro-Minor-30*, the main objective was to design a classifier for proteins that are stable (class ‘1’) or not stable (class ‘0’) at 65°C and higher temperatures. The threshold of 65°C was chosen because primary envisioned purpose of our method was to detect C2EP proteins that can withstand >60°C temperatures during isothermal amplification step in a one-pot SARS-CoV-2 detection kit (Nguyen *et al.* 2022). Also, *TemStaPro-Minor-30* is hardly suitable for training for multiple thresholds because, due to the random sampling of proteomes, it contains protein sequences mostly from organisms, whose growth temperatures are in ranges 20°C–40°C or 60°C–80°C (Supplementary Fig. S1), thus the cases, which are not included in these intervals, are not sufficiently covered.

The larger dataset, *TemStaPro-Major-30*, was designated to involve as much data as possible to train, validate and test binary classifiers for nine different temperature thresholds (40°C, 45°C, 50°C, 55°C, 60°C, 65°C, 70°C, 75°C, 80°C) for the final software tool, utilizing the input and the architecture selected during the classifier design process performed using *TemStaPro-Minor-30*. Importantly, *TemStaPro-Major-30* sequences cover the range of temperatures between 0°C and 100°C (Supplementary Fig. S2).

It is important to note that the collected data is not suitable for training multi-class classification (where classes represent non-overlapping temperature intervals) or regression models because the temperature values used for ground truth are only lower bounds for the possible temperatures of stability of proteins. For example, a protein from an organism living in 45°C environment may (or may not) also be stable at 60°C. This also means that a single binary classifier is not very versatile. A binary classifier trained using 45°C threshold cannot tell if a protein predicted as stable at over 45°C is also stable at over 60°C—a classifier trained using at least 60°C threshold is needed for that.

### 2.2 Additional data for benchmarking

#### 2.2.1 SAPPHERE and iThermo testing sets

SAPPHERE (Charoenkwan *et al.* 2022) dataset was used to compare the performance of *TemStaPro* with SAPPHERE, SCMTTP, and ThermoPred methods. This dataset is a balanced set of 742 sequences. It contains thermophilic and

**Table 1.** Datasets of protein sequences that were used in the development of the tool.

Dataset	Subset	All sequences	Class 0 sequences	Class 1 sequences	Max. length
TemStaPro-Minor-30	Cross-validation	239 629	146 657	92 972	1022
	Testing	41 930	25 580	16 350	1022
TemStaPro-Major-30	Training	943 605	879 799	63 806	9841
	Validation	230 985	215 167	15 818	9387
	Testing	210 137	196 072	14 065	13 394
SAPPHIRE	Testing	742	371	371	1643
iThermo	Testing	562	289	273	3567

non-thermophilic proteins—the exact temperature threshold for group distinction is not mentioned, but, according to the creators of the dataset, proteins labelled as thermophilic are stable at 80°C–100°C temperatures, they were taken from thermophilic organisms that grow at those temperatures (Charoenkwan *et al.* 2021).

iThermo (Ahmed *et al.* 2022) dataset was used to compare the performance of TemStaPro with iThermo, BertThermo, and DeepTP methods. This dataset is composed of proteins from organisms that grow in vastly different temperature ranges: above 60°C and below 30°C.

### 2.2.2 Sequence dataset of Class II effector proteins

Initial datasets of Cas12 and Cas9 were taken from Sasnauskas *et al.* (2023) and Gasiunas *et al.* (2020), respectively. Cas13 sequence dataset was constructed by building HMMER (Eddy 2011) sequence profiles for Cas13 groups (Kavuri *et al.* 2022) and using them to search NR (Sayes *et al.* 2022), UniRef100 (Suzek *et al.* 2007), MGnify (Richardson *et al.* 2023), and IMG/VR v4 (Camargo *et al.* 2023) databases with hmmsearch (Eddy 2011). Only sequences with  $E$ -value  $\leq 1e-20$  were extracted. In case the same sequence was found using different queries, the hit having lower  $E$ -value was assigned to the group. Latter dataset was combined with Cas12 and Cas9 datasets to form final dataset of 16 376 sequences (SupplementaryFileC2EPsPredictions.tsv). Thermostability predictions were done for all those sequences, but to check the thermostability of different C2EP groups, we only used sequences devoid of prediction clashes and having more than 300 residues.


### 2.3 Protein language models

This work exploits the transfer learning by taking protein representations from the last layer of pLMs and passing them as input to the classification model (Fig. 1).

The potential suitability of both ESM-2 and ProtT5-XL embeddings for thermostability classification was detected using principal component analysis (PCA) of mean embedding vectors. Plots of the first two principal components (Fig. 2) demonstrated the distinct separation of points corresponding to different thermostability classes.

### 2.4 Consideration of protein localization predictability by pLM embeddings

Because protein subcellular localization is known to be predictable with high accuracy from pLM embeddings (Stark *et al.* 2021, Thumuluri *et al.* 2022), there may be a question whether a pLM-based classifier trained to predict some protein property was not inadvertently trained to predict the protein location. This question is not really applicable to our case, because our training data is labelled on the proteome level. That is, every temperature value is relevant to all the

**Figure 1.** The scheme of embeddings from protein language model usage in the application NN model.

proteins in a proteome regardless of their location. To illustrate that proteins predicted to be located differently are distributed similarly in terms of temperature in our training/validation/testing datasets, we predicted protein locations using a ProtT5-XL-based classifier (Stark *et al.* 2021) and plotted histograms for two major localization classes, *cytoplasm* and *extracellular* (Supplementary Fig. S3).


### 2.5 Binary classifier design process

The classifier design process utilized *TemStaPro-Minor-30* dataset and involved 10-fold cross-validation and testing of multiple neural network (NN) architectures using different pLM embeddings (ESM-2 or ProtTrans ProtT5-XL). Classifiers in this study were implemented as feed-forward densely connected NN models with up to two hidden layers, whose sizes were chosen to be original embeddings size divided by several multiples of 2 (Supplementary Fig. S4 and Table S1). The performance analysis was done using common metrics for binary classification (Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC), accuracy, precision, recall, and area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC ROC)), with MCC being the primary metric.

The cross-validation results showed that all the tried combinations of inputs and NN architectures with at least one hidden layer achieve very similar high MCC values (Supplementary Fig. S5). Usage of a non-zero weight decay had a slight effect on the performance results (Supplementary Figs S6 and S7).

The results of testing performed using model trained on the whole unsplit cross-validation (using the average stopping epoch learned from the cross-validation stage) were highly consistent with the cross-validation results (Supplementary Fig. S8).

Overall, ESM-2-based and ProtT5-XL-based variants performed very similarly, yet ProtT5-XL embeddings are faster to compute and shorter, therefore the best architecture



**Figure 2.** PCA visualizations of ESM-2 mean embeddings (left) and ProtTrans ProtT5-XL mean embeddings (right) computed for the cross-validation subset of the *TemStaPro-Minor-30* dataset. Plots were generated using *Scikit-Learn Python* library (version 1.3.2).

utilizing ProtT5-XL was chosen (C2H2\_h256-128 from [Supplementary Table S1](#)).

## 2.6 Final binary classifiers training and testing

The functionality of the *TemStaPro* method is carried out by multiple binary classifiers that accept mean ProtT5-XL (from ProtTrans) representations (vectors of length 1024) as input. Classifiers were implemented as NN models using *PyTorch*. Each model is a multi-layer perceptron with two fully connected hidden layers of sizes 256 and 128. After each layer (except the last one), rectified linear unit (ReLU) activation function is applied. Sigmoid activation function is used after the last layer.

Every single binary classifier was trained on *TemStaPro-Major-30* data (labelled according to the corresponding temperature threshold), using mini-batch training principle (with batch size of 24) and Adam optimizer ([Kingma and Ba 2017](#)) with learning rate of 0.0001 and weight decay of 0.0001. Since the datasets were imbalanced, training and validation sets were loaded using weighted random sampler.

Each binary classifier was validated by assessing performance on the whole validation set after every training epoch, selecting the model that achieved the highest MCC. Each chosen model was then tested on the appropriate testing set, reporting MCC and other binary classification metrics.

## 2.7 Predictor application

The *TemStaPro* user's input is a FASTA file with amino acid sequences with proteins' identifiers in the headers. For each protein in the FASTA file a mean ProtT5-XL ([Elnaggar et al. 2022](#)) embedding is generated, which is the input of the classification model. In addition to this, there is an option available to pass embeddings of each residue to the model. Per-residue embeddings can also be averaged over a residue window of size  $k$ , which can be customized, to get per-segment embeddings. Then each segment (of size  $k$ ) of amino acids gets a prediction.

In the default *TemStaPro* operating mode, the classification predictions are made by six ensembles each composed of five NN models that were trained to make binary classification of proteins with respect to one of six temperature thresholds: 40°C, 45°C, 50°C, 55°C, 60°C, and 65°C. The output list of six predictions is created from averaged predictions of each ensemble.

Based on the sequence of all six classification predictions, each input protein is assigned two labels: left-hand and right-

hand. These labels are determined by scanning the binary predictions starting from the left or right-hand side, respectively. For example, the left-hand label is assigned the temperature range, where the last positive prediction (class '1') is encountered. If outputs are only negative (class '0'), then the label is the first temperature range. On the other hand, the right-hand label is assigned by reading the outputs starting from the right: the label is assigned the temperature range, where the first '1' is encountered. The treatment of the '0'-only case coincides with the left-hand principle.

Since binary predictions are made independently, conflicts might occur between the outputs of the classifiers: for instance, the predictor of 40°C threshold would predict that protein is not stable at 40°C and higher temperatures, although the predictor of 50°C threshold would state otherwise. When such conflict occurs, left-hand and right-hand labels differ. On the contrary, if the labels report the same temperature interval, that interval can be interpreted as the highest temperature range at which the protein was predicted to still be thermostable.

An alternative *TemStaPro* operating mode is similar to the default one, but includes three more classifiers (for thresholds of 70°C, 75°C, and 80°C). Due to relative scarcity of positive examples for training these additional classifiers, they are expected to be less reliable and therefore they were not included in the default *TemStaPro* mode.

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Performance of binary classifiers

Performance of the trained classifiers on the *TemStaPro-Major-30* testing set is summarized in [Supplementary Fig. S9](#) and [Table S2](#). The maximum MCC score was 0.638, achieved by the binary classifier for 50°C temperature threshold. The MCC scores for the classifiers of the highest practical utility were: 0.601 for 60°C and 0.610 for 65°C.

However, the performance metrics may be not easy to interpret as they are affected by the substantial threshold-dependent imbalance of positive and negative examples in the *TemStaPro-Major-30* testing set. A balanced testing set may provide a more conventionally interpretable performance overview. It is also important to assess results in comparison with other methods that use pLM embeddings. Thus, for each threshold, a balanced testing subset of 2000 sequences was randomly sampled from *TemStaPro-Major-30*. The sampled data were used to compare performance of BertThermo,

ProLaTherm, and TemStaPro for every threshold. The resulting MCC values are showcased in Fig. 3, other metrics are presented in Supplementary Table S3. For all the temperature thresholds, TemStaPro classifiers reached higher MCC, PR AUC, ROC AUC, F1, and accuracy scores than BertThermo and ProLaTherm. The maximum MCC score was 0.903, achieved by the TemStaPro binary classifier for 80°C temperature threshold. The MCC scores for the TemStaPro classifiers of highest practical utility were: 0.805 for 60°C and 0.811 for 65°C.

### 3.2 Performance on other benchmarks

To compare TemStaPro with modern, yet non-deep learning-based methods, TemStaPro was tested on the SAPHIRE tool's testing dataset (Charoenkwan *et al.* 2022), which was previously used to test SCMTPP (Charoenkwan *et al.* 2021) and ThermoPred (Lin and Chen 2011) tools for protein thermostability prediction.

The method with the highest MCC score among SCMTPP, ThermoPred, and SAPHIRE is the latter one. The results showed that TemStaPro predictors for temperature thresholds 60°C–70°C perform better than SAPHIRE (Table 2). The MCC scores of our other predictors (trained for thresholds  $\leq 55^\circ\text{C}$  and  $\geq 75^\circ\text{C}$ ) differed from SAPHIRE tool's score by no more than 0.08.

To compare TemStaPro with modern deep learning-based methods, it was tested on the iThermo (Ahmed *et al.* 2022) test dataset. The DeepTP (Zhao *et al.* 2023) and BertThermo (Pei *et al.* 2023) performance results were taken from the BertThermo publication. Among BertThermo, DeepTP, and iThermo, BertThermo achieved the best evaluation classification scores. TemStaPro outperformed BertThermo—the maximums of all the metrics were achieved by the TemStaPro classifiers (Table 3).


Importantly, TemStaPro training data were made to not contain any sequences closer than 30% in terms of identity to the sequences from SAPHIRE and iThermo datasets.

### 3.3 Software tool

We implemented TemStaPro as a command-line software tool. By default, for each input protein sequence, TemStaPro outputs global predictions for six temperature thresholds, and the left-hand and right-hand labels derived from the predictions as described in Section 2.7. An example output table of the global scoring is given in Supplementary Fig. S10.

Besides the default global protein scoring, the user might opt for per-residue or per-segment predictions. For the per-residue case each amino acid in the protein sequence gets a distinct set of thermostability predictions (Supplementary Fig. S11), similarly for per-segment option, where each full segment of the chosen size in the sequence gets its set of predictions. Additionally, there is an option to plot per-residue and per-segment predictions (Supplementary Fig. S12).

The speed of the TemStaPro software is mostly determined by whether the ProtT5-XL embeddings are produced on GPU or not. Using NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080 Ti GPU, TemStaPro processes 10 000 sequences with average length of 1000 residues in <2 h. Without GPU, the operating time increases several times (up to 60 times if run on a laptop with Intel i7-8565U CPU).



**Figure 3.** Comparison of testing scores between BertThermo, ProLaTherm, and TemStaPro using the sampled balanced testing datasets for each threshold included in TemStaPro.

**Table 2.** Models' scores after testing with an independent SAPHIRE dataset.<sup>a</sup>

Model	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	MCC	ROC AUC
TemStaPro-t80	0.923	0.849	<b>0.997</b>	0.856	0.990
TemStaPro-t75	0.930	0.868	0.992	0.867	0.989
TemStaPro-t70	<b>0.960</b>	0.951	0.968	<b>0.919</b>	0.993
TemStaPro-t65	0.957	0.957	0.957	0.914	0.993
TemStaPro-t60	0.951	0.987	0.916	0.905	0.995
TemStaPro-t55	0.934	0.989	0.879	0.873	<b>0.996</b>
TemStaPro-t50	0.908	0.989	0.827	0.828	0.993
TemStaPro-t45	0.907	0.989	0.825	0.825	0.992
TemStaPro-t40	0.896	<b>0.995</b>	0.798	0.808	0.993
SAPHIRE	0.942	0.951	0.933	0.884	0.980
SCMTPP	0.865	0.849	0.881	0.731	—
ThermoPred	0.86	0.938	0.782	0.729	—

<sup>a</sup> Each column's highest values are emphasized in bold.


**Table 3.** Models' scores after testing with iThermo dataset.<sup>a</sup>

Model	Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	MCC	ROC AUC
TemStaPro-t80	0.884	0.766	<b>0.997</b>	0.787	0.986
TemStaPro-t75	0.902	0.802	<b>0.997</b>	0.818	0.990
TemStaPro-t70	0.973	0.952	0.993	0.947	<b>0.999</b>
TemStaPro-t65	<b>0.986</b>	0.978	0.993	<b>0.972</b>	0.998
TemStaPro-t60	0.979	0.989	0.969	0.958	<b>0.999</b>
TemStaPro-t55	0.980	<b>1.000</b>	0.962	0.962	<b>0.999</b>
TemStaPro-t50	0.963	<b>1.000</b>	0.927	0.928	<b>0.999</b>
TemStaPro-t45	0.964	<b>1.000</b>	0.931	0.931	<b>0.999</b>
TemStaPro-t40	0.954	0.996	0.913	0.911	<b>0.999</b>
iThermo	0.963	0.963	0.962	0.927	0.986
DeepTP	0.934	0.963	0.901	0.870	0.983
BertThermo	0.975	0.985	0.965	0.950	0.994

<sup>a</sup> Each column's highest values are emphasized in bold.

### 3.4 Thermostability of Class II effector proteins

To get a better view on thermal stability among different C2EP groups, we tested our method on a large dataset (16376 sequences) of Cas9, Cas12, TnpB, and Cas13 proteins (SupplementaryFileC2EPsPredictions.tsv). For further analysis, we considered only sequences longer than 300 residues. There were 11341 such sequences, 10734 (94.6%) of



**Figure 4.** Predicted thermostability of various C2EP groups. Numbers in brackets correspond to the number of sequences tested.

them had clash-free predictions. Thermostability prediction varied greatly between groups of Cas12 and TnpB (Fig. 4). This might be explained by the fact that members of Cas12 and TnpB differ greatly in sequence similarity and length (Urbaitis *et al.* 2022, Karvelis *et al.* 2021). The Cas12a group, which is currently actively studied and used in biotechnology applications (Khan and Sallard 2023), did not have thermostable ( $\geq 60^\circ\text{C}$ ) sequences (Fig. 4) as predicted by our method.

In contrast to Cas12a, more than half of the members of Cas12b group were predicted to function at  $45^\circ\text{C}$  or higher temperature (Fig. 4). Such observation corresponds to the experimental data because most of the characterized thermostable Cas12 proteins belong to the Cas12b group (Yang *et al.* 2016, Nguyen *et al.* 2022). Interestingly, we predicted that most thermostable Cas12 groups are Cas12f1, Cas12f2, and Cas12g (Fig. 4). However, the latter groups were not studied experimentally for thermostability. On the other hand, some of the members (e.g. Un1, Un2, Mi1, and Mi2) of Cas12f1 and Cas12f2 groups are found in archaea, which is an indication of possible thermostability of these C2EPs. Two groups of TnpBs (namely, TnpB2 and TnpB-Kra, which contains TnpB from *Ktedonobacter racemifer* (Altae-Tran *et al.* 2021)) showed higher predicted thermal stability compared to a group represented by TnpB from *Deinococcus radiodurans* ISDra2.

Just a few Cas9 groups (namely, Cas9-C3 and Cas9-C7; Supplementary Table S4) contain thermostable members. This observation is in tune with experimental data. The Cas9-C3 group contains characterized thermostable proteins CaldoCas9, GeoCas9, and ThermoCas9 (Adalsteinsson *et al.* 2021, Mougiakos *et al.* 2017, Harrington *et al.* 2017).

Cas9-C7 group includes NsaCas9 which was shown to function at temperatures above  $60^\circ\text{C}$  in our previous study (Gasiunas *et al.* 2020).

Cas13 groups tend to have predicted lower thermostability except for Cas13x (Fig. 4), which contains only eight members, thus it is too early to draw any conclusions about their thermal stability.

In rare cases, our method predicted lower (differences  $>10^\circ\text{C}$ ) than experimentally characterized temperatures for thermostable proteins (e.g. TccCas13a; Supplementary Table S4). However, these are exceptions, in 90% of the cases (35 out of 39) predicted thermostability varied no more than  $10^\circ\text{C}$  from the experimental data (Supplementary Table S4).

### 3.5 Experimental validation of thermostability predictions

To validate the accuracy of the thermostability prediction model, we have experimentally characterized two potentially thermostable proteins. Ghy2Cas9 was previously identified and described in Gasiunas *et al.* (2020). This enzyme showed dsDNA cleavage activity in cell-free lysates, but protein thermostability was not characterized. We also identified a putative thermostable Cas12b ortholog from *Clostridia bacterium*, CbaCas12b (NMA13999.1), in publicly available genome databases. We expressed the enzymes in *E. coli* and purified them. The proteins along with SpyCas9, as a control, were subjected to analysis by nano differential scanning fluorimetry (nanoDSF) to ascertain the temperatures at which they unfold. The enzymes were tested either without their guide RNA (apo) or with single guide RNA (RNP), except for CbaCas12b, for which we could not identify a tracrRNA. Ghy2Cas9 was shown to begin to unfold at around  $54^\circ\text{C}$ ,

CbaCas12b at 57°C, and SpyCas9 at 45°C, with their respective RNPs unfolding at around 2°C–3°C higher temperature (Supplementary Figs S13a and S14). Predicted temperatures of thermal stability for both Ghy2Cas9 and SpyCas9 (55°C–60°C) and <40°C, respectively) did not differ more than 7°C from their experimentally determined melting point temperatures. Following this, we evaluated the dsDNA cleavage activity of Ghy2Cas9 as well as SpyCas9 across a range of temperatures from 37°C to 70°C using fluorophore-labelled dsDNA substrates. As shown in Supplementary Fig. S13b, Ghy2Cas9 and SpyCas9 retained robust nuclease activity at temperatures up to 55°C and 50°C, respectively, which correlates with the determined unfolding temperature of the RNPs by nanoDSF.

## 4 Discussion and conclusions

Embeddings from pre-trained pLMs can be highly suitable for the task of protein thermostability prediction—this became nearly apparent even after our initial PCA of ESM and ProtTrans embeddings. We further showed that a simple dense NN can be efficiently trained to predict a protein thermal stability class from the mean of per-residue embedding vectors. With that established, we endeavoured to make a better thermostability prediction method not by complicating the machine learning model, but rather by preparing and using more data for training and validation. We prepared and utilized a dataset of over one million sequences annotated with temperatures. The considerable amount and diversity of our data allowed us to train, validate, and test classifiers for multiple temperature thresholds (from 40°C to 80°C). For every temperature threshold, TemStaPro outperformed other pLM-based methods, BertThermo and ProLaTherm. When tested on recent independent datasets, SAPPHERE and iThermo, our trained and validated method, named TemStaPro, performed better than state-of-the-art sequence-based predictors.

We combined our trained classifiers into a software tool that predicts protein thermostability for multiple temperature thresholds, reports whether the results of multiple classifiers are in agreement, and indicates the highest temperature range at which the protein is predicted to be thermostable. We tested that software on CRISPR-Cas C2EPs. Interestingly, we saw large variation in thermal stability among groups of Cas12 and TnpB. For example, more than a half of the members of groups Cas12b, Cas12f1, Cas12f2, Cas12g, TnpB2, TnpB-Kra, and V-U1 have predicted temperatures of  $\geq 45^\circ\text{C}$  (Fig. 4). In contrast, members of Cas12a, Cas9, and Cas13 groups might function at lower temperatures.

We also observed that TemStaPro is a more pessimistic than optimistic predictor—it tends to slightly underestimate the highest temperature at which the protein is still stable. We attribute this trait to the particularity of the training data, where sequences were annotated not with exact melting temperature values, but with their lower bounds.

To conclude, considering that the large majority (90%) of our predictions for well-characterized proteins were confirmed experimentally, we believe that TemStaPro can be useful for pre-screening potentially thermostable candidate proteins and thus reducing the number of experiments needed to determine protein thermostability in biotechnology.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Antanas Kiziela, Mindaugas Margelevičius, and Česlovas Venclovas for valuable comments about the study and the software.

## Supplementary data

Supplementary data are available at Bioinformatics online.

## Conflict of interest

E.G., K.S., T.U., and G.G. are employees of CasZyme. G.G. has a financial interest in CasZyme. The remaining authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## Funding

This work was supported by European Regional Development Fund (Project No. 13.1.1-LMT-K-718-05-0021) under grant agreement with the Research Council of Lithuania (LMTLT). Funded as European Union's measure in response to COVID-19 pandemic.

## Data availability

The data underlying this article and a supplementary \*.tsv table are available in Zenodo system at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7743637> Supplementary data \*.xlsx tables are available at <https://github.com/ievapudz/TemStaPro/tree/main/data>. TemStaPro software source code is freely available at <https://github.com/ievapudz/TemStaPro>.

## References

- Adalsteinsson BT, Kristjansdottir T, Merre W *et al.* Efficient genome editing of an extreme thermophile, *Thermus thermophilus*, using a thermostable Cas9 variant. *Sci Rep* 2021;11:9586.
- Ahmed Z, Zulfiqar H, Khan AA *et al.* iThermo: a sequence-based model for identifying thermophilic proteins using a multi-feature fusion strategy. *Front Microbiol* 2022;13:790063.
- Altae-Tran H, Kannan S, Demircioglu FE *et al.* The widespread IS200/IS605 transposon family encodes diverse programmable RNA-guided endonucleases. *Science* 2021;374:57–65.
- Camargo AP, Nayfach S, Chen I-MA *et al.* IMG/VR v4: an expanded database of uncultivated virus genomes within a framework of extensive functional, taxonomic, and ecological metadata. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2023;51:D733–43.
- Charoenkwan P, Chotpatiwetchkul W, Lee VS *et al.* A novel sequence-based predictor for identifying and characterizing thermophilic proteins using estimated propensity scores of dipeptides. *Sci Rep* 2021; 11:23782.
- Charoenkwan P, Schaduagratt N, Moni MA *et al.* SAPPHERE: a stacking-based ensemble learning framework for accurate prediction of thermophilic proteins. *Comput Biol Med* 2022;146:105704.
- Dehouck Y, Folch B, Rooman M. Revisiting the correlation between proteins' thermoresistance and organisms' thermophilicity. *Protein Eng Des Sel* 2008;21:275–8.
- Eddy SR. Accelerated profile HMM searches. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2011; 7:e1002195.
- Elnaggar A, Heinzinger M, Dallago C *et al.* ProtTrans: toward understanding the language of life through self-supervised learning. *IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell* 2022;44:7112–27.
- Engqvist MKM. Correlating enzyme annotations with a large set of microbial growth temperatures reveals metabolic adaptations to growth at diverse temperatures. *BMC Microbiol* 2018a;18:177.

- Engqvist MKM. Growth temperatures for 21,498 microorganisms, 2018b. <https://zenodo.org/records/1175609>.
- Fan G-L, Liu Y-L, Wang H. Identification of thermophilic proteins by incorporating evolutionary and acid dissociation information into chou's general pseudo amino acid composition. *J Theor Biol* 2016; 407:138–42.
- Feng C, Ma Z, Yang D *et al.* A method for prediction of thermophilic protein based on reduced amino acids and mixed features. *Front Bioeng Biotechnol* 2020;8:285.
- Fenoy E, Edera AA, Stegmayer G. Transfer learning in proteins: evaluating novel protein learned representations for bioinformatics tasks. *Brief Bioinform* 2022;23:bbac232.
- Fu L, Niu B, Zhu Z *et al.* CD-HIT: accelerated for clustering the next-generation sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* 2012;28:3150–2.
- Gasiunas G, Young JK, Karvelis T *et al.* A catalogue of biochemically diverse CRISPR-Cas9 orthologs. *Nat Commun* 2020;11:5512.
- Ghounemy A, Mahas A, Marsic T *et al.* CRISPR-Based diagnostics: challenges and potential solutions toward point-of-care applications. *ACS Synth Biol* 2023;12:1–16.
- Gromiha MM, Suresh MX. Discrimination of mesophilic and thermophilic proteins using machine learning algorithms. *Proteins* 2008; 70:1274–9.
- Harrington LB, Paez-Espino D, Staahl BT *et al.* A thermostable Cas9 with increased lifetime in human plasma. *Nat Commun* 2017;8:1424.
- Haselbeck F, John M, Zhang Y *et al.* Superior protein thermophilicity prediction with protein language model embeddings. *NAR Genom Bioinform* 2023;5:lqad087.
- Karvelis T, Druteika G, Bigelyte G *et al.* Transposon-associated TnpB is a programmable RNA-guided DNA endonuclease. *Nature* 2021; 599:692–6.
- Kavuri NR, Ramasamy M, Qi Y *et al.* Applications of CRISPR/Cas13-Based RNA editing in plants. *Cells* 2022;11:2665.
- Khan S, Sallard E. Current and prospective applications of CRISPR-Cas12a in pluricellular organisms. *Mol Biotechnol* 2023; 65:196–205.
- Kingma DP, Ba J. Adam: a method for stochastic optimization, 2017. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>.
- Leinonen R, Diez FG, Binns D *et al.* UniProt archive. *Bioinformatics* 2004;20:3236–7.
- Lin H, Chen W. Prediction of thermophilic proteins using feature selection technique. *J Microbiol Methods* 2011;84:67–70.
- Lin Z, Akin H, Rao R *et al.* Evolutionary-scale prediction of atomic-level protein structure with a language model. *Science* 2023;379:1123–30.
- Mougiakos I, Mohanraju P, Bosma EF *et al.* Characterizing a thermostable Cas9 for bacterial genome editing and silencing. *Nat Commun* 2017;8:1647.
- Nguyen LT, Macaluso NC, Pizzano BLM *et al.* A thermostable Cas12b from *Brevibacillus* leverages one-pot discrimination of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern. *EBioMedicine* 2022;77:103926.
- Pei H, Li J, Ma S *et al.* Identification of thermophilic proteins based on sequence-based bidirectional representations from transformer-embedding features. *Appl Sci* 2023;13:2858.
- Richardson L, Allen B, Baldi G *et al.* MGnify: the microbiome sequence data analysis resource in 2023. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2023; 51:D753–9.
- Rives A, Meier J, Sercu T *et al.* Biological structure and function emerge from scaling unsupervised learning to 250 million protein sequences. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2021;118:e2016239118.
- Sasnauskas G, Tamulaitiene G, Druteika G *et al.* TnpB structure reveals minimal functional core of Cas12 nuclease family. *Nature* 2023; 616:384–9.
- Sayers EW, Bolton EE, Brister JR *et al.* Database resources of the National Center for Biotechnology Information. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2022;50:D20–D26.
- Stark H, Dallago C, Heinzinger M *et al.* Light attention predicts protein location from the language of life. *Bioinform Adv* 2021;1:vbab035.
- Suzek BE, Huang H, McGarvey P *et al.* UniRef: comprehensive and non-redundant UniProt reference clusters. *Bioinformatics* 2007; 23:1282–8.
- Thumhuri V, Almagro Armenteros JJ, Johansen AR *et al.* DeepLoc 2.0: multi-label subcellular localization prediction using protein language models. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2022;50:W228–34.
- Urbaitis T, Gasiunas G, Young JK *et al.* A new family of CRISPR-type V nucleases with C-rich PAM recognition. *EMBO Rep* 2022;23:e55481.
- Yang H, Gao P, Rajashankar KR *et al.* PAM-Dependent target DNA recognition and cleavage by C2c1 CRISPR-Cas endonuclease. *Cell* 2016;167:1814–28.e12.
- Zhao J, Yan W, Yang Y. DeepTP: a deep learning model for thermophilic protein prediction. *Int J Mol Sci* 2023;24:2217.