

# **Direct parameter-free biological quantitative sequence activity model induction**

**Zeina Shreif, Deborah A. Striegel, and Vipul Periwal\***

National Institutes of Health, NIDDK, Laboratory of Biological Modeling  
Building 12A, 12 South Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA

---

\* Correspondence: Tel: 301-496-0895, Fax: 301-402-0535, Email: [vipulp@mail.nih.gov](mailto:vipulp@mail.nih.gov)

## **Abstract**

Extracting useful information from large biological datasets remains a challenging problem. We combine methods from theoretical physics and Bayesian model selection in a novel manner to compute biophysical models directly from data. Using fundamental physical principles to derive a simple iteration to induce parameter-free models with minimal computational effort, we apply our approach to data on a synthetic cAMP-regulated enhancer and show that the predictive power of our parameter-free approach surpasses that of models with hundreds of parameters. We predict the activity of new sequences and extract the exact locations of transcription factor binding sites.

## Main Text

Sophisticated approximations from statistical physics have been used for the analysis of datasets arising from technological advances in experimental biology [1-4]. Predictive models of such data have uncertainties but it is difficult to distinguish between theoretical uncertainties arising from approximations and experimental uncertainties. Statistical physics has often been applied to Bayesian model selection [5, 6] for this analysis. However, there are no symmetry principles or conserved quantities in biological contexts to guide us in defining a Maximum Entropy prior on the space of possible models, or in selecting latent variables for hard or soft Expectation Maximization. The explosion in the number and complexity of possible models means that it is impossible to include every single one.

Quantitative sequence activity models (QSAMs) are used with data from massively parallel reporter assays (MPRA) to extract predictive information about transcription factor binding [7]. Such models have a large number of parameters corresponding to weights assigned to the occurrence of each possible nucleotide at each sequence position. The number of parameters is prohibitive if the QSAM attempts to capture interaction effects between nucleotides at distal sequence positions. Interaction effects are certainly present when transcriptional activity is driven by protein complexes that effectively bind non-locally to a chromosome [8].

Here, we take a fresh look at this problem from the dual perspectives of theoretical physics and Bayesian inference for any set of symbol sequences with associated quantitative measurements. By testing for the most likely null model consistent with the data, we derive a fixed-point equation that is iteratively solvable. We then compute the Taylor expansion of the effective potential, an idea borrowed from quantum field theory, explicitly from the data. We use this effective potential to predict the phenotype of any given sequence without the need for

parameter optimization. We test this Taylor expansion to quadratic order against quantitative activity measurements from MPRA and show that the universal part of the effective potential is a parameter-free QSAM that has predictive power at the limits of experimental reproducibility. Higher orders in the Taylor expansion can also be computed using our approach.

The starting point for our analysis is a set of sequences of nucleotides, and activity measurements for each sequence. Our aim is to derive a function on the space of possible sequences such that the value of the function at any sequence is the latter's activity. We embed sequences into a family of frequency models with each model specified by a set of frequencies  $\{f_{iA}\}$  where  $f_{iA}$  is the frequency of a nucleotide represented by the letter  $A$  at position  $i$ . In particular, a specific nucleotide sequence is a model  $\{f_{iA}\}$  with all frequencies 0 or 1. We will reach our goal indirectly by first computing the maximum of a specific Bayesian posterior probability distribution and then use the outcome to calculate the desired activity function. A Bayesian calculation requires a model prior and a data likelihood. For the first, we assume that the nucleotides that appear at a given position in the sequences are randomly chosen with no correlation between positions and that just the frequencies of occurrence determine the activity of a sequence. We need a family of models that reflects this set of null hypotheses. When we toss a coin with probability  $q$  of heads, the probability of finding a frequency  $f$  of heads in  $M$  tosses follows a binomial distribution  $\Pr(f | q, M) = M! q^f / (Mf)!$ . Similarly, for our null models, the model prior for a set of frequencies  $\{f_{iA}\}$  given a set of probabilities,  $\{q_{iA}\}$ , should be a product of multinomial distributions, one factor for each position in the sequence,

$$\Pr(\{f_{iA}\} | \{q_{iA}\}, M) = \prod_i \frac{\Gamma(M+1)}{\prod_A \Gamma(Mf_{iA}+1)} \prod_A q_{iA}^{Mf_{iA}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $M$  is taken to be a continuous variable, as in dimensional regularization.

We take the likelihood function, which is the probability of obtaining the set of observed sequences  $\{s\}$  with expected frequencies  $\bar{f} \equiv \{f_{iA}\}$ , to be  $\Pr(\{s\} | \bar{f}, M) = e^{-ME(\bar{f})}$ , where  $E(\bar{f})$  is the effective potential evaluated at  $\bar{f}$ . To compute it, we introduce a source  $\bar{J}$  and define the moment-generating partition function

$$Z \equiv \exp(MW(\bar{J})) = \sum_s (w(s))^\beta \exp\left(\sum_{i,A} MJ_{iA} \delta_{s_i,A}\right), \quad (2)$$

where  $W(\bar{J})$  is the connected generating function,  $w(s)$  is the measured activity of sequence  $s$ ,  $\beta = 1/T$  for temperature  $T$ , and  $\delta_{s_i,A}$  is 1 if position  $i$  of sequence  $s$  has nucleotide  $A$  and is 0 otherwise. Then,  $E(\bar{f})$  is the Legendre transform of  $W(\bar{J})$  with respect to  $\bar{J}$ :

$$E(\bar{f}) = \bar{J} \cdot \bar{f} - W(\bar{J}), \quad (3)$$

where  $\bar{f} = \partial W / \partial \bar{J}$ . Now the Bayesian posterior distribution is obtained using Bayes' theorem:

$$\Pr(\bar{f} | \{s\}, M) = \frac{\Pr(\bar{f} | \{q_{iA}\}, M) \Pr(\{s\} | \bar{f}, M)}{\Pr(\{s\} | M)}, \quad (4)$$

where the probability of the data,  $\Pr(\{s\} | M)$ , is a normalizing constant.

The most likely model  $\bar{f}^0$  maximizes  $\Pr(\bar{f} | \{s\}, M)$ . If we have  $\bar{f}^0$ , we can obtain the effective potential at other frequency models by expanding in a Taylor expansion around  $\bar{f}^0$  with all derivatives determined directly from the data,

$$E(\bar{f}) = E(\bar{f}^0) + (\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \frac{\partial E}{\partial \bar{f}} \Big|_{\bar{f}^0} + \frac{1}{2} (\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial \bar{f}^2} \Big|_{\bar{f}^0} (\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0)^T + \dots \quad (5)$$

Define a function  $K(\bar{f})$  such that  $\Pr(\bar{f} | \{q_{iA}\}, M) = e^{MK(\bar{f})}$ . We take the probabilities  $\{q_{iA}\}$  to be the frequencies found in  $\{s\}$  independent of the activity. Maximizing  $\Pr(\bar{f} | \{s\}, M)$  yields

$$\left. \frac{\partial K}{\partial f_{iA}} \right|_{\bar{f}^0} = \left. \frac{\partial E}{\partial f_{iA}} \right|_{\bar{f}^0}. \quad (6)$$

By definition, eq. (3) requires  $\left. \frac{\partial E}{\partial f_{iA}} \right|_{\bar{f}} = J_{iA}$ . Hence, at the most likely model,  $\bar{f}^0$ ,  $J_{iA}(\bar{f}^0) = \left. \frac{\partial K}{\partial f_{iA}} \right|_{\bar{f}^0}$ .

With this re-organization, we can iteratively solve for  $J_{iA}(\bar{f}^0)$ ,  $\bar{f}_E^{(n+1)} = \bar{f} \left( \bar{J} = \left. \frac{\partial K}{\partial \bar{f}} \right|_{\bar{f}_E^{(n)}} \right)$  where

$\bar{f}_E^{(n)}$  is the value of  $\bar{f}$  at the  $n^{\text{th}}$  iterative step. At the fixed point, we obtain  $\bar{f}^0$  and in turn

$$\left. \frac{\partial E}{\partial f_{iA}} \right|_{\bar{f}^0} \text{ which is equal } J_{iA}(\bar{f}^0).$$

All derivatives of the effective potential at  $\bar{f}^0$  can now be directly computed, limited only by the number of sequences available. Here we obtain the second order expansion as follows: since

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial f_{iA} \partial f_{jB}} \right|_{\bar{f}^0} = \left. \frac{\partial J_{iA}(\bar{f})}{\partial f_{jB}} \right|_{\bar{f}^0} \text{ and } f_{jB} = \partial W / \partial J_{jB}, \text{ we obtain}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial f_{iA} \partial f_{jB}} = \left[ \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial J_{iA} \partial J_{jB}} \right]^{-1}. \quad (7)$$

where  $\partial^2 W / \partial J_{iA} \partial J_{jB} = M \left\{ \langle \delta_{s_i,A} \delta_{s_j,B} \rangle - \langle \delta_{s_i,A} \rangle \langle \delta_{s_j,B} \rangle \right\}$ , obtained from  $\partial^2 Z / \partial J_{iA} \partial J_{jB}$ .

Here,  $\langle x \rangle \equiv \sum_s x \rho_s$  for weights of the probability distribution  $\rho_s = w(s)^\beta e^{M\bar{J} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_s} / \sum_s w(s)^\beta e^{M\bar{J} \cdot \bar{\sigma}_s}$

and  $\bar{\sigma}_s \equiv \{ \delta_{s_i,A} \}$ . The Taylor expansion is limited by the number of terms that we can reliably

compute from the data, though each derivative is determined by the data at the fixed point by the

determination of the weights of the probability distribution. However, as the effective potential is convex by the basic properties of the Legendre transform construction, we find that the second-order expansion suffices to match experimental reproducibility.

Define  $H(s)$  by  $w(s)^\beta = e^{-\beta H(s)}$ . Then  $H(s)$  is a function of  $s$  whose expectation value is obtained from

$$M \frac{\partial E}{\partial \beta} = \langle H \rangle . \quad (8)$$

This equation states that the derivative of the effective potential with respect to  $\beta$  evaluated at any specific model is given by the expectation value of  $H$  in an ensemble where the expectation value of every nucleotide at each position is given by the frequencies defining that model. We shall show that at small  $\beta$ ,  $\langle H \rangle$ , computed using eq. (8), is an excellent predictor of  $H(s)$ .

We apply our method to randomly mutated sequences of a synthetic cAMP-regulated enhancer (CRE) with quantitative activity measurements obtained from MPRA in Ref [7]. We divide the data into a training set and a test set. We use the former to obtain  $\langle H \rangle$  and the latter to gauge the accuracy of our predictions of the activity of new sequences from  $\langle H \rangle$ .

Testing the predictive power of our method at different values of  $M$  and  $\beta$  (Fig. 1a,b), we find that, at small  $\beta$  and  $M$  ( $M = 0.01, \beta = 0.1$ ),  $\partial E / \partial \beta$  (eq. (8)) is a better predictor than the linear QSAM model ( $r^2 = 0.696 \pm 0.006$  for the training set (Fig. 1c, Table S1, Fig. S1a,c) and  $0.627 \pm 0.010$  for the test set (Fig. 1d, Table S1, Fig. S1b,d) compared with  $r^2 = 0.63$  obtained using the linear QSAM [7]). The goodness of fit does not significantly change whether we use only 10% of the sequences for testing ( $r^2 = 0.690 \pm 0.001$  for training and  $0.630 \pm 0.013$  for testing) or 30% ( $r^2 = 0.702 \pm 0.002$  for training and  $0.624 \pm 0.004$  for testing). Our results reflect

the limit of the variance in the experimental data (Melnikov et al [7] reported a variance between replicates with  $r^2 = 0.67$ ).

We illustrate the meaning of  $M$  and  $\beta$  by showing their effect on the Shannon entropy of the data (the training set),  $-\sum_s \rho_s \ln \rho_s$ , and the peak of the probability distribution,  $\rho_{\max}$  (Fig. 2).

In the strong-coupling limit, entropy is high and the probability distribution is flatter. Fig. 2 shows that entropy decreases as both  $M$  and  $\beta$  increase, as the probability distribution peaks at higher values of  $M$  and  $\beta$ .

While it is usual in theoretical physics to compute the effective potential,  $E$ , from the action or Hamiltonian,  $H$ , here we are computing  $E$  directly from the data and attempting to infer  $H$ . Rewriting the usual form of the weak-coupling (low-temperature) saddle-point expansion appropriately,

$$\beta H(\bar{f}) = ME(\bar{f}) - \left\{ H_1(\bar{f}) + \frac{1}{\beta} H_2(\bar{f}) + \frac{1}{\beta^2} H_3(\bar{f}) + \dots \right\}, \quad (9)$$

we see that  $H(\bar{f})$  is proportional to  $E(\bar{f})$  only at large enough  $\beta$ . Eq. (9) suggests that we might be able to improve on the fit obtained from eq. (8) by including additional terms related to  $E(\bar{f})$ . Can such additional terms, with one or two additional parameters that need to be optimized, do better than the parameter-free model given by eq. (8)?  $\beta$  cannot be too large, as that would shift the most likely frequency  $\bar{f}^0$  closer to a few sequences with high activity but far from the rest. Even at the best  $\beta$  values, approximating  $H(\bar{f})$  by  $E(\bar{f})$  alone (Fig. 3a,b) is not as predictive as  $M \partial E / \partial \beta$  at low  $\beta$  and  $M$  values (Fig. 1), as the 2<sup>nd</sup> term in the saddle expansion,  $H_1(\bar{f})$ , does not disappear at large  $\beta$ . Thus,  $H_1(\bar{f})$  might be related to



$(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \bar{J}$  ,  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \partial \bar{J} / \partial M$  , and/or  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \partial \bar{f}^0 / \partial M$  . We test our intuition by observing the goodness of fit,  $r^2$  , when these terms are used to predict  $H(\bar{f})$  individually (Fig. 3) and in combination with  $ME(\bar{f})$  (Fig. 4). With  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \bar{J}$  ,  $r^2$  does not appreciably vary with  $\beta$  ( $r^2 = 0.18$  for the training set (Fig. 3c) and  $0.19$  for the test set (Fig. 3d)) but is improved with a combination of  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \bar{J}$  and  $ME(\bar{f})$  (Fig. 4a,b). Thus,  $H_1(\bar{f})$  may contain a contribution from  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \bar{J}$  while  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \partial \bar{J} / \partial M$  and  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \partial \bar{f}^0 / \partial M$  contribute to higher order terms as they also improve the fit when combined with  $ME(\bar{f})$  (Fig. 4c-f) but they individually vary with  $\beta$  (Fig. 3e-h). In the strong coupling limit, using  $ME(\bar{f})$  combined with  $M \partial E / \partial \beta$  does not appreciably improve  $r^2$  (Fig. 5), consistent with eq. (8).

To ascertain the interactions that underlie the activity of sequences, we compute a mutual information matrix,  $\{I_{ij}\}$  , where

$$I_{ij} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{A,B} \frac{\Pr(iA, jB)}{\Pr(*, *)} \ln \left( \frac{\Pr(iA, jB) \Pr(*, *)}{\Pr(iA, *) \Pr(*, jB)} \right) \quad (10)$$

is the mutual information between positions  $i$  and  $j$  where  $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, N_p$  for  $N_p$  positions, and  $\Pr(iA, jB)$  is the joint probability distribution of a perturbation  $\bar{\varepsilon}^{(iA, jB)}$  in the direction increasing  $f_{iA}$  and  $f_{jB}$  while keeping the sum of frequencies equal to one at each position:

$$\Pr(iA, jB) \propto \exp \left\{ -ME \left( \bar{f}^0 + \bar{\varepsilon}^{(iA, jB)} \right) \right\}, \Pr(iA, *) = \sum_B \Pr(iA, jB), \Pr(*, jB) = \sum_A \Pr(iA, jB), \text{ and}$$

$$\Pr(*, *) = \sum_{A,B} \Pr(iA, jB).$$

For small  $\beta$ , nucleotide interactions are distributed throughout the promoter sequence and do not highlight any localized binding sites (Fig. 6a). The sequences in the dataset have multiple random mutations. The ability to predict the activity of sequences that may be quite far from the optimized binding motifs is not congruent with the ability to pinpoint specific binding sites. As our quadratic order Taylor expansion calculation gives predictions for the test set that are at the limit of experimental variation, this is not a question of an inadequate approximation. However, all the known interaction sites can indeed be found in our analysis by increasing  $\beta$  to emphasize sequences with higher activity. At  $\beta = 10.25$  we obtain a high resolution (Fig. 6b) which clearly shows four interaction sites that are consistent with the known binding sites of CRE (CREB1, CREB2, CREB3, and CREB4) [7]. Only 3 of these sites (sites 2 – 4) can be detected at  $\beta = 2.0$ . However, increasing  $\beta$  further to a low-temperature regime, where only very few high activity sequences contribute to the partition function, results in the loss of the power of statistical averaging (Fig. 6c). These mutual information matrices show that other positions far from the known binding sites interact to affect the activity of the sequences. When we reanalyze the sequences using only the cryptic and known binding sites, only some positions of the binding sites continue showing a strong interaction (Fig. 6d-e). While our model can explain ~69% of the variance (including experimental variance), only 59% can be explained from the binding sites alone ( $r^2 = 0.59$  for training and  $r^2 = 0.55$  for test set when only the cryptic and binding sites are analysed). Thus, ~13% to 15% of sequence activity depends on regions between binding sites even for this synthetic promoter.

The statistical physics of modeling [8-11] is an important aspect of extracting information from data in sciences such as biology where the data is never complete and the structure of possible models is never certain. Such systems are typically complex enough that they cannot be

modeled with explicit parameterized models incorporating every interactant. Simplified effective model development requires trade-offs between goodness of fit and model complexity [12, 13]. This seldom satisfies experimentalists who contend that the real system is much more. However, optimizing a model incorporating the mostly unknown interactions of even 1,000 genes, let alone 30,000, is practically impossible.

We developed a novel method to extract model information from data without introducing explicit parameterized models, in particular without parameter optimization. Our method relies on three conceptual foundations: (1) a re-examination of the symmetry between model and data implicit in Bayes' theorem, leading to an explicit weighting of sequences consistent with a given model, as in robust regression [14, 15]; (2) a counter-intuitive skeptical approach to Bayesian model comparison where we test for the most likely null model that is consistent with the data; and (3) an iterative method to find this most likely null model, and in the process compute the actual effective potential underlying the data to all orders in derivatives about the fixed point null model.

A limitation of our analysis is that the effective potential computed is convex. The iteration underlying the computation fails to converge if convexity is violated. This is remedied by the Maxwell construction and the Legendre-Fenchel transform. However, our accuracy in predicting activity will be limited by this obligatory convexity. The re-weighting of sequences enforced by our iteration is determined by our choice of null model distribution. We have verified that our results do not depend on varying this distribution.

We showed explicitly that our parameter-free approach based on fundamental physical principles has better or equal predictive power compared to models requiring hundreds of parameters [7, 16, 17]. It is computationally efficient, requiring minutes on a desktop

workstation to extract the effective potential from tens of thousands of sequence-activity pairs. This effective potential pinpoints the features (e.g., positions in a sequence of nucleotides) that interact to affect a particular quantitative phenotype. Indeed, it is a startling realization that the best activity prediction is achieved with interactions that are far from localized around known binding sites, suggesting that transcription factor binding embodies distributed control [18, 19] as a determinant of activity even on a synthetic enhancer.


### **Acknowledgement**

This work was supported by Intramural Research Program of the National Institutes of Health, NIDDK. We thank C. Chow and A. Sherman for helpful comments.

## Figures


### Figure 1

In (a) and (b) we show how  $r^2$  from the training set (a) and the test set (b) vary with  $M$  and  $\beta$ , where the activities are predicted from the  $M \partial E / \partial \beta$  function. At  $M = 0.01$ ,  $\beta = 0.1$ , we plot (c and d) log of the activity of the sequences,  $\ln(w(s))$ , versus log of the fitted activity,  $\ln(w_{fit}(s))$ , and predicted,  $\ln(w_{pred}(s))$ , activities for the training (c) and test (d) sets, respectively.




### Figure 2

The variation of the entropy (left) and the peak of the probability distribution  $\rho_{max}$  (right) with  $M$  and  $\beta$ .




**Figure 3**

The goodness of fit ( $r^2$ ) for the training set (a, c, e, g) and the test set (b, d, f, h). The activities are predicted from  $ME$  (a,b),  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \bar{J}$  (c, d),  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \partial \bar{J} / \partial M$  (e, f), and  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \partial \bar{f}^0 / \partial M$  (g, h).




**Figure 4**

The goodness of fit ( $r^2$ ) for the training set (a, c, e) and the test set (b, d, f). The activities are predicted from  $ME$  and  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \bar{J}$  (a, b),  $ME$  and  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \partial \bar{J} / \partial M$  (c, d),  $ME$  and  $(\bar{f} - \bar{f}^0) \cdot \partial \bar{f}^0 / \partial M$  (e, f).



### Figure 5


The goodness of fit ( $r^2$ ) for the training set (a) and the test set (b). The activities are predicted from  $ME$  and  $M \partial E / \partial \beta$ .





**Figure 6**

Mutual information matrices analysing the full sequences (a-c) or only the cryptic and known binding sites part of the sequences (d-f). Mutual information is computed from eq. (10) at  $M = 0.01$  and  $\beta = 2.0$  (a, d),  $\beta = 10.25$  (b, e), and  $\beta = 20.0$  (c, f).



## Supplementary Information

We obtained a large set of sequences (26337 in total) of a synthetic cAMP-regulated enhancer (CRE) whose activities were determined by a massively parallel reporter assay reported in Ref [7]. For the sets numbered 1 through 11 in Table S1 (group 1), we randomly picked 70% of the sequences to use as a training set ( $N_{\text{training}}$  = total number of sequences in the training set) and the 30% left as a test set ( $N_{\text{testing}}$  = total number of sequences in the test set) to gauge the accuracy of our predictions. For the sets numbered 12 through 23 in Table S1 (group 2), we randomly picked 90% of the sequences to use for training and the 10% left for testing. Both groups did equally well, with  $r^2 = 0.702 \pm 0.002$  (training),  $r^2 = 0.624 \pm 0.004$  (testing) in group 1, and  $r^2 = 0.690 \pm 0.001$  (training),  $r^2 = 0.630 \pm 0.013$  (testing) in group 2. Taking both groups together, we obtain  $r^2 = 0.696 \pm 0.006$  (training) and  $r^2 = 0.627 \pm 0.010$  (testing).


**Table S1:  $r^2$  of activity prediction from  $M \partial E / \partial \beta$  at  $M = 0.01$  and  $\beta = 0.1$**

70% for training and 30% for testing					90% for training and 10% for testing				
Set number	$N_{\text{training}}$	$N_{\text{test}}$	$r^2$ (training)	$r^2$ (testing)	Set number	$N_{\text{training}}$	$N_{\text{test}}$	$r^2$ (training)	$r^2$ (testing)
1	18434	7903	0.7019	0.6186	12	23714	2623	0.6901	0.6280
2	18370	7967	0.7028	0.6293	13	23742	2595	0.6906	0.6264
3	18469	7868	0.7035	0.6187	14	23738	2599	0.6911	0.6209
4	18354	7983	0.6990	0.6273	15	23764	2573	0.6898	0.6329
5	18431	7906	0.6993	0.6268	16	23694	2643	0.6895	0.6356
6	18460	7877	0.7043	0.6186	17	23648	2689	0.6885	0.6498
7	18407	7930	0.7019	0.6223	18	23695	2642	0.6902	0.6205
8	18517	7820	0.7019	0.6212	19	23721	2616	0.6878	0.6517
9	18431	7906	0.7005	0.6295	20	23627	2710	0.6890	0.6346
10	18540	7797	0.7027	0.6245	22	23703	2634	0.6898	0.6278
11	18436	7901	0.7033	0.6216	23	23703	2634	0.6924	0.6051
Average			0.7019	0.6235	Average			0.6899	0.6303
Standard Deviation			0.0016	0.0040	Standard Deviation			0.0012	0.0126

## Supplementary Figures

**Figure S1: The goodness of fit ( $r^2$ ) of  $M \partial E / \partial \beta$  at  $M = 0.01$  and  $\beta = 0.1$**

We plot log of the activity of the sequences,  $\ln(w(s))$ , versus log of the fitted,  $\ln(w_{fit}(s))$ , and predicted,  $\ln(w_{pred}(s))$ , activities for the training (a, c) and test (b, d) sets, respectively. Here,  $M \partial E / \partial \beta$  is computed at  $M = 0.01$  and  $\beta = 0.1$ . The results shown here are for sets number 6 (a,b) and 19 (c,d).



## References

- [1] S. V. Buldyrev, N. V. Dokholyan, A. L. Goldberger, S. Havlin, C. K. Peng, H. E. Stanley, and G. M. Viswanathan, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **249**, 430 (1998).
- [2] C. K. Peng, A. C. C. Yang, and A. L. Goldberger, *Chaos* **17**, 015115 (2007).
- [3] S. M. Ossadnik, S. V. Buldyrev, A. L. Goldberger, S. Havlin, R. N. Mantegna, C. K. Peng, M. Simons, and H. E. Stanley, *Biophysical Journal* **67**, 64 (1994).
- [4] C. K. Peng, S. V. Buldyrev, A. L. Goldberger, S. Havlin, M. Simons, and H. E. Stanley, *Phys Rev E* **47**, 3730 (1993).
- [5] P. Gregory, *Bayesian Logical Data Analysis for the Physical Sciences* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 2005).
- [6] D. Sivia and J. Skilling, *Data Analysis A Bayesian Tutorial* (Oxford University Press Inc., New York, 2006).
- [7] A. Melnikov et al., *Nat Biotechnol* **30**, 271 (2012).
- [8] J. B. Kinney, G. Tkacik, and C. G. Callan, *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **104**, 501 (2007).
- [9] K. S. Brown and J. P. Sethna, *Phys Rev E* **68** (2003).
- [10] R. N. Gutenkunst, J. J. Waterfall, F. P. Casey, K. S. Brown, C. R. Myers, and J. P. Sethna, *Plos Comput Biol* **3**, 1871 (2007).
- [11] M. T. Weirauch et al., *Nat Biotechnol* **31**, 126 (2013).
- [12] G. Danuser, J. Allard, and A. Mogilner, *Annual review of cell and developmental biology* **29**, 501 (2013).
- [13] R. Samaga and S. Klamt, *Cell communication and signaling : CCS* **11**, 43 (2013).
- [14] R. A. Maronna, D. R. Martin, and V. J. Yohai, *Robust Statistics: Theory and Methods* (Wiley, 2006).
- [15] F. R. Hampel, E. M. Ronchetti, P. J. Rousseeuw, and W. A. Stahel, *Robust Statistics: The Approach Based on Influence Functions* (Wiley-Interscience, 2005).
- [16] J. Jonsson, T. Norberg, L. Carlsson, C. Gustafsson, and S. Wold, *Nucleic Acids Research* **21**, 733 (1993).
- [17] Z. Peng, T. Feifei, W. Yugian, L. Zhiliang, and S. Zhicai, *Current Computer - Aided Drug Design* **4**, 311 (2008).
- [18] T. M. Stout and T. J. Williams, *Annals of the History of Computing*, *IEEE* **17**, 6 (1995).
- [19] F. P. Miller, A. F. Vandome, and J. McBrewster, *Distributed Control Systems* (Alpha Press, 2010).