

Remodeling Peptide-MHC-TCR Triad Binding as Sequence Fusion for Immunogenicity Prediction

Jiahao Ma^{1,3*} Hongzong Li^{1*} Jian-Dong Huang^{2,3} Ye-Fan Hu^{1,4} Yifan Chen⁵

¹ BayVax Biotech Limited

² Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong

³ Materials Innovation Institute for Life Sciences and Energy, The University of Hong Kong

⁴ Shenzhen BayVax Biotech Limited

⁵ Computational Machine Intelligence Laboratory, Hong Kong Baptist University

Abstract

The complex nature of tripartite peptide-MHC-TCR interactions is a critical yet underexplored area of immunogenicity prediction. Traditional studies in a simpler field, TCR-antigen binding, have not adequately addressed the complex dependencies involved in triad binding. In this paper, we propose new modeling approaches for the tripartite molecule interactions, exploiting sequence information from MHCs, peptides, and TCRs. Intentionally, our methods adhere to the native sequence forms and align with biological processes for improving the prediction accuracy. Moreover, by incorporating representation learning techniques, we devise a new fusion mechanism for sufficiently integrating the three sequences. Empirical experiments demonstrate our models outperform traditional methods in prediction accuracy by 2.8%-13.3% across existing benchmarks. We further validate our designs through extensive ablation studies, showing the effectiveness of the proposed model components. The model implementation and the code, as well as a complete manuscript with colored hyperlinks and a technical appendix for better digital viewing, are included as supplementary materials and scheduled to be open-sourced upon publication.

1 Introduction

From a biological perspective, cellular immunity is vital to health by recognizing and eliminating pathogen-infected and abnormal cells. The core of cellular immunity involves the binding of three key protein sequences: major histocompatibility complex (**MHC**), antigenic **peptide**, and T cell receptor (**TCR**). In more details, the MHC first binds with the antigenic peptide to form the peptide-MHC (pMHC) complex, determining whether the peptide will be presented to the immune system. Then, the interaction between the pMHC complex and the TCR decides if an immune response will be triggered. Therefore, a precise and accurate characterization of the triad interactions of peptide, MHC, and TCR is essential for understanding cellular immunity against pathogens and cancers.

Studies on sequence binding have led to advanced immunotherapies with promising clinical trial results. Therapeutic cancer vaccines using antigenic peptides [Rojas et al. \(2023\)](#); [Yarchoan et al. \(2024\)](#) rely on the peptide-MHC binding prediction when TCR data is limited. TCR-T therapies

* Equal contribution.




Figure 1: **The Role of pMHC-TCR in Adaptive Immunity and the Correspondence between Our Model Architecture and the Biological Process.** (More details will be introduced in Section 3.1.)

(a) Antigen Presentation via APCs to activate T cells. Antigens are up-taken by the APCs and then bind to the MHC. Subsequently, the pMHC complex displayed on APCs can bind to some TCRs on T cells.

(b) Recognition of Antigens by T cells. All cells present some peptides via the pMHC. Certain peptides can be recognized by T cells through the pMHC-TCR interaction, leading to their elimination by T cells.

(c) Workflow of model training taking peptide-MHC binding as pre-training support for pMHC-TCR binding predictions (right panel) by mimicking biological process (left panel). The dashed box indicates the pre-training module.

employing *TCR* genes Hassel et al. (2023); D’Angelo et al. (2024) have also shown successes, with two drugs receiving accelerated FDA approval on Jan. 25, 2022 Mullard (2022) and Aug. 2, 2024, respectively. These approvals in the recent two years underscore the urgent need for improved MHC-peptide-TCR binding prediction algorithms. (Further discussion on real-world impacts is provided in Appendices C.1 and C.2.)

Challenges. Organically fusing information from the three sequences—antigenic peptide, MHC, and TCR—is essential for predicting their interactions, as it closely mirrors the natural process of the tripartite molecule interactions. However, the majority of prevalent immunogenicity prediction algorithms Yang et al. (2023); Montemurro et al. (2021) focus solely on **a fraction of the natural immune process**, involving only two of the three aforementioned sequences. This limitation restricts their clinical applicability and calls for more comprehensive modeling approaches: as per the law of total variance, intuitively modeling the complete interaction of the *three* biological sequences leads to more accurate prediction. To this end, we aim to address several key challenges, including ① properly representing biological sequences, ② effectively modeling heterogeneous sequence fusion, and ③ using existing data to address real-world healthcare and medicine issues.

Overview. In this work, we propose an approach to modeling complex triad binding based on real biological processes. As shown in Figure 1, the activation of immune responses is driven by two sequential steps: ① the binding of an antigenic peptide to the major histocompatibility complex (MHC), forming a peptide-MHC (pMHC) molecule (Kammertoens & Blankenstein, 2013), and ② the subsequent binding of the T-cell receptor (TCRs) to the pMHC, resulting in a pMHC-TCR molecule Huppa et al. (2010). From our perspective, these two steps are supposed to guide the flow of data transformation, allowing models to **effectively mimic the real biological process**.

Table 1: Comparison of common models for immunological sequence binding, highlighting differences in model components and concatenation methods.

Model	MHC Modeling	Peptide Modeling	TCR Modeling	Fusion Mechanism
STMHCpan Ye et al. (2023)	peptide-MHC Graph	peptide-MHC Graph	N/A	Star-Transformer
TransPHLA Chu et al. (2021; 2022)	Self-Attention	Self-Attention	N/A	Self-Attention
Cross-TCR Interpreter Koyama et al. (2023)	Self-Attention	N/A	Self-Attention	Concat + Cross-Attention
netMHCpan Borole & Rajan (2024)	LSTM	LSTM	N/A	Concat
CeBHLA Wu et al. (2023)	BiLSTM	BiLSTM	N/A	CNN
UniTCR Gao et al. (2024)	N/A	N/A	Self-Attention	Cross-Attention
DeepAIR Zhao et al. (2023)	N/A	N/A	Self-Attention	Gate-Based Attention
MIX-TPI Yang et al. (2023)	N/A	2D CNN	2D CNN	Conditional Gate
NetTCR Montemurro et al. (2021)	N/A	1D CNN	1D CNN	Concat
pMThet (Lu et al., 2021)	LSTM	LSTM	Autoencoder	Concat

Following this intuition, we design our models to retain the essential characteristics of each sequence and “recover” the process mentioned above. Specifically, we propose to adopt the sequence form (usually an $l \times d$ matrix) as the data representation along the forward pass in our models, which is consistent with the real biological process. We also apply proper representation learning techniques in multimodal fusion to model the sequence fusion. Driven by these designs, we further discuss how unified token embedding (considering amino acids, the “tokens” in biological sequences, also have identical types in various sequences) will affect the performance of immunogenicity prediction. Finally, we demonstrate that the empirical results on real-world datasets align well with our conjecture. In summary,

- We develop a new model for peptide-MHC-TCR triad binding, **Fusion-pMT**, which maintains the sequence form during data transform and aligns with the real biological process.
- We introduce representation learning techniques (multimodal fusion + unified token embedding) to model the sequence fusion, consequently improving the performance of immunogenicity prediction.
- We evaluate the effect of the representation learning techniques we adopt, which further validates the effectiveness and versatility of our design from empirical aspects. The analysis improves the practical relevance of our approach and its potential to improve immunogenicity prediction.

2 Related Works

The prediction of interactions among peptides, MHC, and TCR is crucial in immunoinformatics. Most methods are focusing on TCR-antigen specificity or peptide-MHC Class I binding, with only a few addressing peptide-MHC-TCR triad binding due to its complexity and the scarcity of experimental data. We identify immunological sequence modeling and biological sequence fusion mechanisms as key factors and review related works accordingly (summarized in Table 1 for the reader’s convenience).

Immunological Sequence Modeling. Traditional methods represented immunological sequences in non-sequence forms. For instance, [Andreatta & Nielsen \(2016\)](#) used simple artificial neural networks (ANN), while [Zhang et al. \(2021, Tessa\)](#) and [Grazioli et al. \(2023, AVIB\)](#) utilized autoencoders for TCR sequences. [Montemurro et al. \(2021, NetTCR\)](#) employed CNN encoders for TCR and antigenic peptides, and models such as [Jin et al. \(2021, DeepAttentionPan\)](#) and [Kalemati](#)

et al. (2023, CapsNet-MHC) enhanced traditional CNNs with attention layers to improve feature extraction.

With advances in natural language processing, sequence modeling techniques have gained popularity. NetMHCpan (Borole & Rajan, 2024; Reynisson *et al.*, 2020; Jurtz *et al.*, 2017) applied LSTM to both MHC and peptide sequences. Building on this, Wu *et al.* (2023, CcBHLA) used BiLSTM, while TransPHLA (Chu *et al.*, 2022; 2021) incorporated self-attention modules to capture complex dependencies. Ye *et al.* (2023, STMHCpan) modeled peptide-MHC interactions as graphs, introducing graph neural networks to the field.

Biological Sequence Fusion Mechanism. Fusion mechanisms model interactions among biological sequences. Montemurro *et al.* (2021, NetTCR) employed direct concatenation of hidden embeddings, while TransPHLA (Chu *et al.*, 2022; 2021) utilized self-attention. Gao *et al.* (2024, UniTCR) integrated single-cell RNA sequencing data with TCR analytics using cross-attention, though its clinical relevance is limited by not accounting for peptide-MHC binding before TCR interaction. Gating-based mechanisms are widely used by MIX-TPI (Yang *et al.*, 2023) and DeepAIR (Zhao *et al.*, 2023) to incorporate protein structural information. Weber *et al.* (2021) further enhanced fusion by learning from the context of binding and non-binding pairs.

Models for Peptide-MHC-TCR Triad Binding. To the best of our knowledge, pMTnet (Lu *et al.*, 2021) is the only model proposed for directly modeling peptide-MHC-TCR triad binding. This model utilizes netMHCpan (Borole & Rajan, 2024; Reynisson *et al.*, 2020; Jurtz *et al.*, 2017) and Tessa (Zhang *et al.*, 2021) as pre-trained models to encode peptide-MHC binding and TCR CDR3 β sequences, respectively. It employs a vector concatenation strategy to model TCR-pMHC interactions. However, due to its reliance on simple concatenation and non-sequence-based feature extraction methods, the model’s PR AUC is limited to approximately 56%.

3 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the fundamental concepts of the immune system in Section 3.1, the challenges faced in computational immunology, existing methods for handling multi-sequence biological problems in Section 3.2, and the mechanism of the cross-attention technique in Section 3.3.

3.1 Biological Sequences in Immune Systems

The activation of immune responses hinges on two key processes: **antigen presentation** and **antigen recognition**, essential to adaptive immunity. Antigen-presenting cells (APCs) activate T cells through antigen presentation, while T cells recognize and eliminate abnormal cells via antigen recognition. These processes involve (1) Binding of an antigenic peptide to MHC, forming a peptide-MHC (pMHC) molecule Kammertoens & Blankenstein (2013). (2) Binding of TCR to the pMHC, forming a pMHC-TCR molecule Huppa *et al.* (2010).

T cells, central to adaptive immunity, possess highly diverse TCRs, composed of α and β chains. The diversity of TCRs, especially the β chains, is pivotal for discriminating self from non-self antigens Mora & Walczak (2019). Antigen recognition also depends on antigen presentation via MHC pathways. The immune response is activated by peptide-MHC-TCR complexes, fundamental to immunity. For a more comprehensive introduction to immune molecules, see Appendix B.1.




Figure 2: **An Overview of Our Model Structure.**

(a) Modules in the dashed box are first pre-trained through peptide-MHC binding tasks, in advance of the core fine-tuning for pMHC-TCR binding predictions.

(b)/(c)/(d) Illustrations for the “One Hot + Positional Embedding” / “Projection Encoder” / “Cross-Attention” module.

3.2 Sequence Binding Tasks in Immune Systems

Research on immunological sequence binding highlights several challenges:

- **Peptide-MHC Binding:** it is crucial for antigen presentation, and useful for vaccine development. However, not all peptides binding to MHC can form a pMHC complex that also binds to TCR, limiting the model’s reflection of entire cellular immunity.
- **Peptide-TCR Binding:** it is critical for T-cell activation and T-cell therapies. Peptide-TCR binding requires a suitable MHC, which is missed in this task.
- **Peptide-MHC-TCR Binding:** it is vital for understanding cellular immunity, and useful for vaccine development. It offers a holistic view of immune recognition, facilitating better disease-combating strategies. Our paper is thus committed to this specific challenge, while **dismissing the three elementary tasks above.**

3.3 Sequence Fusion in Multi-Sequence Biological Problems

Amino Acids Embedding. Embedding amino acids is essential for modeling protein interactions, as it captures the unique properties, sequence context, and positional information of each residue. This process involves transforming sequences into representations that computational models can process. Techniques such as position-specific scoring matrices [Madrigal et al. \(2024\)](#) and deep learning-based embeddings [Cao et al. \(2021\)](#); [Tu et al. \(2022\)](#); [Lee et al. \(2021\)](#) are commonly used. These embeddings are critical for maintaining biochemical context and improving the accuracy of protein structure and function predictions. Advanced methods may also incorporate attention

mechanisms to model interactions between distant residues, enhancing the capture of complex spatial relationships crucial for functional activity [Reynisson et al. \(2020\)](#).

Cross Attention. The cross-attention mechanism [Hou et al. \(2019\)](#); [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#) has recently gained prominence in sequence interaction tasks, including text translation [Gheini et al. \(2021\)](#), image captioning [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#), voice recognition [Sun et al. \(2021\)](#), and etc. Its key advantage lies in enabling models to focus on relevant parts of a sequence based on information from another, thereby enhancing sequence interaction and understanding [Ju et al. \(2021\)](#); [Jin et al. \(2023\)](#).

From an immunology perspective, the cross-attention mechanism mimics the biological selectivity and specificity in immune responses, which helps to improve the prediction of binding affinities and antigen presentation. Leveraging cross attention, biological models achieve more accurate alignment and prediction of these interactions [Kurata & Tsukiyama \(2022\)](#).

Cross attention allows elements in one sequence to attend to all elements in another sequence and vice versa, through the following mechanism:

$$\text{Attn}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V}) = \text{softmax} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^T}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right) \mathbf{V},$$

where $\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V}$ are the query, key, and value matrices derived from the input sequences. Due to the correspondence between the key matrix \mathbf{K} and the value matrix \mathbf{V} ([Chen et al., 2022a](#)), we suggest those two matrices correspond to the same sequence.

4 Remodeling Peptide-MHC-TCR Triad Binding as Sequence Fusion

To comprehensively understand and predict peptide-MHC-TCR interactions, accurate representation of protein sequences is indispensable. This section delineates our approach to capturing both the spatial relations (Section 4.1) and inherent characteristics of amino acids (Section 4.2) among distinct sequences. Through the new model proposed in Section 4.3, we aim to preserve the innate sequential characteristics of proteins, which are crucial for understanding their biological functions and interactions. Important implementation details are discussed in Section 4.4.

4.1 Representing Biological Sequences

In this subsection, we outline the methods used to represent protein sequences within our model, emphasizing the critical need to accurately capture both the amino acids and their positional information. Our approach preserves the intrinsic sequential nature of biological sequences throughout the encoding and transformation processes.

Issues for a Vector Representation. The transformation of protein sequences into vector representations poses several challenges. One major issue is the potential loss of sequential context and structural information, which are critical for understanding protein functionality. Traditional vectorization methods often flatten the sequence, treating it as a mere collection of features without regard to the natural order and interaction between amino acids. It leads to significant information loss, especially where the spatial arrangement and chemical properties of residues dictate their interactions and function. In our proposed method, we address these issues by incorporating techniques that respect and preserve the inherent structure of the sequence, such as position

encoding and context-aware embeddings, which are crucial for accurately modeling the dynamic and complex nature of protein interactions.

More details on position encoding and context-aware embeddings are provided in Appendix A.4.

Importance of Sequence Form. The structural form of a protein sequence—its sequence of amino acids and their respective positions—plays a pivotal role in determining its biological function. Proper representation of these sequences is crucial for computational models to predict protein interactions. Our method emphasizes the maintenance of the sequential integrity of protein sequences to ensure that both local and global structural characteristics are accurately represented, which is essential for predicting interactions.

More details on these techniques and their specific applications are provided in Appendix A.4.

Empirical results. We verify the proposal of maintaining the sequence form for biological sequences, through ablation studies on TCR-Antigen binding in Section 5.4.

4.2 Unified encoders for heterogeneous sequences

In a representation learning study, Chen et al. (2022b) proposed that similar representations can make effective use of the attention mechanism. Following this observation, we accordingly suggest each MHC and antigenic peptide sequence share the same encoder, so that the cross-attention mechanism we propose can be more effective in modeling sequence fusion.

As shown in Figure 2(a), for a sequence one-hot embedding matrix \mathbf{X} , no matter if it indicates peptide, MHC, or TCR, the linear transform matrix \mathbf{W} will be identical. We note this technique enforces the same encoding for different biological sequences, which aligns with the real binding process considering the low-level amino acids are identical in arbitrary biological sequences. In Section 5.5, we ablate the usage of the unified encoder against distinct encoders to empirically verify the design.

4.3 A complete fusion mechanism for the peptide-MHC-TCR triad binding

We incorporate the representation learning techniques above and introduce the entire process of our proposed fusion mechanism, which further elaborates Figure 2. On the learning side, we follow a common “pre-training + fine-tuning” paradigm to handle the three input sequences; on the architecture side, we intentionally first fuse peptide and MHC and then turn to the fusion with TCR sequences, which not only resembles the biological process but also effectively utilize the abundant data for peptide-MHC interactions.

Stage 1: Pre-training via peptide-MHC binding. As depicted in Figure 2(b), we first solely train the modules within the dashed box in Figure 2(a) with a peptide-MHC binding prediction task. Specifically, we take the pre-training data (the peptide and the MHC sequences along with their binding labels) from Chu et al. (2022) and feed the input sequences into the (partial) model. The sequence matrix (which shares the same shape as the peptide query matrix \mathbf{Q}_p) output by the last cross-attention layer then undergoes a mean pooling; ultimately, the resulting vector is fed into an MLP classifier along with the cross-entropy loss for training.

Remark. This design effectively utilizes the objectively available peptide-MHC binding data, which is more abundant than the peptide-MHC-TCR triad binding data. This practice is adopted by Lu et al. (2021) as well.

Table 2: Statistical Comparison of Model Performances

Metric	Fusion-pMT (netMHCpan) vs pMTnet		Fusion-pMT vs Fusion-MT (netMHCpan)	
	T-Value	P-Value	T-Value	P-Value
PR AUC	54.997	0.00033	57.743	0.000001
ROC AUC	25.69	0.001512	10.315	0.008406
ACC	42.205	0.000561	85.977	0.000001

Stage 2: full parameter fine-tuning for peptide-MHC-TCR binding. We then start to train the whole model. Here is how we handle the three input sequences: as shown in Figure 2(a), we pass peptide and MHC sequences to the pre-trained model above, wherein the mean-pooling module and the MLP classifier are removed as in pre-trained large language models (Devlin et al., 2019)); the sequence matrix output by the last cross-attention layer in the pre-trained peptide-MHC part, this time will be transformed into a query matrix Q_{pm} and interact with the TCR in another cross-attention module. The MLP classifier in the complete model is the same as in the pre-trained peptide-MHC binding model.

Remark. This model design notably reflects the representation learning techniques we mentioned before. In particular, we maintain the sequence form for both TCR and the product of the peptide-MHC interaction, as discussed in Section 4.1; moreover, we apply the unified encoder to all the three sequences, as per Section 4.2.

The two-stage paradigm allows for an realistic interaction modeling between the peptide, MHC, and TCR sequences. Initially, the peptide and MHC representations interact to produce an intermediate sequence matrix, which is then used to interact with the TCR representation, capturing the complex dependencies between these biological sequences.

4.4 Implementation details

We discuss the practical issues and the related implementation details crucial to the model performance.

Gradient Vanishing. To mitigate the issue of gradient vanishing, we employ the LeakyReLU activation function (Jha et al., 2022) in both the intermediate layers and the feedforward layers. Additionally, we implemented residual connections that bypass the attention mechanism by directly connecting the encoded sequence information to the fully connected layers, which reduces the risk of gradient vanishing.

Data Augmentation and Information Leakage. Here, we detail how we address the triad binding dataset from Lu et al. (2021). For model training and validation, we keep using the same datasets as in Lu et al. (2021), where in negative samples were randomly generated at a 1:10 ratio and positive samples were augmented tenfold to attain a balanced dataset with equal positive and negative samples.

In addition to the training and validation datasets in Lu et al. (2021), we construct one new dataset (referred to as **pMT-unseen Testing**) with unseen peptides (unseen in either the training or validation data), and another dataset (dubbed **OOD Testing**) with data collected from VD-Jdb (Goncharov et al., 2022). To reflect real-world scenarios, in these two datasets negative samples

are randomly generated, and all seen positive samples are excluded. The configuration leads to an imbalanced state with a 1:10 ratio of positive to negative samples.

5 Experiment Results

This section includes two main parts. The main result part provides a detailed performance analysis of our model (Fusion-pMT and Fusion-pM) compared to the baseline pMTnet and TransPHLA. We used the same test data from pMT-net, unseen peptide test data, and newly collected data to evaluate the performance, reliability, and robustness of the models (Appendix A.2). The second part focuses on the ablation study. We conducted two different ablation studies: one to evaluate the influence of preserving the sequence form, and the other to examine the effect of the unified encoder (Section 5.4).

5.1 Experiment Setups

The experiments along this section are mainly conducted to examine the performance of two important variants featured with our proposed techniques: the **peptide-MHC binding model** and the tripartite **peptide-MHC-TCR binding model**, which incorporates the former as a pre-trained encoder to exploit the abundant peptide-MHC binding data.

Specifically, our proposed models and other baseline methods will be evaluated under multiple metrics, including Accuracy (ACC), F1 Score, Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC), ROC AUC, and PR AUC. We will also ablate the proposed principles mentioned for modeling sequence fusion such as the performance of applying unified encoders versus different encoders for peptide-MHC binding, and the principle to maintain sequence form in modeling sequence interactions. All models and methods were implemented in PyTorch and trained on a 40GB NVIDIA A100 GPU.

5.2 Immune Presentation Prediction (Peptide-MHC Binding)

In our study, the Peptide-MHC Binding Model demonstrates competitive performance compared to the established TransPHLA model, as shown in Table 4. Our model achieves an Accuracy (ACC) of 0.9120, closely matching TransPHLA’s 0.9130, and a slightly higher F1 score of 0.9172 compared to TransPHLA’s 0.9170. Notably, our model surpasses TransPHLA in Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC) with a score of 0.8916 versus 0.8890, and in ROC AUC with 0.9522 compared to 0.9500. These results reflect the robustness of our approach.

TransPHLA’s architecture leverages three self-attention layers [Chu et al. \(2022\)](#), which contribute to its strong performance over models with out attention mechanism like NetMHCpan [Jurtz et al. \(2017\)](#). However, by integrating Cross-Attention and a Unified Encoder, our model slightly improves upon these metrics. The Cross-Attention mechanism allows for more dynamic interactions between peptide and MHC sequences, while the Unified Encoder ensures consistent feature extraction. This combination enhances the model’s ability to accurately predict peptide-MHC binding, underscoring the effectiveness of our design choices.

5.3 Immunogenicity Prediction (Peptide-MHC-TCR Binding)

In-distribution generalization. For the tripartite peptide-MHC-TCR model, our approach maintains robust performance in ACC and ROC AUC and PR AUC. It scores 0.9512 in PR AUC, substantially higher than pMTnet’s 0.8000 (details are shown in Table 2), indicating a significant




Figure 3: **Comparative Performance Analysis of Peptide-MHC-TCR triad binding Prediction Models in terms of ROC AUC, ACC and MCC.**

enhancement in model precision and reliability in predicting true positive rates among complex biological samples. Meanwhile, The ROC AUC for our model is 0.9220, a notable improvement over pMTnet’s 0.8200, showcasing its superior ability to discriminate between binding and non-binding interactions across a wide range of operational thresholds.

The integration of a Cross-Attention based Transformer within our model design particularly enhances its capability to process and understand the intricate relationships between peptides, MHC molecules, and TCR sequences. This architectural enhancement is pivotal when extending the model to tripartite interactions in the peptide-MHC-TCR binding model. Here, our advanced model significantly outperforms the baseline models, including the pMTnet and modifications explored in the ablation study focused solely on the TCR component.

Out-of-distribution generalization. Our Fusion-pMT consistently outperformed the pMTnet across various metrics and datasets shown in Figure 3. For instance, when evaluating the ROC AUC on the pMT-unseen testing, Fusion-pMT achieved a mean score of 0.7326 compared to pMTnet’s 0.7158. This trend continued with the OOD Testing independent from pMT-unseen testing, where Fusion-pMT scored 0.6320, significantly higher than pMTnet’s 0.5744. In terms of accuracy (ACC), Fusion-pMT also showed superior performance. On the pMT-unseen testing, Fusion-pMT had an accuracy of 0.7092, while pMTnet had 0.6558. This pattern was evident in the OOD Testing as well, with Fusion-pMT scoring 0.6001 against pMTnet’s 0.5428. Lastly, for the Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC), Fusion-pMT again led with a score of 0.3766 on the Testdata, compared to pMTnet’s 0.3154. On the Newdata, Fusion-pMT achieved 0.2122, outperforming pMTnet’s 0.1181. Overall, Fusion-pMT demonstrated better generalization and robustness, especially on new data, making it a more reliable model in this comparison.

Performance on unseen peptides and OOD data is a critical indicator of a model’s potential clinical applicability [Gao et al. \(2023\)](#). Although both pMTnet and our model perform lower on these datasets compared to randomly split data, our results demonstrate that adhering to sequence form retention, employing advanced fusion techniques, and designing pre-trained models based on biological processes significantly improve real-world performance. This makes Fusion-pMT a more robust choice for practical applications [Grazioli et al. \(2022\)](#) (Details can be found in Table 5).

5.4 Ablation studies: sequence representation

Compared with pMTnet, which uses a bottleneck autoencoder model to encode the TCR sequence, we developed a Cross-Attention-based Transformer, Fusion-pMT (netMHC-pan), to represent the TCR sequence and preserve the sequence form until the binding prediction block. The results are shown in Figure 3 and the model architecture in Section 4. Fusion-pMT (netMHC-pan) shows significant improvements in performance metrics over pMTnet: Accuracy (ACC) is higher by 0.0650 (from 0.8500 to 0.9150), Precision-Recall Area Under the Curve (PR AUC) increases by 0.1512 (from 0.8000 to 0.9512), and Receiver Operating Characteristic Area Under the Curve (ROC AUC) advances by 0.1020 (from 0.8200 to 0.9220). These considerable improvements demonstrate the critical importance of maintaining sequence integrity in our model, which enables more effective capturing of complex, sequence-dependent interactions crucial for accurate binding predictions.

5.5 Ablation studies: unified encoders

As shown in Figure 4, our fusion-pM model, which employs distinct encoders for peptides and MHCs and incorporates a Cross-Attention Sequence Fusion Block, demonstrates performance on par with the state-of-the-art TransPHLA model. The latter achieves higher ROC AUC values on its independent test dataset. On this basis, the fusion-pM (Same Encoder) variant, which employs a uniform encoder for both peptides and MHCs, demonstrates improved performance across all evaluated metrics: accuracy (ACC), F1 score, and Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC). The ACC scores show minimal variation between the two model variants, with the fusion-pM (Same Encoder) reaching 0.9139, only slightly behind the original fusion-pM at 0.9173. However, both F1 and MCC metrics indicate more substantial gains with the unified encoder approach, suggesting that employing the same encoder for sequence fusion not only simplifies the model architecture but may also enhance performance in terms of both prediction precision and class balance handling [Cer et al. \(2018\)](#). These results prompt further investigation into the benefits of encoder uniformity in complex sequence fusion tasks in immunological prediction.

6 Conclusions and Limitations

In this paper, we have proposed a new model Fusion-pMT for peptide-MHC-TCR triad binding, through a revisit of sequence fusion. In particular, we notice that maintaining the sequence form for each input along the transform aligns with the real biological processes and can significantly improve the performance in immunogenicity prediction. With this insight, we also propose to characterize how different sequences interact with each other through both the cross-attention mechanism and the shared embedding vocabulary of amino acids. Notably, we evaluate our Fusion-pMT on various real-world datasets and show that it consistently exhibits higher performance than baseline methods. Overall, we believe that we pave a new way for understanding peptide-MHC-TCR triad binding with the insights from the representation learning techniques for modeling sequence fusion.




Figure 4: **Ablation studies** for: (a) Peptide-MHC-TCR Traid binding Prediction with Sequence Representaion and (b) Peptide-MHC Models with unified encoders. “pMT/pHLA-original Testing” is the original testing dataset in Lu et al. (2021) / Chu et al. (2022).

Limitations. While we have illustrated the empirical success of Fusion-pMT, it is also crucial to understand the limitations that arise in more complex settings: (1) Fusion-pMT does not fully utilize the spatial information within the biological sequences, since related data are rare and expensive. (2) Out-of-distribution performance. There is no theoretical guarantee that Fusion-pMT can make good predictions on instances away from the training dataset. (3) Fusion-pMT predicts the binding of peptide-MHC-TCR solely in a binary way, which might weaken the further application of our model in the field of immunity quantification.

References

- Massimo Andreatta and Morten Nielsen. Gapped sequence alignment using artificial neural networks: application to the MHC class I system. *Bioinformatics*, 32(4):511–517, 2016. ISSN 1367-4811. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btv639. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btv639>.
- Christina M. Arieta, Yushu Joy Xie, Daniel A. Rothenberg, Huitian Diao, Dewi Harjanto, Shirisha Meda, Krisann Marquart, Byron Koenitzer, Tracey E. Sciuto, Alexander Lobo, Adam Zuiani, Stefanie A. Krumm, Carla Iris Cadima Couto, Stephanie Hein, André P. Heinen, Thomas Ziegenhals, Yunpeng Liu-Lupo, Annette B. Vogel, John R. Srouji, Stephanie Fesser, Kaushik Thanki, Kerstin Walzer, Theresa A. Addona, Özlem Türeci, Uğur Şahin, Richard B. Gaynor, and Asaf Poran. The T-cell-directed vaccine BNT162b4 encoding conserved non-spike antigens protects animals from severe SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cell*, 186(11):2392–2409.e21, 2023. ISSN 0092-8674. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2023.04.007. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2023.04.007>.

-
- Piyush Borole and Ajitha Rajan. Building trust in deep learning-based immune response predictors with interpretable explanations. *Communications Biology*, 7(1):279, 2024. ISSN 2399-3642. doi: 10.1038/s42003-024-05968-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-024-05968-2>.
- Yue Cao, Payel Das, Vijil Chenthamarakshan, Pin-Yu Chen, Igor Melnyk, and Yang Shen. Fold2seq: A joint sequence (1d)-fold (3d) embedding-based generative model for protein design. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1261–1271. PMLR, 2021.
- Daniel Cer, Yinfei Yang, Sheng-yi Kong, Nan Hua, Nicole Limtiaco, Rhomni St John, Noah Constant, Mario Guajardo-Cespedes, Steve Yuan, Chris Tar, et al. Universal sentence encoder for english. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing: system demonstrations*, pp. 169–174, 2018.
- Chun-Fu Richard Chen, Quanfu Fan, and Rameswar Panda. Crossvit: Cross-attention multi-scale vision transformer for image classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 357–366, 2021.
- Yifan Chen, Devamanyu Hazarika, Mahdi Namazifar, Yang Liu, Di Jin, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. Empowering parameter-efficient transfer learning by recognizing the kernel structure in self-attention. In Marine Carpuat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, and Ivan Vladimir Meza Ruiz (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pp. 1375–1388, Seattle, United States, July 2022a. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.findings-naacl.102. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-naacl.102>.
- Yifan Chen, Devamanyu Hazarika, Mahdi Namazifar, Yang Liu, Di Jin, and Dilek Hakkani-Tur. Inducer-tuning: Connecting prefix-tuning and adapter-tuning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 793–808. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022b. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.50. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.50>.
- Hongbo Chi, Marion Pepper, and Paul G. Thomas. Principles and therapeutic applications of adaptive immunity. *Cell*, 187(9):2052–2078, 2024. ISSN 0092-8674. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2024.03.037. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2024.03.037>.
- Yanyi Chu, Yan Zhang, Qiankun Wang, Lingfeng Zhang, Xuhong Wang, Yanjing Wang, Jianmin Wang, Xue Jiang, Dennis Salahub, Yi Xiong, and Dong-qing Wei. TransMut: a program to predict HLA-I peptide binding and optimize mutated peptides for vaccine design by the Transformer-derived self-attention model. *Research Square*, 2021. doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-785618/v. URL <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-785618/v>.
- Yanyi Chu, Yan Zhang, Qiankun Wang, Lingfeng Zhang, Xuhong Wang, Yanjing Wang, Dennis Russell Salahub, Qin Xu, Jianmin Wang, Xue Jiang, Yi Xiong, and Dong-qing Wei. A transformer-based model to predict peptide–HLA class I binding and optimize mutated peptides for vaccine design. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(3):300–311, 2022. ISSN 2522-5839. doi: 10.1038/s42256-022-00459-7. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-022-00459-7>.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1423. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1423>.

-
- Sandra P D’Angelo, Dejka M Araujo, Albiruni R Abdul Razak, Mark Agulnik, Steven Attia, Jean-Yves Blay, Irene Carrasco Garcia, John A Charlson, Edwin Choy, George D Demetri, Mihaela Druta, Edouard Forcade, Kristen N Ganjoo, John Glod, Vicki L Keedy, Axel Le Cesne, David A Liebner, Victor Moreno, Seth M Pollack, Scott M Schuetze, Gary K Schwartz, Sandra J Strauss, William D Tap, Fiona Thistlethwaite, Claudia Maria Valverde Morales, Michael J Wagner, Breelyn A Wilky, Cheryl McAlpine, Laura Hudson, Jean-Marc Navenot, Tianjiao Wang, Jane Bai, Stavros Rafail, Ruoxi Wang, Amy Sun, Lilliam Fernandes, Erin Van Winkle, Erica Elefant, Colin Lunt, Elliot Norry, Dennis Williams, Swethajit Biswas, and Brian A Van Tine. Afamitresgene autoleucel for advanced synovial sarcoma and myxoid round cell liposarcoma (SPEARHEAD-1): an international, open-label, phase 2 trial. *The Lancet*, 403(10435):1460–1471, 2024. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00319-2. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(24\)00319-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00319-2).
- Yicheng Gao, Yuli Gao, Kejing Dong, Siqi Wu, and Qi Liu. Reply to: The pitfalls of negative data bias for the t-cell epitope specificity challenge. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(10):1063–1065, 2023.
- Yicheng Gao, Kejing Dong, Yuli Gao, Xuan Jin, Jingya Yang, Gang Yan, and Qi Liu. Unified cross-modality integration and analysis of T cell receptors and T cell transcriptomes by low-resource-aware representation learning. *Cell Genomics*, 2024. ISSN 2666-979X. doi: 10.1016/j.xgen.2024.100553. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xgen.2024.100553>.
- Mozhdeh Gheini, Xiang Ren, and Jonathan May. Cross-attention is all you need: Adapting pretrained Transformers for machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1754–1765. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.132. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.132>.
- Mikhail Goncharov, Dmitry Bagaev, Dmitrii Shcherbinin, Ivan Zvyagin, Dmitry Bolotin, Paul G. Thomas, Anastasia A. Minervina, Mikhail V. Pogorelyy, Kristin Ladell, James E. McLaren, David A. Price, Thi H. O. Nguyen, Louise C. Rowntree, E. Bridie Clemens, Katherine Kedzierska, Garry Dolton, Cristina Rafael Rius, Andrew Sewell, Jerome Samir, Fabio Luciani, Ksenia V. Zornikova, Alexandra A. Khmelevskaya, Saveliy A. Sheetikov, Grigory A. Efimov, Dmitry Chudakov, and Mikhail Shugay. VDJdb in the pandemic era: a compendium of T cell receptors specific for SARS-CoV-2. *Nature Methods*, 19(9):1017–1019, 2022. ISSN 1548-7105. doi: 10.1038/s41592-022-01578-0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-022-01578-0>.
- Filippo Grazioli, Anja Möscher, Pierre Machart, Kai Li, Israa Alqassem, Timothy J O’Donnell, and Martin Renqiang Min. On tcr binding predictors failing to generalize to unseen peptides. *Frontiers in immunology*, 13:1014256, 2022.
- Filippo Grazioli, Pierre Machart, Anja Möscher, Kai Li, Leonardo V Castorina, Nico Pfeifer, and Martin Renqiang Min. Attentive variational information bottleneck for tcr–peptide interaction prediction. *Bioinformatics*, 39(1):btac820, 2023.
- Yi Han, Yuqiu Yang, Yanhua Tian, Farjana J Fattah, Mitchell S von Itzstein, Yifei Hu, Minying Zhang, Xiongbin Kang, Donghan M Yang, Jialiang Liu, Yaming Xue, Chaoying Liang, Indu Raman, Chengsong Zhu, Olivia Xiao, Jonathan E Dowell, Jade Homsy, Sawsan Rashdan, Shengjie Yang, Mary E Gwin, David Hsiehchen, Yvonne Gloria-McCutchen, Ke Pan, Fangjiang Wu, Don Gibbons, Xinlei Wang, Cassian Yee, Junzhou Huang, Alexandre Reuben, Chao Cheng, Jianjun Zhang, David E Gerber, and Tao Wang. pan-MHC and cross-Species Prediction of T Cell

-
- Receptor-Antigen Binding. *bioRxiv*, 2023. ISSN 2692-8205. doi: 10.1101/2023.12.01.569599. URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.569599>.
- Jessica C Hassel, Sophie Piperno-Neumann, Piotr Rutkowski, Jean-Francois Baurain, Max Schlaak, Marcus O Butler, Ryan J Sullivan, Reinhard Dummer, John M Kirkwood, Marlana Orloff, Joseph J Sacco, Sebastian Ochsenreither, Anthony M Joshua, Lauris Gastaud, Brendan Curti, Josep M Piulats, April K S Salama, Alexander N Shoushtari, Lev Demidov, Mohammed Milhem, Bartosz Chmielowski, Kevin B Kim, Richard D Carvajal, Omid Hamid, Laura Collins, Koustubh Ranade, Chris Holland, Constance Pfeiffer, and Paul Nathan. Three-Year overall survival with Tebentafusp in metastatic uveal melanoma. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 389(24):2256–2266, 2023. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2304753. URL <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2304753>.
- Jonas S. Heitmann, Tatjana Bilich, Claudia Tandler, Annika Nelde, Yacine Maringer, Maddalena Marconato, Julia Reusch, Simon Jäger, Monika Denk, Marion Richter, Leonard Anton, Lisa Marie Weber, Malte Roerden, Jens Bauer, Jonas Rieth, Marcel Wacker, Sebastian Hörber, Andreas Peter, Christoph Meisner, Imma Fischer, Markus W. Löffler, Julia Karbach, Elke Jäger, Reinhild Klein, Hans-Georg Rammensee, Helmut R. Salih, and Juliane S. Walz. A COVID-19 peptide vaccine for the induction of SARS-CoV-2 T cell immunity. *Nature*, 601(7894):617–622, 2022. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-021-04232-5. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-04232-5>.
- Jonas S. Heitmann, Claudia Tandler, Maddalena Marconato, Annika Nelde, Timorshah Habibzada, Susanne M. Rittig, Christian M. Tegeler, Yacine Maringer, Simon U. Jaeger, Monika Denk, Marion Richter, Melek T. Oezbek, Karl-Heinz Wiesmüller, Jens Bauer, Jonas Rieth, Marcel Wacker, Sarah M. Schroeder, Naomi Hoenisch Gravel, Jonas Scheid, Melanie Märklin, Annika Henrich, Boris Klimovich, Kim L. Clar, Martina Lutz, Samuel Holzmayer, Sebastian Hörber, Andreas Peter, Christoph Meisner, Imma Fischer, Markus W. Löffler, Caroline Anna Peuker, Stefan Habringer, Thorsten O. Goetze, Elke Jäger, Hans-Georg Rammensee, Helmut R. Salih, and Juliane S. Walz. Phase I/II trial of a peptide-based COVID-19 T-cell activator in patients with B-cell deficiency. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):5032, 2023. ISSN 2041-1723. doi: 10.1038/s41467-023-40758-0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-40758-0>.
- Ruibing Hou, Hong Chang, Bingpeng Ma, Shiguang Shan, and Xilin Chen. Cross attention network for few-shot classification. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, 2019. ISBN 9781713807933.
- Johannes B Huppa, Markus Axmann, Manuel A Mörtelmaier, Björn F Lillemeier, Evan W Newell, Mario Brameshuber, Lawrence O Klein, Gerhard J Schütz, and Mark M Davis. TCR–peptide–MHC interactions in situ show accelerated kinetics and increased affinity. *Nature*, 463(7283): 963–967, 2010. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/nature08746. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08746>.
- Kanchan Jha, Sriparna Saha, and Hiteshi Singh. Prediction of protein–protein interaction using graph neural networks. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):8360, 2022.
- Jing Jin, Zhonghao Liu, Alireza Nasiri, Yuxin Cui, Stephen-Yves Louis, Ansi Zhang, Yong Zhao, and Jianjun Hu. Deep learning pan-specific model for interpretable mhc-i peptide binding prediction with improved attention mechanism. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics*, 89(7): 866–883, 2021.
- Zhi Jin, Tingfang Wu, Taoning Chen, Deng Pan, Xuejiao Wang, Jingxin Xie, Lijun Quan, and Qiang Lyu. CAPLA: improved prediction of protein–ligand binding affinity by a deep learning approach

-
- based on a cross-attention mechanism. *Bioinformatics*, 39(2):btad049, 2023. ISSN 1367-4811. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btad049. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btad049>.
- Xincheng Ju, Dong Zhang, Rong Xiao, Junhui Li, Shoushan Li, Min Zhang, and Guodong Zhou. Joint multi-modal aspect-sentiment analysis with auxiliary cross-modal relation detection. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 4395–4405. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.360. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.360>.
- Vanessa Jurtz, Sinu Paul, Massimo Andreatta, Paolo Marcatili, Bjoern Peters, and Morten Nielsen. NetMHCpan-4.0: improved peptide–MHC class I interaction predictions integrating eluted ligand and peptide binding affinity data. *The Journal of Immunology*, 199(9):3360–3368, 2017. ISSN 1550-6606. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1700893. URL <https://doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.1700893>.
- Mahmood Kalemami, Saeid Darvishi, and Somayyeh Koochi. Capsnet-mhc predicts peptide-mhc class i binding based on capsule neural networks. *Communications Biology*, 6(1):492, 2023.
- Thomas Kammertoens and Thomas Blankenstein. It’s the Peptide-MHC Affinity, Stupid. *Cancer Cell*, 23(4):429–431, 2013. ISSN 1535-6108. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccr.2013.04.004>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1535610813001384>.
- Kyohei Koyama, Kosuke Hashimoto, Chioko Nagao, and Kenji Mizuguchi. Attention network for predicting T-cell receptor–peptide binding can associate attention with interpretable protein structural properties. *Frontiers in Bioinformatics*, 3, 2023. ISSN 2673-7647. doi: 10.3389/fbinf.2023.1274599. URL <https://doi.org/10.3389/fbinf.2023.1274599>.
- Hiroyuki Kurata and Sho Tsukiyama. ICAN: interpretable cross-attention network for identifying drug and target protein interactions. *PLoS ONE*, 17(10):e0276609, 2022. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0276609. URL <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0276609>.
- Taeheon Lee, Sangseon Lee, Minji Kang, and Sun Kim. Deep hierarchical embedding for simultaneous modeling of gpcr proteins in a unified metric space. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1):9543, 2021.
- Guangna Liu, Hua Chen, Xingyu Cao, Lemei Jia, Wei Rui, Hongli Zheng, Daosheng Huang, Fang Liu, Yue Liu, Xueqiang Zhao, Peihua Lu, and Xin Lin. Efficacy of pp65-specific TCR-T cell therapy in treating cytomegalovirus infection after hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *American Journal of Hematology*, 97(11):1453–1463, 2022. ISSN 0361-8609. doi: 10.1002/ajh.26708. URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajh.26708>.
- Tianshi Lu, Ze Zhang, James Zhu, Yunguan Wang, Peixin Jiang, Xue Xiao, Chantale Bernatchez, John V Heymach, Don L Gibbons, Jun Wang, Lin Xu, Alexandre Reuben, and Tao Wang. Deep learning-based prediction of the T cell receptor–antigen binding specificity. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 3(10):864–875, 2021. ISSN 2522-5839. doi: 10.1038/s42256-021-00383-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-021-00383-2>.
- Ariel Madrigal, Tianyuan Lu, Larisa M Soto, and Hamed S Najafabadi. A unified model for interpretable latent embedding of multi-sample, multi-condition single-cell data. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):6573, 2024.
- Alessandro Montemurro, Viktoria Schuster, Helle Rus Povlsen, Amalie Kai Bentzen, Vanessa Jurtz, William D Chronister, Austin Crinklaw, Sine R Hadrup, Ole Winther, Bjoern Peters, et al. NetTCR-2.0 enables accurate prediction of TCR-peptide binding by using paired TCR α and

-
- β sequence data. *Communications Biology*, 4(1):1060, 2021. ISSN 2399-3642. doi: 10.1038/s42003-021-02610-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-021-02610-3>].
- Thierry Mora and Aleksandra M Walczak. Quantifying lymphocyte receptor diversity. In Jayajit Das and Ciriya Jayaprakash (eds.), *Systems Immunology: An Introduction to Modeling Methods for Scientists*, pp. 183–198. CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, Boca Raton FL, United States, 2019. ISBN 978-1-4987-1740-3. doi: 10.1201/9781315119847.
- Asher Mullard. FDA Approval of immunocore’s first-in-class TCR therapeutic broadens depth of the T cell engager platform. *Nature Reviews Drug discovery*, 21(3):170, 2022. ISSN 1474-1784. doi: 10.1038/d41573-022-00031-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41573-022-00031-3>.
- Birkir Reynisson, Bruno Alvarez, Sinu Paul, Bjoern Peters, and Morten Nielsen. NetMHCpan-4.1 and NetMHCIIpan-4.0: improved predictions of MHC antigen presentation by concurrent motif deconvolution and integration of MS MHC eluted ligand data. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 48(W1): W449–W454, 2020. ISSN 1362-4962. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkaa379. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkaa379>.
- Kenneth L Rock, Eric Reits, and Jacques Neefjes. Present Yourself! By MHC Class I and MHC Class II Molecules. *Trends in Immunology*, 37(11):724–737, 2016. ISSN 1471-4906. doi: 10.1016/j.it.2016.08.010. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.it.2016.08.010>.
- Luis A Rojas, Zachary Sethna, Kevin C Soares, Cristina Olcese, Nan Pang, Erin Patterson, Jayon Lihm, Nicholas Ceglia, Pablo Guasp, Alexander Chu, Rebecca Yu, Adrienne Kaya Chandra, Theresa Waters, Jennifer Ruan, Masataka Amisaki, Abderezak Zebboudj, Zagaa Odgerel, George Payne, Evelyn Derhovanessian, Felicitas Müller, Ina Rhee, Mahesh Yadav, Anton Dobrin, Michel Sadelain, Marta Łuksza, Noah Cohen, Laura Tang, Olca Basturk, Mithat Gönen, Seth Katz, Richard Kinh Do, Andrew S Epstein, Parisa Momtaz, Wungki Park, Ryan Sugarman, Anna M Varghese, Elizabeth Won, Avni Desai, Alice C Wei, Michael I D’Angelica, T Peter Kingham, Ira Mellman, Taha Merghoub, Jedd D Wolchok, Ugur Sahin, Özlem Türeci, Benjamin D Greenbaum, William R Jarnagin, Jeffrey Drebin, Eileen M O’Reilly, and Vinod P Balachandran. Personalized RNA neoantigen vaccines stimulate T cells in pancreatic cancer. *Nature*, 618(7963):144–150, 2023. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-06063-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06063-y>.
- Licai Sun, Bin Liu, Jianhua Tao, and Zheng Lian. Multimodal cross-and self-attention network for speech emotion recognition. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 4275–4279. IEEE, 2021. doi: 10.1109/ICASSP39728.2021.9414654. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP39728.2021.9414654>.
- Xinming Tu, Zhi-Jie Cao, Sara Mostafavi, Ge Gao, et al. Cross-linked unified embedding for cross-modality representation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 15942–15955, 2022.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, 2017. ISBN 9781510860964.
- Anna Weber, Jannis Born, and María Rodríguez Martínez. Titan: T-cell receptor specificity prediction with bimodal attention networks. *Bioinformatics*, 37(Supplement_1):i237–i244, 2021.

-
- Jeffrey S. Weber, Matteo S. Carlino, Adnan Khattak, Tarek Meniawy, George Ansstas, Matthew H. Taylor, Kevin B. Kim, Meredith McKean, Georgina V. Long, Ryan J. Sullivan, Mark Faries, Thuy T. Tran, C. Lance Cowey, Andrew Pecora, Montaser Shaheen, Jennifer Segar, Theresa Medina, Victoria Atkinson, Geoffrey T. Gibney, Jason J. Luke, Sajeve Thomas, Elizabeth I. Buchbinder, Jane A. Healy, Mo Huang, Manju Morrissey, Igor Feldman, Vasudha Sehgal, Celine Robert-Tissot, Peijie Hou, Lili Zhu, Michelle Brown, Praveen Aanur, Robert S. Meehan, and Tal Zaks. Individualised neoantigen therapy mRNA-4157 (V940) plus pembrolizumab versus pembrolizumab monotherapy in resected melanoma (KEYNOTE-942): a randomised, phase 2b study. *The Lancet*, 403(10427):632–644, 2024. ISSN 0140-6736. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(23)02268-7. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(23\)02268-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)02268-7).
- Yejian Wu, Lujing Cao, Zhipeng Wu, Xinyi Wu, Xinqiao Wang, and Hongliang Duan. CcBHLA: pan-specific peptide-HLA class I binding prediction via Convolutional and BiLSTM features. *bioRxiv*, 2023. ISSN 2692-8205. doi: 10.1101/2023.04.24.538196. URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.04.24.538196>.
- Minghao Yang, Zhi-An Huang, Wei Zhou, Junkai Ji, Jun Zhang, Shan He, and Zexuan Zhu. MIX-TPI: a flexible prediction framework for TCR-pMHC interactions based on multimodal representations. *Bioinformatics*, 39(8):btad475, 2023. ISSN 1367-4811. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btad475. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btad475>.
- Mark Yarchoan, Edward J Gane, Thomas U Marron, Renzo Perales-Linares, Jian Yan, Neil Cooch, Daniel H Shu, Elana J Fertig, Luciane T Kagohara, Gabor Bartha, Josette Northcott, John Lyle, Sarah Rochestie, Joann Peters, Jason T Connor, Elizabeth M Jaffee, Ildiko Csiki, David B Weiner, Alfredo Perales-Puchalt, and Niranjana Y Sardesai. Personalized neoantigen vaccine and pembrolizumab in advanced hepatocellular carcinoma: a phase 1/2 trial. *Nature Medicine*, 30(4):1044–1053, 2024. ISSN 1546-170X. doi: 10.1038/s41591-024-02894-y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-024-02894-y>.
- Zheng Ye, Shaohao Li, Xue Mi, Baoyi Shao, Zhu Dai, Bo Ding, Songwei Feng, Bo Sun, Yang Shen, and Zhongdang Xiao. STMHCpan, an accurate Star-Transformer-based extensible framework for predicting MHC I allele binding peptides. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 24(3):bbad164, 2023. ISSN 1477-4054. doi: 10.1093/bib/bbad164. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbad164>.
- Jing Zhang, Yingshuai Xie, Weichao Ding, and Zhe Wang. Cross on cross attention: Deep fusion transformer for image captioning. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 33(8):4257–4268, 2023. ISSN 1558-2205. doi: 10.1109/TCSVT.2023.3243725. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCSVT.2023.3243725>.
- Ze Zhang, Danyi Xiong, Xinlei Wang, Hongyu Liu, and Tao Wang. Mapping the functional landscape of T cell receptor repertoires by single-T cell transcriptomics. *Nature Methods*, 18(1):92–99, 2021. ISSN 1548-7105. doi: 10.1038/s41592-020-01020-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-020-01020-3>.
- Yu Zhao, Bing He, Fan Xu, Chen Li, Zhimeng Xu, Xiaona Su, Haohuai He, Yueshan Huang, Jamie Rossjohn, Jiangning Song, et al. DeepAIR: A deep learning framework for effective integration of sequence and 3D structure to enable adaptive immune receptor analysis. *Science Advances*, 9(32):eabo5128, 2023. ISSN 2375-2548. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.abo5128. URL <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abo5128>.

A Experiment Settings

A.1 Experiment Setups

We evaluate the performance of our proposed model and baselines using multiple metrics, including Accuracy (ACC), F1 Score, Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC), Receiver Operating Characteristic Area Under the Curve (ROC AUC), and Precision-Recall Area Under the Curve (PR AUC). Our discussion emphasizes the advantages of models designed based on the principle of sequence fusion, focusing on how different designs affect model performance, such as using the same encoder for Peptide and MHC versus different encoders, and the use of Cross-Attention.

For model training and validation, we used the datasets from Lu et al. (2021), where negative samples were randomly generated at a 1:10 ratio, and positive samples were augmented tenfold to create a balanced dataset. These datasets include 28,604 TCR CDR3 sequences, 426 antigens, and 63 HLA types. In addition, we constructed a new pMT-unseen Testing dataset, which contains unseen peptides not present in the training or validation data, and an Out-of-Date (OOD) Testing dataset with data collected from VDJdb (Goncharov et al. 2022). The pMT-unseen Testing dataset includes 272 CDR3 sequences, 224 antigens, and 24 HLA types, while the OOD dataset consists of 1,346 CDR3 sequences, 239 antigens, and 53 HLA types. To simulate real-world scenarios, negative samples in these test sets were randomly generated, and all seen positive samples were excluded, resulting in an imbalanced state with a 1:10 ratio of positive to negative samples.

This analysis is crucial for understanding which sequence fusion methods are most effective in accurately and robustly predicting binding and immune recognition issues, providing insights into the potential utility of these Model Fusion methods in computational immunology. All models and methods, except for pMTnet, are implemented in PyTorch, and the models are trained on a 40GB NVIDIA A100 GPU.

A.2 Baselines and Benchmarks

Despite the growing interest in computational immunology, the field still lacks standardized datasets and benchmark tests for evaluating interactions between TCRs, MHCs, and antigenic peptides. The lack of standardized benchmarks hampers the assessment of the robustness and reproducibility of models designed to study these complex biological interactions. Establishing a reliable benchmark is crucial for advancing the predictive capabilities and scientific validity of computational models in immunology.

For the peptide-MHC (pMHC) binding analysis, our approach aligns with established practices in the field, where more standardized methods are available. Specifically, we utilize the dataset and testing methodology from TransPHLA Chu et al. (2022), which inherits and expands upon the dataset from the widely recognized netMHCpan model Borole & Rajan (2024). TransPHLA’s method divides the data into four distinct parts: Train, Validation, Independent, and External, with the latter two parts serving different testing objectives. This structured approach ensures that our model is tested against a comprehensive and diverse set of data, enhancing the reliability of our results.

In terms of datasets involving the combination of TCRs, MHCs, and antigenic peptides, we closely follow the experimental setup used in pMTnet Lu et al. (2021) and pMTnet-omni Han et al. (2023). The dataset includes 32,607 pairs of pMHC-TCR bindings and a significantly larger set of generated negative pairs. We meticulously partition the original training dataset into a new training

set and a validation set with an 80:20 split. This allows for rigorous assessment and continuous refinement of our model’s predictive capabilities during training, using a distinct subset for validation. Furthermore, we adhere to the preprocessing steps outlined in pMTnet’s methodology, including sequence amendment methods and the generation of negative pairs, to maintain the integrity and relevance of our training, validation, and test sets. This adherence to established protocols ensures that our experimental procedures are robust and capable of producing reliable and reproducible results. More details can be found in Appendix A.5

A.3 Training Details

The integration model processes combined features through a carefully designed series of fully connected layers, reducing the dimensionality from the combined inputs to a singular output that signifies the likelihood of interaction. To mitigate the risk of overfitting, given the model’s complexity and the intricate nature of the immunological data, dropout layers with a rate of 0.1 are included following each activation phase.

The training regimen involved 300 planned epochs to ensure model convergence without significant overtraining, with a batch size of 64 to maintain a diverse set of samples per batch. Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) with a learning rate of 0.01 was chosen as the optimization technique, due to its robust performance across varied training scenarios. The model was trained using a Binary Cross-Entropy with Logits Loss function (`nn.BCEWithLogitsLoss()`), and early stopping was implemented to prevent overfitting. Specifically, training was halted after 10 consecutive epochs without improvement in validation accuracy, resulting in the process stopping at 85 epochs.

Throughout the training process, the model consistently improved in both training and validation accuracy, achieving the best validation accuracy of 95.50

Despite occasional fluctuations in validation loss, the use of dropout layers and early stopping effectively mitigated overfitting and ensured stable training. The model demonstrated strong generalization capabilities, making it a reliable choice for predicting interactions within the Peptide-MHC-TCR complex.

Avoiding Overfitting. To prevent overfitting, we applied early stopping during training. This technique helps to halt the training process when performance on the validation set starts to degrade, thereby improving the model’s ability to generalize to unseen sequences. Early stopping ensures that the model does not become overly specialized to the training data, which can lead to poor performance on new, unobserved data.

Table 3: Hyperparameter settings for the Peptide-MHC-TCR interaction model

Parameter	Value	Description
Embedding Dimension	64	Dimensionality of sequence embeddings
Attention Heads	4	Number of heads in the multihead attention layers
Learning Rate	0.01	Step size at each iteration of model weights
Batch Size	64	Number of samples per batch
Dropout Rate	0.1	Proportion of neurons disabled during training
Training Epochs	300	Number of complete passes through the training dataset

A.4 Protein sequence embedding

Protein sequences. A protein sequence S is composed of L amino acids, represented as

$$S = [a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_L],$$

The set of the 21 standard amino acids is denoted as

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\text{A, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, N, P, Q, R, S, T, V, W, X, Y}\}$$

in terms of letter abbreviations of amino acids.

One-hot encoding. Following [Devlin et al. \(2019\)](#), we first transform a protein sequence into a binary vector representation, which is a common practice in large language models. Here, each amino acid a_i is represented as a one-hot encoded vector $\mathbf{h}(a_i)$ of length $|\mathcal{A}|$:

$$\mathbf{h}(a_i) = [h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{|\mathcal{A}|}]^T,$$

where $h_j = 1$ if a_i is the j -th amino acid in \mathcal{A} , and $h_j = 0$ otherwise. The entire protein sequence S is thus

$$\mathbf{H}^T(S) = [\mathbf{h}(a_1), \mathbf{h}(a_2), \dots, \mathbf{h}(a_L)],$$

where $\mathbf{H}(S) \in \{0, 1\}^{L \times |\mathcal{A}|}$.

Positional Encoding for Protein Sequences. This subsection outlines the methods used to represent protein sequences within our model, emphasizing the critical need to accurately capture both the amino acids and their positional information. These details are vital for understanding the complex interactions within biological sequences. Our approach is designed to preserve the intrinsic sequential integrity of these sequences throughout the encoding and transformation processes.

Importance of Sequence Form The structural form of a protein sequence—its sequence of amino acids and their respective positions—plays a pivotal role in determining its biological function. Proper representation of these sequences is therefore crucial for computational models aimed at predicting protein interactions or functions from sequence data alone. Our method emphasizes the maintenance of the sequential integrity of protein sequences to ensure that both local and global structural characteristics are accurately represented, which is essential for predicting interaction potentials and functional capabilities.

Notations and Procedures To facilitate a clear understanding of our methods, we introduce the following notations and procedures used in our sequence representation:

- **Protein Sequence Notation:** Let $S = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$ denote a protein sequence, where s_i represents the i -th amino acid in the sequence.
- **Encoding:** Each amino acid s_i is encoded using a specific numerical representation that captures its chemical properties and contributes to its role within the protein’s structure. This encoding might utilize techniques ranging from simple categorical encoding schemes to more complex embeddings derived from machine learning models.
- **Transformation Processes:** The encoded representations are processed through computational models (e.g., convolutional neural networks or recurrent neural networks) designed to capture the interactions between amino acids and to preserve their positional information.

-
- **Aggregation:** The transformed representations are aggregated to form a comprehensive representation of the entire sequence. This step may involve methods like pooling or attention mechanisms that consider the significance of different parts of the sequence in a context-dependent manner.

These steps ensure that our model not only captures the individual characteristics of each amino acid but also their contextual relationships within the entire sequence, which is crucial for effective prediction of biological functions and interactions.

More details on these techniques and their specific applications are provided in Appendix A.4.

The positional encoding provides the model with information about the relative or absolute position of the tokens in the sequence. The sine and cosine functions for positional encoding are defined as follows Vaswani et al. (2017):

$$p(s, 2i) = \sin\left(\frac{s}{10000^{2i/d_{\text{model}}}}\right),$$
$$p(s, 2i + 1) = \cos\left(\frac{s}{10000^{2i/d_{\text{model}}}}\right),$$

where s denotes the position within the biological sequence, i denotes the dimension within the embedding spaces, d_{model} is the dimensionality of the model’s embeddings. The encoding mechanism ensures that the model can effectively interpret the sequential order of the sequences for biological interactions.

A.5 Model Architecture

To accurately predict MHC-Antigen binding and effectively model peptide-MHC-TCR interactions, we developed a biologically inspired model that combines advanced representation learning with sequence interaction techniques. The model transforms peptide and MHC sequences into high-dimensional embeddings using linear transformations augmented by sinusoidal positional encodings, which help preserve sequence integrity and temporal dynamics.

At the core of the model is a cross-attention mechanism that dynamically integrates features from both peptide and MHC sequences, enabling the model to capture complex dependencies. The multi-head attention structure allows the model to recognize diverse interaction patterns, enhancing its ability to predict subtle binding affinities. After the attention phase, features are refined through normalization and feed-forward layers, which deepen the model’s capability to handle intricate interactions. The final output layer, utilizing a sigmoid function, provides a probability score for peptide-MHC binding, making the results easy to interpret.

This integrative approach not only improves predictive accuracy but also offers a robust framework for understanding complex immunological interactions. The use of multihead attention with positional encodings ensures that the model efficiently captures the complexity of amino acid sequences, making it a balanced blueprint for tackling other biological systems.




Figure 5: Training Performance and Weight Matrix Visualization for Fusion-pM and Fusion-pMT Models. The training loss and accuracy curves of (a) fusion-pM and (b) fusion-pMT. In both (a) and (b), The left panel illustrates the loss curve for both models across epochs, and the right panel shows the accuracy curve, highlighting model performance over the same training epochs. Notably, both models show significant improvement in accuracy and reduction in loss as training progresses. The features heatmaps of the weight matrices from Peptide encoder models used in (c) and MHC encoder in (d) Fusion-pM compared to those from the same encoder in (e) fusion-pM (same encoder). These visualizations provide insights into the variability and pattern of weights, underscoring the differences in learning and representation between the two models under different encoding strategies.

Table 4: Statistical Comparison of Model Performances

Metrics	TransPHLA	Fusion-pMT	Fusion-pMT (CA only)	Fusion-pMT (CA only+Same Encoder)
ACC	0.929496	0.9178012	0.913916401	0.917299549
ROC AUC	0.978332	0.9848903	0.983075857	0.983227388
F1	0.93012	0.9124046	0.908061301	0.912064603
MCC	0.859111	0.8424454	0.835070059	0.840990338

Table 5: Model comparison statistics for ROC AUC, ACC, and MCC metrics across different datasets.

Model	Dataset	Metric	Mean	Std	T-Value	P-Value	F-Value	Chi-Square
Fusion-pMT	Testdata	ROC AUC	0.7326	0.0070	147.4925	0.0000	21754.0321	0.0002
Fusion-pMT	Testdata	ACC	0.7092	0.0106	95.6013	0.0001	9134.7278	0.0001
Fusion-pMT	Testdata	MCC	0.3766	0.0237	22.3263	0.0019	498.5206	0.0138
pMTnet	Testdata	ROC AUC	0.7158	0.0024	420.2273	0.0000	176590.9735	0.0000
pMTnet	Testdata	ACC	0.6558	0.0071	106.1322	0.0001	11263.8464	0.0002
pMTnet	Testdata	MCC	0.3154	0.0130	38.8203	0.0007	1506.8830	0.0086
Fusion-pMT	Newdata	ROC AUC	0.6320	0.0190	46.9625	0.0005	2205.4734	0.0017
Fusion-pMT	Newdata	ACC	0.6001	0.0231	46.2826	0.0005	1993.1442	0.0011
Fusion-pMT	Newdata	MCC	0.2122	0.0405	10.4466	0.0092	109.1366	0.0917
pMTnet	Newdata	ROC AUC	0.5744	0.0174	46.6449	0.0005	2175.7504	0.0016
pMTnet	Newdata	ACC	0.5428	0.0109	70.7446	0.0002	5004.7960	0.0007
pMTnet	Newdata	MCC	0.1181	0.0300	13.9158	0.0044	193.6424	0.0703

A.6 Statistical Analysis

B Useful Facts

B.1 Biological Molecules of Adaptive Immunity

In adaptive immunity, the major players are the highly diverse B and T cells, with unique surface receptors known as B cell receptors (BCRs) and T cell receptors (TCRs), respectively. These cells recognize specific parts of an antigen, referred to as epitopes. However, the mechanisms of antigen recognition differ between B and T cells. B cells target a fragment of the antigen known as a B cell epitope. Recognition by BCRs primarily depends on three-dimensional conformational information from the fragment, which contains mainly non-contiguous amino acid residues. On the other hand, T cell epitopes, recognized by TCRs, depend on their binding to major histocompatibility complex (MHC) molecules. These epitopes are linear, formed by contiguous amino acid residues.

Major Histocompatibility Complex (MHC) The **major histocompatibility complex (MHC)** is a type of cell surface proteins essential for the adaptive immunity. In humans, MHC genes are called human leukocyte antigens (*HLAs*). The MHC class I molecules present endogenous peptides from proteins self-generated intracellularly, while The MHC class II molecules are mainly expressed on antigen presenting cells. The MHC class I molecules contain an α chain from *MHC* class I genes and β_2 microglobulin (β_2m), which can present peptides ranging from 8 to 12 amino acids. MHC class II molecules consist of one α and one β chain, allowing the binding of longer peptides ranging from 9 to 25 residues, or even longer. The MHC class I and MHC class II are also

Table 6: Overview of Molecules Involved in Antigen Presentation.

Molecule	Location	Total Length/aa	Active Length	Main Function	Theoretic Diversity	Homology
MHC Class I	Cell Surface	α : 360 / β_2m : 120	Relevant: α chain	Present peptides to CD8 ⁺ T cells	$6 \times 20^{6-7}$	Varies
MHC Class II	Cell Surface	α & β : 260-280	Relevant: α_1 and β_1 domains	Present peptides to CD4 ⁺ T cells	12×20^{10}	Varies
T Cell Receptor	T Cell Surface	α : 223 / β : 247	Variable regions: 110-120 each chain	Recognize peptide-MHC complexes	10^{23}	Low
B Cell Receptor	B Cell Surface or Secreted Form	Light: 211-217 Heavy: 450/ 550	Variable domain: 110	Recognize antigens	10^{21}	Low

highly diverse, with approximately $6 \times 20^{6-7}$ and 12×20^{10} alleles, respectively [Rock et al. \(2016\)](#). The MHC class I molecules present endogenous peptides from proteins self-generated intracellularly, while The MHC class II molecules are mainly expressed on antigen presenting cells.

T Cell Receptor (TCR) The **T cell receptor (TCR)** is a type of protein complex on the surface of T cells responsible for recognizing fragments of antigen as peptides bound to MHCs. Classically, the TCR consists of an α chain and a β chain, which are encoded by gene *TRA* and *TRB*, respectively. The high diversity of TCR is generated by rearrangements of the V and J segments of the *TRA* gene and V, D, and J segments of the *TRB* gene in the thymus, with 10^{23} possible rearrangements theoretically [Mora & Walczak \(2019\)](#). Within the TCRs, the indices for α and β chains have been separately estimated to be 10^9 and 10^{14} [Mora & Walczak \(2019\)](#). Consequently, β chains garner a greater degree of attention and are the focus of significant experiments in TCR sequencing, making β chains a core component in data-driven modeling. In another estimation, the number of potential rearrangements can be up to 10^{61} [Chi et al. \(2024\)](#). While at one moment, there are around 10^{11} per human with around 10^9 distinct TCRs [Chi et al. \(2024\)](#), which requires the highly precise prediction of pMHC-TCR for further drug development based on TCRs.

B Cell Receptor (BCR) The **B cell receptor (BCR)** from B cells contains multiple forms, including the secreted form and the membrane-bound form. Secreted BCRs are usually called **antibody (Ab)**, while both membrane-bound and secreted BCRs can be called **immunoglobulin (Ig)**. BCRs are arranged in three globular regions that roughly form a Y shape. In humans, one BCR unit consists of four chains, two heavy chains (H) and two light chains (L). Each heavy chain’s variable region is approximately 110 amino acids in length. There are five types of mammalian BCR heavy chains denoted by Greek letters: α , δ , ϵ , γ and μ . These chains are found in **IgA**, **IgD**, **IgE**, **IgG**, and **IgM** antibodies, respectively. Heavy chains differ in size and composition. α and γ contain approximately 450 amino acids, while ϵ and μ have about 550 amino acids. In mammals, there are only two types of light chains, λ and κ , which have minor differences in the sequence. A light chain has two successive domains, constant (C_L) and variable (V_L). The approximate length of a light chain is 211–217 amino acids. The diversity of BCR is generated from V(D)J recombination and somatic hypermutation, with 10^{21} possible rearrangements theoretically [Mora & Walczak \(2019\)](#). Another estimation suggested that the total paired-sequence diversity is 10^{16-18} , while there are 5×10^9 B cells in the peripheral blood of a healthy human.

B.2 Protein Interactions and Prediction Methods

In our computational study, we developed a specialized neural network model, termed fusion-pMT, to understand the interactions within the peptide-MHC-TCR complex. The model’s architecture leverages a custom-built submodule, which employs an advanced multi-head attention mechanism (with eight attention heads and a dropout rate of 0.1) to process and integrate features from peptide and MHC sequences. The sequences are embedded into a 64-dimensional space, facilitating a detailed representation of their complex biological characteristics.

The model encapsulates the dynamics of peptide-MHC interactions through its cross-attention mechanism, which is crucial for capturing the nuanced dependencies between these biomolecules. Further processing is performed by a fully connected neural network, which integrates the attention outputs with flattened peptide and MHC sequence features. This integration feeds into a deep learning pipeline that includes multiple layers of nonlinear transformations and dropout regularization, aiming to predict interaction outcomes robustly.

Training of the pMHC Model is meticulously orchestrated over 200 epochs, employing a binary cross-entropy loss function optimized via stochastic gradient descent with a learning rate of 0.1. This training regimen includes a patience mechanism set to 10 epochs to prevent overfitting and ensure model generalizability. Model performance is evaluated through both training and validation phases, with checkpoints saved upon achieving new best validation accuracies, underscoring the model's progressive learning capability.

C Miscellanies

C.1 Impacts on immunology and medicine

By using cross attention to address multi-sequence biological problems, the prediction of pMHC-TCR has implications in various fields, particularly in immunology and medicine. In the field of immunology, an AI4Sci model understanding the TCR-pMHC interaction can help in the study of diseases, including autoimmune diseases, infections, and cancers. In medicine, with the advancement in AI, personalized predictions of TCR-pMHC interactions can potentially lead to individualized treatments in precision medicine.

C.2 Impacts in Healthcare


In healthcare, the prediction of pMHC-TCR interactions has significant implications in the development of advanced therapies against cancers or infectious diseases (Figure 6) .

Vaccine Development. Understanding which peptides can bind to MHC molecules and be recognized by TCRs can help in the design of more effective vaccines, especially the neoantigen-based cancer vaccine. Neoantigens are newly generated peptides from somatic mutations that can be recognized by TCRs of tumor-specific T cells. These mutations can be identified through DNA/RNA-sequencing. Once all mutations are identified, they must be computationally predicted from matched tumor-normal sequencing data, and then ranked according to their predicted capability in stimulating a T cell response. Neoantigen-based cancer has shown promising results in a phase 2b study [Weber et al. \(2024\)](#). This selection of effective neoantigen candidates relies on the precise prediction of pMHC-TCR interactions [Rojas et al. \(2023\)](#); [Yarchoan et al. \(2024\)](#).

In addition to cancers, pMHC-TCR prediction can also accelerate the development of infectious disease vaccines. It is because that viral peptides can also be recognized by TCRs due to higher immunogenicity. During the COVID-19 pandemic, T-cell-directed vaccines has been designed in the form of peptides [Heitmann et al. \(2022\)](#) and mRNA [Arieta et al. \(2023\)](#). More precise prediction of pMHC-TCR interactions can improve the development of T-cell-directed vaccines with better clinical outcomes in patients with immunodeficiency in phase I/II study [Heitmann et al. \(2023\)](#) (Figure 6a).

TCR-T Cellular Therapy. The prediction of pMHC-TCR interactions can also aid in the development of T cell therapies, where the goal is to enhance the immune system's ability to

(a) Vaccine Development



(b) TCR-T Cellular Therapy Development




Figure 6: **The Application of pMHC-TCR Binding Prediction in Healthcare** (a) Schematic Representation of the Therapeutic Cancer Vaccine. (b) Schematic Representation of the Engineered TCR-T Cell Therapy.

recognize and destroy abnormal cells. The development of TCR-T therapies against cancer involves identifying a specific TCR that recognizes the tumor antigen by analyzing TCR sequencing data. Subsequently, this *TCR* gene can be manipulated to be expressed in autologous T cells. These engineered tumor-specific T cells can be expanded to induce tumor killing by recognizing pMHC on tumor cells [Hassel et al. \(2023\)](#); [D'Angelo et al. \(2024\)](#). Two drug based on this therapy has been approve by the Food and Drug Administration of USA on January 25, 2022 [Mullard \(2022\)](#) and August 2, 2024, respectively. Additionally, the proof-of-concept for using TCR-T therapies against infectious diseases have been validated in treating cytomegalovirus infection after hematopoietic stem cell transplantation [Liu et al. \(2022\)](#), which sheds light on the broader application of TCR-T cellular therapies (Figure 6b)