
From thermodynamics to protein design: Diffusion models for biomolecule generation towards autonomous protein engineering

Wenran LI¹ Xavier F. Cadet² David Medina-Ortiz^{3,4} Mehdi D. Davari⁵
 Ramanathan Sowdhamini^{6,7,8} Cedric Damour⁹ Yu Li¹⁰ Alain Miranville¹¹ Frederic Cadet^{1,12}

Abstract

Protein design with desirable properties has been a significant challenge for many decades. Generative artificial intelligence is a promising approach and has achieved great success in various protein generation tasks. Notably, diffusion models stand out for their robust mathematical foundations and impressive generative capabilities, offering unique advantages in certain applications such as protein design. In this review, we first give the definition and characteristics of diffusion models and then focus on two strategies: Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models (DDPM) and Score-based Generative Models (SGM), where DDPM is the discrete form of SGM. Furthermore, we discuss their applications in protein design, peptide generation, drug discovery, and protein-ligand interaction. Finally, we outline the future perspectives of diffusion models to advance autonomous protein design and engineering. The $E(3)$ group consists of all rotations, reflections, and trans-

lations in three-dimensions. The equivariance in the $E(3)$ group can maintain the physical stability of the $N - C_\alpha - C$ frame of each amino acid as much as possible, and we reflect on how to keep the diffusion model $E(3)$ equivariant for protein generation.

Keywords: Diffusion model; Biomolecule generation; Equivariance.

1. Introduction

For decades, protein engineering and protein design tasks have been regarded as NP-hard optimization problems, the algorithmic challenges continue to persist despite advancements in computational methods. (Mukhopadhyay, 2014; Pierce & Winfree, 2002). As the number of residues increases from 75 to 200, the number of conformations increases from $O(n^{75})$ to $O(n^{200})$, where n is the average number of rotamers per position. Researchers have been working to explore effective methods to bridge the sizeable gap. Due to their ability to learn complex patterns for large datasets, deep learning approaches have been applied to various tasks such as protein structure prediction, sequence design for specific functions, and *de novo* protein design (DNPD) (Watson et al., 2023). Generative modeling is a subfield of ML that focuses on developing algorithms capable of generating new data samples that resemble the data distribution from a given training dataset. Successful applications of generative modeling have highlighted the potential of protein design by modeling the probability distribution of protein sequences. Techniques such as variational autoencoders (VAE) and generative adversarial networks (GAN) have been employed on generation problems for protein sequences and structures (Rossetto & Zhou, 2019; Tucs et al., 2020). Alternatively, diffusion models have given amazing results for image, audio, and text synthesis, while being relatively simple to implement. Diffusion models are related to stochastic differential equations (SDEs),

¹University of Paris City & University of Reunion, INSERM, BGR, DSIMB, F-75015 Paris, France ²Department of Computing, Imperial College London, United Kingdom ³Department of Computer Engineering, University of Magallanes, Punta Arenas, Chile ⁴Centre for Biotechnology and Bioengineering, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile ⁵Department of Bioorganic Chemistry, Leibniz Institute of Plant Biochemistry, Halle 06120, Germany ⁶National Centre for Biological Science, TIFR, Bangalore, India ⁷Molecular Biophysics Unit, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India ⁸Institute of Bioinformatics and Applied Biotechnology, Bangalore, India ⁹EnergyLab, EA 4079, Faculty of Sciences and Technology, University of Reunion, France ¹⁰School of Information Science and Technology and Beijing Institute of Artificial Intelligence, China ¹¹Laboratoire de Mathématiques Appliquées, University Le Havre Normandie, le Havre, France ¹²PEACCEL, Artificial Intelligence Department, AI for Biologics, 75013, Paris, France. Correspondence to: Frederic Cadet <frederic.cadet.run@gmail.com>.

making their theoretical properties particularly intriguing. These models have shown significant advantages in modeling complex distributions and have thus gained traction in protein engineering (Tang et al., 2024a). Using their mathematical foundations, diffusion models offer a promising framework for addressing challenges in protein design.

Building on these foundations, a diffusion probabilistic model (Kloeden et al., 1992) uses a parameterized Markov chain trained by variational inference. This approach enables the generation of samples that align with the data distribution within finite time, providing a structured and efficient mechanism for generative tasks. Transitions of this chain are learned to reverse a diffusion process, which is a Markov chain that gradually adds noise to the data in the opposite direction of sampling until signal is destroyed. Diffusion models address key challenges faced by other generative approaches: they overcome the difficulty of accurately matching posterior distributions in VAEs, mitigate the instability arising from the adversarial training objectives in GANs, and excel in protein generation tasks, particularly in producing structures with improved atom stability (Chen et al., 2024a; Tang et al., 2024b; Li et al., 2024a).

The concept of equivariance (Batzner et al., 2022) arises naturally in machine learning of atomistic systems: physical properties have well-defined transformation properties under translation, reflection, and rotation of a set of atoms. Several reviews on the application of diffusion modeling to the generation of biomolecules have been published (Norton & Bhattacharya, 2024; Guo et al., 2023b; Zhang et al., 2023b; Goles et al., 2024); they have surveyed some diffusion models that can address various bioinformatics problems, such as denoising cryo-EM data, single-cell gene expression analysis, and protein design (for details, see Appendix. I.). However, most reviews have not discussed the common mathematical features and the importance of equivariance properties.

The motivation for this work is to provide advanced and comprehensive insights into the development, evaluation, and comparison of diffusion models, explaining the advantages and disadvantages of these approaches compared to other generative models, and the future directions and perspectives of diffusion models to assist the protein design.

The main **contributions** of this review include:

- An accessible introduction to the fundamentals of diffusion models and equivariance.
- A fairly detailed overview of the applications of 56

diffusion models in biomolecule design (for more details, see Appendix. A.).

- A discussion on the future development of diffusion models to assist in biomolecule design.

This work explores the generation of different biomolecules through diffusion models, emphasizing protein design.

2. Theoretical preparation

This section introduces two common diffusion models, DDPM and SGM, to lay the foundation for the following sections. In addition, we give the concepts of symmetry and equivariance and the relationship between them. The relationship between the molecular structure and the model is also revealed.

2.1. Diffusion models

A diffusion model is a deep generative model based on two stages: a forward diffusion stage and a reverse diffusion stage. In the forward diffusion stage, the input data are gradually perturbed over several steps by adding Gaussian noise. In the reverse phase, a model restores the original input data by learning to reverse the diffusion process step by step. Figure 1 illustrates how a diffusion model works to generate an image.




Figure 1: Visualization of diffusion models operating on the image generation. During the diffusion process, the image becomes blurred until it becomes a Gaussian distribution. The reverse process is a denoising process, and the image gradually becomes clear.

In the discrete form, for a sufficiently large time $T > 0$, $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$, with the random variable $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where n is the dimension, the forward process iteratively adds isotropic Gaussian noise to the sample. The Gaussian transition kernel is set as:

$$q(x_t|x_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{1 - \beta_t}x_{t-1}, \beta_t I), \quad (1)$$

$$q(x_{1:T}|x_0) = \prod_{t=1}^T q(x_t|x_{t-1}), \quad (2)$$

where the β_t are chosen according to a fixed variance scheme (Song et al., 2022; Croitoru et al., 2023; Rombach et al., 2022). Noisy data x_t can be sampled

directly from x_0 :

$$x_t = \sqrt{\alpha_t}x_0 + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t}\epsilon, \quad (3)$$

where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ and $\alpha_t = \prod_{s=1}^t (1 - \beta_s)$.

While the reverse process, starting from noise $x_T \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$, aims to learn the process of denoising:

$$p_\theta(x_0) = p(x_T) \prod_{t=1}^T p_\theta(x_{t-1}|x_t); \quad (4)$$

$$p_\theta(x_{t-1}|x_t) = \mathcal{N}(x_{t-1}; \mu_\theta(x_t, t), \sigma_\theta(x_t, t)), \quad (5)$$

i.e. to learn $p_\theta(x_{t-1}|x_t)$ using a model with hyperparameters θ . Here

$$\mu_\theta(x_t, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \beta_t}} \left(x_t - \frac{\beta_t}{\sqrt{1 - \alpha_t}} \sigma_\theta(x_t, t) \right),$$

the DDPM aims to approximate ϵ using a parametric model structured as σ_θ . The objective function can be written as follows:

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x_0, t, \epsilon} [\|\epsilon - \sigma_\theta(\sqrt{\alpha_t}x_0 + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t}\epsilon, t)\|^2].$$

In the continuous form (Kingma et al., 2023), the following stochastic differential equation (SDE) (Kloeden et al., 1992) has the same transition distribution $q(x_t|x_0)$ as in equation (2) for any $t \in [0, T]$:

$$dx = f(t)x_t dt + g(t)d\omega_t,$$

where ω_t is the standard Wiener process, $f(t)$ is a drift term that typically describes a time-dependent scaling of the data, and $g(t)$ is a scalar function known as the diffusion coefficient.

(Song et al., 2020) indicated that the following time reversal SDE and probability flow ordinary differential equation (ODE) preserve the marginal distribution for $x_T \sim p_\theta(x_T)$:

$$dx = [f(x, t) - g(t)^2 \nabla_x \log p_\theta(x)]dt + g(t)d\bar{\omega}_t, \quad (6)$$

$$dx = [f(x, t) - \frac{1}{2}g(t)^2 \nabla_x \log p_\theta(x)]dt \quad (7)$$

where $\bar{\omega}_t$ is the reverse Wiener process, $\nabla_x \log p_\theta(x)$ is the Stein score. Score-based generative models learn the gradient of the probability distribution rather than the distribution itself, i.e.,

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x_0, t, \epsilon} [\|s_{t, \theta}(x_t) - \nabla_{x_t} \log p_\theta(x_t|x_0)\|^2].$$

Further descriptions about diffusion models are provided in Appendix. B.

2.2. Geometric symmetry and equivariance

Geometric symmetry and equivariance are related concepts in mathematics and machine learning, especially when dealing with transformations like rotations, translations, and reflections.

Definition 2.1. (Symmetry) (Cohen et al., 2021) Let X denote the input space, Y the label space, and w the weight space, let $f : X \times W \rightarrow Y$ denote a model. A transformation $g : W \rightarrow W$ is a symmetry of the parameterization if

$$f(x, gw) = f(x, w) \quad \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } w \in W$$

Definition 2.2. (Equivariant) (Bronstein et al., 2021) Let $\rho_g : X \rightarrow X$ be a set of transformations on X for the abstract group $g \in G$. We say a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is equivariant to g if there exists an equivalent transformation on its output space $\rho'_g : Y \rightarrow Y$ such that:

$$f(\rho_g(x)) = \rho'_g(f(x)).$$

Symmetry typically refers to the static properties of shapes, patterns, or systems. It is used to describe the geometric conformation in proteins. Equivariance, on the other hand, refers to the dynamic relationships between input and output under transformations. Most of the models discussed in this paper are equivariant models.

3. Diffusion model for protein generation

This section discusses the generation of protein sequence and structure separately.

3.1. Sequence Generation

Sequence generation models usually regard amino acids as the word, input them to language models for feature extraction first, then input them to diffusion models for generation.

TaxDiff (Zongying et al., 2024) combines the denoise transformer with the diffusion model to learn taxonomically guided over the space of protein sequences and thus fulfills the requirements of downstream tasks in biology. **EvoDiff** (Alamdari et al., 2023b) presents order-agnostic autoregressive diffusion models (DAOMs) and discrete denoising diffusion probabilistic models (D3PM) to generate highly realistic, diverse and structurally plausible proteins.

DPLM (Wang et al., 2024c) initially trained with masked language models (MLMs), then continuously trained with the diffusion objective, demonstrates

a strong generative capability for protein sequences. DPLM-2 (Wang et al., 2024b) is a multimodal protein foundation model that extends DPLM to accommodate both sequences and structures, where foundation models are large deep learning neural networks that have changed the way data scientists approach machine learning. For assessing the feasibility of the sequences, (Zongying et al., 2024) used OmegaFold (Wu et al., 2022) to predict their corresponding structures and calculate the average predicted Local Distance Difference Test (pLDDT) across the entire structure, which reflects OmegaFold’s confidence in its structure prediction for each residue on sequences level. We compare the pLDDT of the models mentioned above in Table 1. We can see from Table 1 that the pLDDT score of the sequences sampled by DPLM-2 is close to that of DPLM. This score suggests that DPLM-2 largely retains its sequence generation capability inherited from sequence pre-training in DPLM.

Table 1: pLDDT results of the diffusion models: EvoDiff, TasDiff, DPLM and DPLM-2. DPLM achieves the best feasibility among them.

Model	EvoDiff	TasDiff	DPLM	DPLM-2
pLDDT(↑)	44.29	68.89	83.25	82.25

Evolutionary scale modelling (ESM) (Lin et al., 2023) is a class of language models applied to the generation of protein sequences. **ForceGen** (Ni et al., 2024) develops a pLDM by combining the ESM Metagenomic Atlas (Lin et al., 2023), a model of the ESM family, with an attention-based diffusion model (Ni et al., 2023) to generate a protein sequence and structure with non-mechanical properties.

3.2. Structure Generation

Generating a backbone is a difficult task because a backbone should fulfill the following three criteria:

- **Physically realizable:** We can find the sequence that folds into the generated structure (Martin et al., 2008).
- **Functional:** We aim for conditional sampling under diverse functional constraints without re-training (Mandell & Kortemme, 2009).
- **Generalizability:** We hope that the model has multiple application scenarios (Murphy et al., 2012).

For the above criteria, we introduce some models that in our opinion best meet the standards in order, and discuss the effects of these models.

3.2.1. PHYSICALLY REALIZABLE MODEL: DIFFUSION ON $SE(3)$ GROUP

$SE(3)$ is the notation for the special Euclidean 3D group that includes translational and rotational isometric transformations and keeps the volume constant (see more details in Appendix. D). This mathematical framework is particularly relevant for modeling molecular systems, where maintaining spatial invariance is crucial for accurate predictions.

Building on this principle, **RFDiffusion** (Watson et al., 2023) repurposes RoseTTAFold (Baek et al., 2021) to perform reverse diffusion. The $SE(3)$ -equivariance of RoseTTAFold underpins RFDiffusion’s ability to respect these isometric transformations during the generative process. RFDiffusion has also been effectively applied in the design of peptide binders (Vázquez Torres et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024). By fine-tuning RoseTTAFold All-Atom (RFAA) (Krishna et al., 2024), a neural network for predicting biomolecular structures, to diffusion denoising tasks, **RFDiffusionAA** generates folded protein structures surrounding the small molecule from random residue distributions. **Protein-Generator** (Lisanza et al., 2023) is a sequence space diffusion model based on RoseTTAFold that simultaneously generates protein sequences and structures. The success rate of ProteinGenerator in generating long sequences that fold to the designed structure is lower than RFDiffusion, this may reflect the intrinsic difference between diffusion in sequence and structure spaces.

FrameDiff (Yim et al., 2023) is a diffusion model in the Lie group (Watson et al., 2022) $SE(3)_0^N$ for the generation of protein backbones. It’s forward process is,

$$dT^{(t)} = [0, -\frac{1}{2}PX^{(t)}]dt + [dB_{so(3)^N}^t, PdB_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}}^{(t)}],$$

where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{3N \times 3N}$ is the projection matrix removing the center of mass $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N x_n$, and $T_{t \geq 0}^{(t)} = (R^{(t)}, X^{(t)})_{t \geq 0}$ is a stochastic process on $SE(3)_0^N$ with invariant measure $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{Id})^{\otimes N} \otimes \mathcal{U}(SO(3))^{\otimes N}$ pushed forward by P . The backward process $(\overleftarrow{T}^t)_{t \in [0, T_F]} = ((\overleftarrow{R}^t, \overleftarrow{X}^{(t)}))_{t \in [0, T_F]}$ is given by

$$d\overleftarrow{R}^{(t)} = \nabla_r \log p_{T_F-t}(\overleftarrow{T}^{(t)})dt + d\mathbf{B}_{SO(3)^N}^{(t)}, \quad (8)$$

$$d\overleftarrow{X}^{(t)} = P\{\frac{1}{2}\overleftarrow{X}^{(t)} + \nabla_x \log p_{T_F-t}(\overleftarrow{T}^{(t)})\}dt + Pd\mathbf{B}_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}}^{(t)}. \quad (9)$$

This model applies Invariant Point Attention (IPA) (Jumper et al., 2021) to keep the updates of residues in coordinate space that are $SE(3)$ -invariant.

FrameDiff has been used for inpainting protein structures and motif scaffolding, named **FrameDiPT** (Zhang et al., 2023a) and **TDS** (Wu et al., 2024), respectively. **VFN-Diff** (Mao et al., 2023) replaces the IPA in FrameDiff with Vector Field Networks (VFN), which is also the $SE(3)$ equivariant model. VFN-Diff significantly outperforms FrameDiff in terms of design capability and diversity.

Genie (Lin & AlQuraishi, 2023) combine aspects of the $SE(3)$ -equivariant reasoning machinery of IPA with DDPMs to create a $SE(3)$ -equivariant denoiser $\epsilon_\theta(F(x_t), t)$ in the protein generation process. **Genie2** (Lin et al., 2024b) extended Genie to motif scaffolding, and introduced a novel multi-motif framework that designs co-occurring motifs without needing to specify inter-motif positions and orientations in advance.

Figure 2 shows that RFDiffusion, FrameDiff and Genie all utilize $SE(3)$ equivariant natural network into the denoiser. This kind of architecture will keep the $N - C_\alpha - C$ frame of each amino acid residue invariant to global rotations and translations. As special subsets of $SE(3)$ equivariant models, some protein generation models such as **ProtDiff-SMCDiff** (Trippe et al., 2023) satisfy $E(3)$ equivariance. They can additionally keep consistency for permutation and translation. This kind of model is highly interesting in molecular design, but until now few protein generation models satisfy this $E(3)$ equivariance property (See more details in Appendix. E).

3.2.2. MODEL WITH STRONG FUNCTIONALITY

Protein design projects often involve complex and composite requirements that vary over time. **Chroma** (Ingraham et al., 2023) explores a programmable generative process with custom energy functions, which aims to make the generated protein have desired properties and functions, such as symmetry, substructure, shape and semantics.

Table 4 shows the comparison of several classical models with their advantages, disadvantages and performances.

3.2.3. MODEL WITH GENERALIZABILITY

AlphaFold3 (AF3) (Abramson et al., 2024) exhibits strong generalizability and versatility, extending beyond protein generation to handle diverse molecular tasks, including ligand and RNA structure prediction. AlphaFold2 (AF2) (Jumper et al., 2021) is a highly accurate protein structure prediction model. Its two important components, Evoformer and IPA, have been widely used in other models. **AlphaFold3** replaces its Structure Module part with a Diffusion module. The

component of the Diffusion module, Diffusion Transformer (Peebles & Xie, 2023), shows great generative ability (see Appendix. F. for more details).

Despite the great success of AlphaFold2, AlphaFold3 takes a larger step in this direction. It has many more application scenarios: ligand docking, protein-nucleic acid complexes, covalent modifications, and protein complexes. With AF3, it is possible to handle a more diverse biomolecular space.

4. Diffusion model for peptide generation

Peptides have aroused great interest due to their potential as therapeutic agents (Wang et al., 2022). Currently, there are several reviews (Wan et al., 2022; Ge et al., 2022; Goles et al., 2024) that summarize the application of generative models to peptides. Here, we focus on peptide generation by diffusion models.

For the design of peptide sequences, **ProT-Diff** (Wang et al., 2024d) combines a pre-trained protein language model (PLM) ProtT5-XL-UniRef50 (Elnaggar et al., 2020) with an improved diffusion model to generate *de novo* candidate sequences for antimicrobial peptides (AMPs). **AMP-Diffusion** (Chen et al., 2024c) uses PLM ESM2 (Lin et al., 2023) for latent diffusion to design AMP sequences with desirable physicochemical properties. This model is versatile and has the potential to be extended to general protein design tasks. **Diff-AMP** (Wang et al., 2024a) integrates thermodynamic diffusion and attention mechanisms into reinforcement learning to advance research on AMP generation. Sequence-based diffusion models complement structure-based approached by aiding in sequence-to-function or optimizing sequence design for structural goals.

For peptide structure design, **Pepflow** (Abdin & Kim, 2023b) trains the diffusion model to generate the peptide structure and then uses $E(3)$ -equivariant graph neural networks (EGNN) to perform conformational sampling. This model can generate a variety of all-atom conformations for peptides of different lengths, and comparative experiments were performed with AF2 and ESM-fold.

For the co-design of peptides, **PepGLAD** (Kong et al., 2024) proposes geometric latent diffusion model combining with receptor-specific affine transformation to do the full-atom peptide design. **MMCD** (Wang et al., 2024e) completes the co-generation of structure and sequence for both antimicrobial and anticancer peptides. It also uses EGNN for the structure generation part.




Figure 2: $SE(3)$ equivariant diffusion models for protein structure generation. RFDiffusion, FrameDiff and Genie utilize RoseTTAFold, IPA and $SE(3)$ -equivariant denoiser as the single step of the denoise process in the diffusion model, respectively. Boxes in pink color are $SE(3)$ equivariant blocks. $SE(3)$ equivariant keeps the frames of each amino acid physically stable.

All the models for peptide structure generation listed above satisfy the $E(3)$ -equivariance property which not only influences the generation of peptides but also provides a guarantee of invariance of the physical properties for binder generation.

5. Small molecule generation

Molecules live in physical 3D space, there is a high need to better understand the design space of diffusion models for molecular modeling. The topic of generating molecules using diffusion models is equivalent to the following question: *How to generate attributed graphs using diffusion models?* To answer this question, there are two main challenges:

- **Complex dependency:** Dependency between nodes and edges.
- **Non-unique representations:** Order of the nodes is not fixed.

For the first challenge, diffusion models need to define the atomic positions $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and the atomic types $a_i = \{C, N, O, \dots\}$ and specify independent forward processes for each data type,

$$p_t(x_t|x_0) = \mathcal{N}(x_t|\alpha_t x_t, \sigma_t \mathbf{I}), \quad (10)$$

$$p_t(a_t|a_0) = \mathcal{N}(a_t|\alpha_t a_t, \sigma_t \mathbf{I}), \quad (11)$$

If $G_t = (x_t, a_t)$, then $p_t(G_t|G_0) = \mathcal{N}(x_t|\alpha_t G_t, \sigma_t \mathbf{I})$, and continuously forward process represented as

$$dG_t = f_t(G_t)dt + g_t(G_t)d\omega_t,$$

The reverse-time diffusion process is represented as:

$$\begin{cases} dx_t = [f_{1,t}(x_t) - g_{1,t}^2 \nabla_{x_t} \log p_t(G_t)]dt + g_{1,t}d\bar{\omega}_1, \\ da_t = [f_{2,t}(x_t) - g_{2,t}^2 \nabla_{a_t} \log p_t(G_t)]dt + g_{2,t}d\bar{\omega}_2. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

we use $s_\theta^x(G_t)$, $s_\theta^a(G_t)$ to approximate $\nabla_{x_t} \log p_t(G_t)$, $\nabla_{a_t} \log p_t(G_t)$ respectively, and train the neural network to jointly approximate the score functions of the

Table 2: Comparison of different protein structure models: Advantages, disadvantages, and performances on 100 amino acid proteins.

Models	Strength	Weakness	Potential application areas
ProtDiff-SMCDiff	Computational efficiency	Complexity	Peptide generation; motif scaffolding
AlphaFold3	Adaptability to different biomolecule types	Hallucinations in disordered regions	Dynamical behavior of biomolecular systems
RFDiffusion	High accuracy; good at conditional tasks	Low flexibility	Protein-ligand interaction
FrameDiff	Theoretical; does not require pre-trained structure predictors	Complexity	Peptide generation
Genie Chroma	Simplicity; designability, diversity Programmability; jointly models structures and sequences	Capacity limited Complexity	Longer protein design Peptide generation




Figure 3: Timeline of major advancements in protein design methods from March 2022 to May 2024. Each event marks the introduction of a significant model or method, categorized by its underlying computational framework. The models are color-coded based on their primary components: Red represents EGNN-based methods, orange corresponds to RoseTTAFold-inspired methods, blue highlights IPA-based methods, and cyan denotes ESM-based methods.

constituent processes:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{E}_{x_t, a_t} [\|s_{\theta}^a(G_t) - \nabla_{a_t} \log p_t(G_t)\| + \|s_{\theta}^x(G_t) - \nabla_{x_t} \log p_t(G_t)\|].$$

For the second challenge, diffusion models should capture the system of positional equivariance such as permutation equivariance, $SE(3)$ equivariance and $E(3)$ equivariance.

5.1. Permutation equivariant

A model is called equivariant to permutation if its permute input is equivalent to permute output (see more details in Appendix. C.).

GDSS (Jo et al., 2022) is a novel permutation equivariant one-shot diffusion model. It can generate valid molecules by capturing the node-edge relationship. **CDGS** (Huang et al., 2023a) incorporates discrete graph structures into a diffusion model. It is permutation equivariant and implicitly defines the permutation invariant graph log-likelihood function.

DiGress (Vignac et al., 2023a) is also a permutation equivariant architecture with a permutation invariant loss. The main difference from GDSS is that DiGress defines a diffusion process independent of each node and edge. DiGress achieves better performance than GDSS on QM9 dataset (Ramakrishnan et al., 2014)

with simpler architecture. **JODO** (Huang et al., 2023b) proposes a diffusion graph transformer to generate 2D graph and 3D geometry molecule generation. Without extra graph structural and positional encoding, JODO-2D is comparable to, or better than, DiGress in most metrics.

5.2. Diffusion model on $SE(3)$ group for molecule

We have discussed the important role of the $SE(3)$ equivariant model in protein structure generation before, here we discuss its application in molecule generation.

GeoDiff (Xu et al., 2022) integrates the diffusion model with graph neural networks (GNN) to generate stable conformations, the difference being that the GNN is $SE(3)$ -invariant. **SubGDiff** (Zhang et al., 2024) incorporates subgraphs into the diffusion model to improve molecular representation learning. With 500 steps, SubGDiff achieves much better performance than GeoDiff with 5000 steps on 5 out of 8 metrics, which implies that it can accelerate the sampling efficiency.

Both **TargetDiff** (Guan et al., 2023) and **DiffBP** (Lin et al., 2024a) propose a target-aware molecular diffusion process with a $SE(3)$ -equivariant GNN denoiser. The training and sampling procedures in TargetDiff are aligned in non-autoregressive and $SE(3)$ equivariant.




Figure 4: Overview of EDM (Equivariant Diffusion Models) and its extensions for molecular generation tasks. The top box represents the foundational EDM model, which uses 3D point cloud representation with $E(3)$ equivariance to handle molecular structures. The figure highlights the key limitations of earlier models (shown in blue boxes). It demonstrates how subsequent models address these challenges through novel methods. Irregular Training Space: GeoLDM uses latent space encoding but performs poorly in generating realistic molecules. SubDiff solves this issue by introducing a subgraph extraction process to improve generation quality. Scalability to Complex Molecules: MDM considers covalent bonds and Van der Waals forces but cannot adapt to target-specific molecular pockets. PMDM incorporates a dual equivariant encoder and Gaussian noise to handle complex protein-ligand interactions. Limited Modality: MiDi combines 2D connectivity graphs and 3D point clouds but struggles with poor adaptation to the data distribution. EQGAT-Diff enhances performance by introducing an EQGAT encoder for better data alignment. Unrealistic Molecules: MolDiff generates molecules with inaccurate ligand interactions. MolSnapper improves molecular realism by accurately representing ligand interactions within target pockets.

DiffBP generates molecules with high protein affinity, appropriate sizes, and favorable drug-like profiles.

5.3. Models based on EGNNs

We consider the rotation, reflection, and translation group in \mathbb{R}^3 , abbreviated as $E(3)$. Since biomolecular structures align with elements in the $E(3)$ group, $E(3)$ -equivariant neural networks are effective tools for analyzing molecular structures and properties.

$E(3)$ Equivariant diffusion model (EDM) (Hoogeboom et al., 2022) learns a diffusion model that is equivariant to translation and rotation. It operates on continuous and categorical features to generate molecules in 3D space. DiffLinker (Igashov et al., 2024) leverages EDM and develops diffusion models for molecular linker

design.

CGD (Klarner et al., 2024) can consistently generate novel, near-out-of-distribution (near-OOD) molecules with desirable properties. CGD also applies to EDM for material design following the setup of GaUDI (Weiss et al., 2023), which can discover molecules better than existing ones. SILVR (Runcie & Mey, 2023) combines ILVR (Choi et al., 2021) and EDM to do fragment merging and linker generation.

By building point-structured latent codes with invariant scalars and equivariant tensors, GeoLDM (Xu et al., 2023) can effectively learn latent representations while preserving roto-translational equivariance. It also circumvents the limitations of EDM on irregular training surfaces. SubDiff (Yang et al., 2024) performs

subgraph-level encoding in the diffusion process and is used for 3D molecular generation tasks. For unconditional generation tasks, SubDiff is generally better than EDM and GeoLDM.

By using a more expressive denoising network, EDM was extended to **GCDM** (Morehead & Cheng, 2024), which margins across conditional and unconditional settings for the QM9 dataset (Ramakrishnan et al., 2014) and the larger GEOM-Drugs dataset (Axelrod & Gómez-Bombarelli, 2022). GCDM is a diffusion model for 3D molecules that can be repurposed for important real-world tasks without retraining or fine-tuning. **DiffSBDD** (Schneuing et al., 2023) formulates structure-based drug design (SBDD). (Pinheiro et al., 2024) follows the noise process in the GCDM. The nodes have both geometric atomic coordinates x as well as nuclear type features h . DiffSBDD uses a simple implementation of EGNN to update features h and coordinates x .

By limiting the message-passing computations to neighboring nodes, **MDM** (Huang et al., 2022) outperforms EDM in building chemical bonds via atom pair distances. It points out the lack of consideration for interatomic relations in GCDM, and addresses the scalability issue by introducing the Dist-transition Block. **PMDM** (Huang et al., 2024) introduces equivariant kernels to MDM to simulate the local chemical bonded graph and the global distant graph.

MiDi (Vignac et al., 2023b) utilizes the adaptive noise schedule and relaxedEGNN (rEGNN) to generate 3D molecules. MiDi outperformed EDM in 2D metrics while obtaining similar 3D metrics for the generated conformers. **EQGAT-diff** (Le et al., 2024) takes EQGAT (Le et al., 2022) as the component of the diffusion model to do the *de novo* 3D molecule design. EQGAT-diff employs rotation equivariant vector features that can be interpreted as learnable vector bundles, which the denoising networks of EDM and MiDi are lacking.

Taking advantage of the strong relationship between the bond types and bond lengths to guide the generation of atom positions, **MolDiff** (Peng et al., 2023) produces high-quality 3D molecular graphs and effectively tackles the atom-bond inconsistency problem with E(3)-equivariant diffusion model. Because it models and diffuses the bonds of molecules, MolDiff surpasses SILVR and EDM in the generation of molecules with better validity. (Ziv et al., 2024b) extends MolDiff to structure-based drug design and created a model called **MolSnapper**, which can sample molecules for given pockets. Compared with MolDiff, MolSnapper generates molecules better tailored to fit the given binding site, achieving a high structural and chemical

similarity to the original molecules.

A full overview of the developments based on EDM can be seen in Figure 3. The examples above show that the combination of EGNN and diffusion model has been widely used in the generation of proteins, peptides, and small molecules. EGNN is also used alone for protein binding site identification (Sestak et al., 2024). But EGNN is not always optimal if EGNN and Geometric Vector Perceptron (GVP) are both integrated with **Keypoint Diffusion**, a diffusion model for *de novo* ligand design: the GVP keypoint model can approach all-atom levels of performance while the EGNN keypoint model failed to exceed the performance C_α representation.

6. Protein-ligand interaction

DiffDock (Corso et al., 2023b) uses an equivariant graph neural network in a diffusion process, and predicts the 3D structure of how a molecule interacts with a protein (shown in Appendix. G). **DockGen** (Corso et al., 2024) improves upon DiffDock by scaling up the training data and model size, as well as integrating a synthetic data generation strategy based on extracting side chains from real protein structures as ligands. It is faster and better suited for bootstrapping.

DiffDock-PP (Ketata et al., 2023) learns to translate and rotate unbound protein structures into their bound conformations. **DiffDock-site** (Guo et al., 2023a) is a novel paradigm that integrates the precision of the point site for identifying and initializing the docking pocket. It notably outperforms DiffDock in several metrics. Its DiffDock-site-P variant stands out by integrating the pretrained DiffDock for refining ligand attributes. By introducing discrete latent variables to DiffDock, **DisCo-Diff** (Xu et al., 2024) improves performance on molecular docking and can also synthesise high-resolution images.

FABind (Pei et al., 2024) takes independent message passing, cross-attention update, and interfacial message passing together, to build a fast and accurate protein-ligand binding model. **FABind+** (Gao et al., 2024a) is enhanced by introducing Huber loss in dynamic pocket Radius Prediction and permutation loss in Docking structure prediction.

NeuralPlexer (Qiao et al., 2023) incorporates essential biophysical constraints and a multi-scale geometric deep learning system for the diffusion process. For generating the ligand-specific protein-ligand complex structure, a deep equivariant generative model named **DynamicBind** (Lu et al., 2024) is employed. DynamicBind predicts the ligand-specific protein-ligand

complex structure with a deep equivariant generative model.

All existing deep learning-based methods fail to outperform classical docking tools (Buttenschoen et al., 2024). Individual data-driven approaches may not provide physically plausible results. We can work towards improving the performance of data-driven deep learning models by introducing physical constraints to diffusion models, such as the model (Williams & Inala, 2024).

7. Discussion

Diffusion models have already demonstrated their advantages over previous traditional and machine learning approaches by setting new state-of-the-art results in numerous problems. In addition, some basic models have also been frequently used in protein generation recently, such as EGNN, RoseTTAFold, IPA and ESM; these models have derived some new models, which we list in Fig. 3 in the form of timeline. Here, we highlight several landmark models:

- The IPA in AlphaFold2 satisfies the property of $SE(3)$ equivariant, but was replaced by the diffusion transformer in **AlphaFold3**. Therefore, AlphaFold3 does not satisfy the properties of an equivariant.
- The reverse diffusion in **RFDiffusion** is composed of RoseTTAFold. This model inherits the good properties of RoseTTAFold, making the generated model physically realizable.
- **FrameDiff** is the first model to introduce $SE(3)$ manifolds into protein structure generation problems. The properties of the $SE(3)$ group provide a mathematical basis for the expression of structural information.
- As a better type of $SE(3)$ equivariant, $E(3)$ equivariant is widely used in the generation of small molecules. The most successful example so far is **EDM**.
- **DiffDock** is the first model to introduce the use of diffusion models in the molecular docking task, and its performance is very close to traditional methods. Several works proposed different modifications to its framework.

Due to the large size and complexity of protein structures, most current protein models can only satisfy $SE(3)$ equivariance but do not have as good properties as $E(3)$ equivariance. How to establish a diffusion

model in the $E(3)$ group to complete protein production is a topic we can study in the future.

While progress in the field has demonstrated that diffusion models can accelerate early-stage drug discovery, challenges remain in adapting such workflows to real-world discovery campaigns:

- Addressing synthesizability is an ongoing challenge, because many proposed ideas may not have known synthetic routes, and a chemist can only triage a function of proposed ideas.
- Despite various widely adopted evaluation metrics, measuring and comparing the performance of diffusion models remains a major challenge given the lack of ground-truth and universal metrics.
- Complex dynamics. Cohesive models tend to be static and ignore the fact that proteins and ligands are amphipathic, which is a factor that should be considered when analyzing protein functions.
- Protein structure prediction models typically predict static structures as seen in PDB, not the dynamical behavior of biomolecular systems in solution.

What are potential directions the community could consider exploring further?

- RFDiffusion and ProteinGenerator, which adapt the diffusion model with the traditional model, RoseTTAFold, have done a variety of tasks, such as peptide binder generation, motif-scaffolding, and sequence-structure codesign. We can explore more applications of these two models.
- There are so few models in the area of diffusion models for peptide design that similar diffusion models for protein design can probably be extended to design peptides.
- Traditional models are more analytical and closely match the physical properties of proteins. We can use them for more fruitful tasks such as protein-nucleic acid and protein-ligand interactions.
- Can ETNN deformations of EGNN (Battiloro et al., 2024) and NequIP (Batzner et al., 2022) be applied to the generation of molecules? Can EGNN be used to study peptide structures?

8. Conclusion

This review comprehensively summarizes the application of the diffusion model for bioengineering. It

captures the progression of AI model architectures, highlighting the emergence of $E(3)$ equivariant GNN (EGNN) and diffusion models as game changers in recent work. Diffusion Models are particularly promising generative frameworks.

9. Acknowledgments

W. Li is supported by a PhD grant from the Region Reunion and European Union (FEDER-FSE 2021/2027) 2023062, 345879. X.F. Cadet is supported by the UKRI CDT in AI for Healthcare <http://ai4health.io>, (Grant No. P/S023283/1), UK. PEACCEL was supported through a research program partially co-funded by the European Union (UE) and Region Reunion (FEDER). DMO acknowledges ANID for the project "SUBVENCIÓN A INSTALACIÓN EN LA ACADEMIA CONVOCATORIA AÑO 2022", Folio 85220004. DMO gratefully acknowledges support from the Centre for Biotechnology and Bioengineering - CeBiB (PIA project FB0001 and AFB240001, ANID, Chile). MDD acknowledges funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) - within the Priority Program Molecular Machine Learning SPP2363 (Project Number 497207454). MDD acknowledges EU COST Action CA21160 (ML4NGP).

References

- Abdin, O. and Kim, P. M. Pepflow: direct conformational sampling from peptide energy landscapes through hypernetwork-conditioned diffusion. *bioRxiv*, pp. 2023–06, 2023a.
- Abdin, O. and Kim, P. M. Pepflow: Direct conformational sampling from peptide energy landscapes through hypernetwork-conditioned diffusion, June 2023b.
- Abramson, J., Adler, J., Dunger, J., Evans, R., Green, T., Pritzel, A., Ronneberger, O., Willmore, L., Ballard, A. J., Bambrick, J., Bodenstein, S. W., Evans, D. A., Hung, C.-C., O’Neill, M., Reiman, D., Tunyasuvunakool, K., Wu, Z., Žemgulytė, A., Arvaniti, E., Beattie, C., Bertolli, O., Bridgland, A., Cherepanov, A., Congreve, M., Cowen-Rivers, A. I., Cowie, A., Figurnov, M., Fuchs, F. B., Gladman, H., Jain, R., Khan, Y. A., Low, C. M. R., Perlin, K., Potapenko, A., Savy, P., Singh, S., Stecula, A., Thillaisundaram, A., Tong, C., Yakneen, S., Zhong, E. D., Zielinski, M., Žídek, A., Bapst, V., Kohli, P., Jaderberg, M., Hassabis, D., and Jumper, J. M. Accurate structure prediction of biomolecular interactions with alphafold 3. *Nature*, 630(8016):493–500, June 2024. ISSN 0028-0836, 1476-4687.
- Alamdari, S., Thakkar, N., van den Berg, R., Lu, A. X., Fusi, N., Amini, A. P., and Yang, K. K. Protein generation with evolutionary diffusion: sequence is all you need. *bioRxiv*, pp. 2023–09, 2023a.
- Alamdari, S., Thakkar, N., Van Den Berg, R., Lu, A. X., Fusi, N., Amini, A. P., and Yang, K. K. Protein generation with evolutionary diffusion: Sequence is all you need, September 2023b.
- Axelrod, S. and Gómez-Bombarelli, R. Geom, energy-annotated molecular conformations for property prediction and molecular generation. *Scientific Data*, 9(1):185, April 2022. ISSN 2052-4463.
- Baek, M., DiMaio, F., Anishchenko, I., Dauparas, J., Ovchinnikov, S., Lee, G. R., Wang, J., Cong, Q., Kinch, L. N., Schaeffer, R. D., Millán, C., Park, H., Adams, C., Glassman, C. R., DeGiovanni, A., Pereira, J. H., Rodrigues, A. V., Van Dijk, A. A., Ebrecht, A. C., Opperman, D. J., Sagmeister, T., Buhlheller, C., Pavkov-Keller, T., Rathinaswamy, M. K., Dalwadi, U., Yip, C. K., Burke, J. E., Garcia, K. C., Grishin, N. V., Adams, P. D., Read, R. J., and Baker, D. Accurate prediction of protein structures and interactions using a three-track neural network. *Science*, 373(6557):871–876, August 2021. ISSN 0036-8075, 1095-9203.
- Battiloro, C., Karaismailoğlu, E., Tec, M., Dasoulas, G., Audirac, M., and Dominici, F. $E(n)$ equivariant topological neural networks, July 2024.
- Batzner, S., Musaelian, A., Sun, L., Geiger, M., Mailoa, J. P., Kornbluth, M., Molinari, N., Smidt, T. E., and Kozinsky, B. $E(3)$ -equivariant graph neural networks for data-efficient and accurate interatomic potentials. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):2453, May 2022. ISSN 2041-1723.
- Bogatskiy, A., Ganguly, S., Kipf, T., Kondor, R., Miller, D. W., Murnane, D., Offermann, J. T., Pettee, M., Shanahan, P., Shimmin, C., et al. Symmetry group equivariant architectures for physics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.06153*, 2022.
- Bronstein, M. M., Bruna, J., Cohen, T., and Veličković, P. Geometric deep learning: Grids, groups, graphs, geodesics, and gauges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.13478*, 2021.
- Buttenschon, M., Morris, G. M., and Deane, C. M. Posebusters: Ai-based docking methods fail to generate physically valid poses or generalise to novel

- sequences. *Chemical Science*, 15(9):3130–3139, 2024. ISSN 2041-6520, 2041-6539.
- Cao, H., Tan, C., Gao, Z., Xu, Y., Chen, G., Heng, P.-A., and Li, S. Z. A survey on generative diffusion models. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2024.
- Chen, M., Mei, S., Fan, J., and Wang, M. An overview of diffusion models: Applications, guided generation, statistical rates and optimization, April 2024a.
- Chen, T., Vure, P., Pulugurta, R., and Chatterjee, P. Amp-diffusion: Integrating latent diffusion with protein language models for antimicrobial peptide generation. *bioRxiv*, pp. 2024–03, 2024b.
- Chen, T., Vure, P., Pulugurta, R., and Chatterjee, P. Amp-diffusion: Integrating latent diffusion with protein language models for antimicrobial peptide generation, March 2024c.
- Choi, J., Kim, S., Jeong, Y., Gwon, Y., and Yoon, S. Ilvr: Conditioning method for denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pp. 14347–14356, Montreal, QC, Canada, October 2021. IEEE. ISBN 978-1-66542-812-5.
- Cohen, T. et al. *Equivariant convolutional networks*. PhD thesis, Taco Cohen, 2021.
- Corso, G., Deng, A., Polizzi, N., Barzilay, R., and Jaakkola, T. The discovery of binding modes requires rethinking docking generalization. In *NeurIPS 2023 Generative AI and Biology (GenBio) Workshop*, 2023a.
- Corso, G., Stärk, H., Jing, B., Barzilay, R., and Jaakkola, T. Diffdock: Diffusion steps, twists, and turns for molecular docking, February 2023b.
- Corso, G., Deng, A., Fry, B., Polizzi, N., Barzilay, R., and Jaakkola, T. Deep confident steps to new pockets: Strategies for docking generalization. *ArXiv*, 2024.
- Croitoru, F.-A., Hondru, V., Ionescu, R. T., and Shah, M. Diffusion models in vision: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(9):10850–10869, September 2023. ISSN 0162-8828, 2160-9292, 1939-3539.
- Dunn, I. and Koes, D. R. Accelerating inference in molecular diffusion models with latent representations of protein structure. *ArXiv*, 2023.
- Elnaggar, A., Heinzinger, M., Dallago, C., Rehawi, G., Wang, Y., Jones, L., Gibbs, T., Feher, T., Angerer, C., Steinegger, M., Bhowmik, D., and Rost, B. Prottrans: Towards cracking the language of life’s code through self-supervised learning, July 2020.
- Gao, K., Pei, Q., Zhu, J., He, K., and Wu, L. Fabind+: Enhancing molecular docking through improved pocket prediction and pose generation, April 2024a.
- Gao, Z., Tan, C., Zhang, Y., Chen, X., Wu, L., and Li, S. Z. Proteininvbench: Benchmarking protein inverse folding on diverse tasks, models, and metrics. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024b.
- Ge, R., Dong, C., Wang, J., and Wei, Y. Editorial: Machine learning for peptide structure, function, and design. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 13:1007635, September 2022. ISSN 1664-8021.
- Goles, M., Daza, A., Cabas-Mora, G., Sarmiento-Varón, L., Sepúlveda-Yañez, J., Anvari-Kazemabad, H., Davari, M. D., Uribe-Paredes, R., Olivera-Nappa, Á., Navarrete, M. A., and Medina-Ortiz, D. Peptide-based drug discovery through artificial intelligence: Towards an autonomous design of therapeutic peptides. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 25(4):bbae275, May 2024. ISSN 1467-5463, 1477-4054.
- Guan, J., Qian, W. W., Peng, X., Su, Y., Peng, J., and Ma, J. 3d equivariant diffusion for target-aware molecule generation and affinity prediction, March 2023.
- Guo, H., Liu, S., Mingdi, H., Lou, Y., and Jing, B. Diffdock-site: A novel paradigm for enhanced protein-ligand predictions through binding site identification. In *NeurIPS 2023 Generative AI and Biology (GenBio) Workshop*, 2023a.
- Guo, Z., Liu, J., Wang, Y., Chen, M., Wang, D., Xu, D., and Cheng, J. Diffusion models in bioinformatics and computational biology. *Nature Reviews Bioengineering*, 2(2):136–154, October 2023b. ISSN 2731-6092.
- Haas, J., Barbato, A., Behringer, D., Studer, G., Roth, S., Bertoni, M., Mostaguir, K., Gumienny, R., and Schwede, T. Continuous automated model evaluation (cameo) complementing the critical assessment of structure prediction in casp12. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics*, 86(S1):387–398, 2018. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/prot.25431>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/prot.25431>.

- Hoogeboom, E., Satorras, V. G., Vignac, C., and Welling, M. Equivariant diffusion for molecule generation in 3d. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 8867–8887. PMLR, 2022.
- Huang, H., Sun, L., Du, B., and Lv, W. Conditional diffusion based on discrete graph structures for molecular graph generation, May 2023a.
- Huang, H., Sun, L., Du, B., and Lv, W. Learning joint 2d & 3d diffusion models for complete molecule generation, June 2023b.
- Huang, L., Zhang, H., Xu, T., and Wong, K.-C. Mdm: Molecular diffusion model for 3d molecule generation, September 2022.
- Huang, L., Xu, T., Yu, Y., Zhao, P., Chen, X., Han, J., Xie, Z., Li, H., Zhong, W., Wong, K.-C., and Zhang, H. A dual diffusion model enables 3d molecule generation and lead optimization based on target pockets. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):2657, March 2024. ISSN 2041-1723.
- Igashov, I., Stärk, H., Vignac, C., Schneuing, A., Satorras, V. G., Frossard, P., Welling, M., Bronstein, M., and Correia, B. Equivariant 3d-conditional diffusion model for molecular linker design. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 6(4):417–427, April 2024. ISSN 2522-5839.
- Ingraham, J. B., Baranov, M., Costello, Z., Barber, K. W., Wang, W., Ismail, A., Frappier, V., Lord, D. M., Ng-Thow-Hing, C., Van Vlack, E. R., Tie, S., Xue, V., Cowles, S. C., Leung, A., Rodrigues, J. V., Morales-Perez, C. L., Ayoub, A. M., Green, R., Puentes, K., Oplinger, F., Panwar, N. V., Obermeyer, F., Root, A. R., Beam, A. L., Poelwijk, F. J., and Grigoryan, G. Illuminating protein space with a programmable generative model. *Nature*, 623(7989):1070–1078, November 2023. ISSN 0028-0836, 1476-4687.
- Jo, J., Lee, S., and Hwang, S. J. Score-based generative modeling of graphs via the system of stochastic differential equations, June 2022.
- Jumper, J., Evans, R., Pritzel, A., Green, T., Figurnov, M., Ronneberger, O., Tunyasuvunakool, K., Bates, R., Židek, A., Potapenko, A., Bridgland, A., Meyer, C., Kohl, S. A. A., Ballard, A. J., Cowie, A., Romera-Paredes, B., Nikolov, S., Jain, R., Adler, J., Back, T., Petersen, S., Reiman, D., Clancy, E., Zielinski, M., Steinegger, M., Pacholska, M., Berghammer, T., Bodenstein, S., Silver, D., Vinyals, O., Senior, A. W., Kavukcuoglu, K., Kohli, P., and Hassabis, D. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *Nature*, 596(7873):583–589, August 2021. ISSN 0028-0836, 1476-4687.
- Ketata, M. A., Laue, C., Mammadov, R., Stärk, H., Wu, M., Corso, G., Marquet, C., Barzilay, R., and Jaakkola, T. S. Diffdock-pp: Rigid protein-protein docking with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03889*, 2023.
- Kingma, D. P., Salimans, T., Poole, B., and Ho, J. Variational diffusion models, April 2023.
- Klärner, L., Rudner, T. G. J., Morris, G. M., Deane, C. M., and Teh, Y. W. Context-guided diffusion for out-of-distribution molecular and protein design, July 2024.
- Kloeden, P. E., Platen, E., Kloeden, P. E., and Platen, E. *Stochastic differential equations*. Springer, 1992.
- Kong, X., Jia, Y., Huang, W., and Liu, Y. Full-atom peptide design with geometric latent diffusion, May 2024.
- Kovtun, D., Akdel, M., Goncarenco, A., Zhou, G., Holt, G., Baugher, D., Lin, D., Adeshina, Y., Castiglione, T., Wang, X., Marquet, C., McPartlon, M., Geffner, T., Rossi, E., Corso, G., Stärk, H., Carpenter, Z., Kucukbenli, E., Bronstein, M., and Naef, L. Pinder: The protein interaction dataset and evaluation resource, July 2024.
- Krishna, R., Wang, J., Ahern, W., Sturmfels, P., Venkatesh, P., Kalvet, I., Lee, G. R., Morey-Burrows, F. S., Anishchenko, I., Humphreys, I. R., et al. Generalized biomolecular modeling and design with rosettafold all-atom. *Science*, 384(6693):eadl2528, 2024.
- Le, T., Noé, F., and Clevert, D.-A. Equivariant graph attention networks for molecular property prediction, March 2022.
- Le, T., Cremer, J., Noé, F., Clevert, D.-A., and Schütt, K. Navigating the design space of equivariant diffusion-based generative models for de novo 3d molecule generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17296*, 2023.
- Le, T., Cremer, J., Noe, F., and Clevert, D.-A. Navigating the design space of equivariant diffusion-based generative models for de novo 3d molecule generation. 2024.
- Li, P., Li, Z., Zhang, H., and Bian, J. On the generalization properties of diffusion models, January 2024a.

- Li, P., Li, Z., Zhang, H., and Bian, J. On the generalization properties of diffusion models, January 2024b.
- Lin, H., Huang, Y., Zhang, O., Ma, S., Liu, M., Li, X., Wu, L., Wang, J., Hou, T., and Li, S. Z. Diffbp: Generative diffusion of 3d molecules for target protein binding, July 2024a.
- Lin, Y. and AlQuraishi, M. Generating novel, designable, and diverse protein structures by equivariantly diffusing oriented residue clouds, June 2023.
- Lin, Y., Lee, M., Zhang, Z., and AlQuraishi, M. Out of many, one: Designing and scaffolding proteins at the scale of the structural universe with genie 2, May 2024b.
- Lin, Z., Akin, H., Rao, R., Hie, B., Zhu, Z., Lu, W., Smetanin, N., Verkuil, R., Kabeli, O., Shmueli, Y., et al. Evolutionary-scale prediction of atomic-level protein structure with a language model. *Science*, 379(6637):1123–1130, 2023.
- Lisanza, S. L., Gershon, J. M., Tipps, S., Arnoldt, L., Hendel, S., Sims, J. N., Li, X., and Baker, D. Joint generation of protein sequence and structure with rosettafold sequence space diffusion. *bioRxiv*, pp. 2023–05, 2023.
- Liu, C., Wu, K., Choi, H., Han, H., Zhang, X., Watson, J. L., Shijo, S., Bera, A. K., Kang, A., Brackenbrough, E., Coventry, B., Hick, D. R., Hoofnagle, A. N., Zhu, P., Li, X., Decarreau, J., Gerben, S. R., Yang, W., Wang, X., Lamp, M., Murray, A., Bauer, M., and Baker, D. Diffusing protein binders to intrinsically disordered proteins, July 2024.
- Lu, W., Zhang, J., Huang, W., Zhang, Z., Jia, X., Wang, Z., Shi, L., Li, C., Wolynes, P. G., and Zheng, S. Dynamicbind: Predicting ligand-specific protein-ligand complex structure with a deep equivariant generative model. *Nature Communications*, 15(1): 1071, February 2024. ISSN 2041-1723.
- Mandell, D. J. and Kortemme, T. Backbone flexibility in computational protein design. *Current opinion in biotechnology*, 20(4):420–428, 2009.
- Mao, W., Zhu, M., Sun, Z., Shen, S., Wu, L. Y., Chen, H., and Shen, C. De novo protein design using geometric vector field networks, October 2023.
- Martin, A. J., Bau, D., Vullo, A., Walsh, I., and Polastri, G. Long-range information and physicality constraints improve predicted protein contact maps. *Journal of Bioinformatics and Computational Biology*, 6(05):1001–1020, 2008.
- Montalvão, R. W., Pitt, W. R., Pinheiro, V. B., and Blundell, T. L. Melodia: A python library for protein structure analysis. *Bioinformatics*, 40(7):btac468, July 2024. ISSN 1367-4811.
- Morehead, A. and Cheng, J. Geometry-complete diffusion for 3d molecule generation and optimization. *Communications Chemistry*, 7(1):150, July 2024. ISSN 2399-3669.
- Mukhopadhyay, M. A brief survey on bio inspired optimization algorithms for molecular docking, July 2014.
- Murphy, G. S., Mills, J. L., Miley, M. J., Machius, M., Szyperski, T., and Kuhlman, B. Increasing sequence diversity with flexible backbone protein design: the complete redesign of a protein hydrophobic core. *Structure*, 20(6):1086–1096, 2012.
- Ni, B., Kaplan, D. L., and Buehler, M. J. Generative design of de novo proteins based on secondary-structure constraints using an attention-based diffusion model. *Chem*, 9(7):1828–1849, July 2023. ISSN 24519294.
- Ni, B., Kaplan, D. L., and Buehler, M. J. Forcegen: End-to-end de novo protein generation based on nonlinear mechanical unfolding responses using a language diffusion model. *Science Advances*, 10(6): eadl4000, February 2024. ISSN 2375-2548.
- Niu, C., Song, Y., Song, J., Zhao, S., Grover, A., and Ermon, S. Permutation invariant graph generation via score-based generative modeling, March 2020.
- Norton, T. and Bhattacharya, D. Sifting through the noise: A survey of diffusion probabilistic models and their applications to biomolecules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01622*, 2024.
- Peebles, W. and Xie, S. Scalable diffusion models with transformers, March 2023.
- Pei, Q., Gao, K., Wu, L., Zhu, J., Xia, Y., Xie, S., Qin, T., He, K., Liu, T.-Y., and Yan, R. Fabind: Fast and accurate protein-ligand binding, January 2024.
- Peng, X., Guan, J., Liu, Q., and Ma, J. Moldiff: Addressing the atom-bond inconsistency problem in 3d molecule diffusion generation, May 2023.
- Pierce, N. A. and Winfree, E. Protein design is np-hard. *Protein Engineering, Design and Selection*, 15(10): 779–782, October 2002. ISSN 1741-0134, 1741-0126.
- Pinheiro, P. O., Jamasb, A., Mahmood, O., Sresht, V., and Saremi, S. Structure-based drug design by denoising voxel grids, July 2024.

- Qiao, Z., Nie, W., Vahdat, A., Miller III, T. F., and Anandkumar, A. State-specific protein-ligand complex structure prediction with a multi-scale deep generative model, April 2023.
- Ramakrishnan, R., Dral, P. O., Rupp, M., and Von Lilienfeld, O. A. Quantum chemistry structures and properties of 134 kilo molecules. *Scientific Data*, 1(1):140022, August 2014. ISSN 2052-4463.
- Rombach, R., Blattmann, A., Lorenz, D., Esser, P., and Ommer, B. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models, April 2022.
- Rossetto, A. M. and Zhou, W. Gandalf: A prototype of a gan-based peptide design method. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM International Conference on Bioinformatics, Computational Biology and Health Informatics*, pp. 61–66, Niagara Falls NY USA, September 2019. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-6666-3.
- Runcie, N. T. and Mey, A. S. Silvr: Guided diffusion for molecule generation. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 63(19):5996–6005, October 2023. ISSN 1549-9596, 1549-960X.
- Satorras, V. G., Hoogeboom, E., and Welling, M. E(n) equivariant graph neural networks, February 2022.
- Schneuing, A., Du, Y., Harris, C., Jamasb, A., Igashov, I., Du, W., Blundell, T., Lió, P., Gomes, C., Welling, M., Bronstein, M., and Correia, B. Structure-based drug design with equivariant diffusion models, June 2023.
- Sestak, F., Schneckenreiter, L., Brandstetter, J., Hochreiter, S., Mayr, A., and Klambauer, G. Vn-egnn: E (3)-equivariant graph neural networks with virtual nodes enhance protein binding site identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07194*, 2024.
- Song, J., Meng, C., and Ermon, S. Denoising diffusion implicit models, October 2022.
- Song, Y., Sohl-Dickstein, J., Kingma, D. P., Kumar, A., Ermon, S., and Poole, B. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13456*, 2020.
- Tang, X., Dai, H., Knight, E., Wu, F., Li, Y., Li, T., and Gerstein, M. A survey of generative ai for de novo drug design: new frontiers in molecule and protein generation. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 25(4):bbae338, 2024a.
- Tang, X., Dai, H., Knight, E., Wu, F., Li, Y., Li, T., and Gerstein, M. A survey of generative ai for *de novo* drug design: New frontiers in molecule and protein generation. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 25(4):bbae338, May 2024b. ISSN 1467-5463, 1477-4054.
- Trippe, B. L., Yim, J., Tischler, D., Baker, D., Broderick, T., Barzilay, R., and Jaakkola, T. Diffusion probabilistic modeling of protein backbones in 3d for the motif-scaffolding problem, March 2023.
- Tucs, A., Tran, D. P., Yumoto, A., Ito, Y., Uzawa, T., and Tsuda, K. Generating ampicillin-level antimicrobial peptides with activity-aware generative adversarial networks. *ACS Omega*, 5(36):22847–22851, September 2020. ISSN 2470-1343, 2470-1343.
- Vázquez Torres, S., Leung, P. J. Y., Venkatesh, P., Lutz, I. D., Hink, F., Huynh, H.-H., Becker, J., Yeh, A. H.-W., Juergens, D., Bennett, N. R., Hoofnagle, A. N., Huang, E., MacCoss, M. J., Expòsit, M., Lee, G. R., Bera, A. K., Kang, A., De La Cruz, J., Levine, P. M., Li, X., Lamb, M., Gerben, S. R., Murray, A., Heine, P., Korkmaz, E. N., Nivala, J., Stewart, L., Watson, J. L., Rogers, J. M., and Baker, D. De novo design of high-affinity binders of bioactive helical peptides. *Nature*, 626(7998):435–442, February 2024. ISSN 0028-0836, 1476-4687.
- Vignac, C., Krawczuk, I., Siraudin, A., Wang, B., Cevher, V., and Frossard, P. Digress: Discrete denoising diffusion for graph generation, May 2023a.
- Vignac, C., Osman, N., Toni, L., and Frossard, P. Midi: Mixed graph and 3d denoising diffusion for molecule generation, June 2023b.
- Wan, F., Kontogiorgos-Heintz, D., and De La Fuente-Nunez, C. Deep generative models for peptide design. *Digital Discovery*, 1(3):195–208, 2022. ISSN 2635-098X.
- Wang, C., Zhong, B., Zhang, Z., Chaudhary, N., Misra, S., and Tang, J. Pdb-struct: A comprehensive benchmark for structure-based protein design.
- Wang, L., Wang, N., Zhang, W., Cheng, X., Yan, Z., Shao, G., Wang, X., Wang, R., and Fu, C. Therapeutic peptides: Current applications and future directions. *Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy*, 7(1):48, February 2022. ISSN 2059-3635.
- Wang, R., Wang, T., Zhuo, L., Wei, J., Fu, X., Zou, Q., and Yao, X. Diff-amp: Tailored designed antimicrobial peptide framework with all-in-one generation, identification, prediction and optimization. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 25(2):bbae078, January 2024a. ISSN 1467-5463, 1477-4054.

- Wang, X., Zheng, Z., Ye, F., Xue, D., Huang, S., and Gu, Q. Dplm-2: A multimodal diffusion protein language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13782*, 2024b.
- Wang, X., Zheng, Z., Ye, F., Xue, D., Huang, S., and Gu, Q. Diffusion language models are versatile protein learners, February 2024c.
- Wang, X.-F., Tang, J.-Y., Liang, H., Sun, J., Dorje, S., Peng, B., Ji, X.-W., Li, Z., Zhang, X.-E., and Wang, D.-B. Prot-diff: A modularized and efficient approach to de novo generation of antimicrobial peptide sequences through integration of protein language model and diffusion model, February 2024d.
- Wang, Y., Liu, X., Huang, F., Xiong, Z., and Zhang, W. A multi-modal contrastive diffusion model for therapeutic peptide generation, January 2024e.
- Watson, J. L., Juergens, D., Bennett, N. R., Trippe, B. L., Yim, J., Eisenach, H. E., Ahern, W., Borst, A. J., Ragotte, R. J., Milles, L. F., et al. Broadly applicable and accurate protein design by integrating structure prediction networks and diffusion generative models. *BioRxiv*, pp. 2022–12, 2022.
- Watson, J. L., Juergens, D., Bennett, N. R., Trippe, B. L., Yim, J., Eisenach, H. E., Ahern, W., Borst, A. J., Ragotte, R. J., Milles, L. F., Wicky, B. I. M., Hanikel, N., Pellock, S. J., Courbet, A., Sheffler, W., Wang, J., Venkatesh, P., Sappington, I., Torres, S. V., Lauko, A., De Bortoli, V., Mathieu, E., Ovchinnikov, S., Barzilay, R., Jaakkola, T. S., DiMaio, F., Baek, M., and Baker, D. De novo design of protein structure and function with rfdiffusion. *Nature*, 620(7976):1089–1100, August 2023. ISSN 0028-0836, 1476-4687.
- Wei, R. and Mahmood, A. Recent advances in variational autoencoders with representation learning for biomedical informatics: A survey. *Ieee Access*, 9: 4939–4956, 2020.
- Weiss, T., Mayo Yanes, E., Chakraborty, S., Cosmo, L., Bronstein, A. M., and Gershoni-Poranne, R. Guided diffusion for inverse molecular design. *Nature Computational Science*, 3(10):873–882, 2023.
- Williams, D. C. and Inala, N. Physics-informed generative model for drug-like molecule conformers. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 64(8): 2988–3007, April 2024. ISSN 1549-9596, 1549-960X.
- Wu, L., Trippe, B., Naesseth, C., Blei, D., and Cunningham, J. P. Practical and asymptotically exact conditional sampling in diffusion models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Wu, R., Ding, F., Wang, R., Shen, R., Zhang, X., Luo, S., Su, C., Wu, Z., Xie, Q., Berger, B., et al. High-resolution de novo structure prediction from primary sequence. *BioRxiv*, pp. 2022–07, 2022.
- Xu, M., Yu, L., Song, Y., Shi, C., Ermon, S., and Tang, J. Geodiff: A geometric diffusion model for molecular conformation generation, March 2022.
- Xu, M., Powers, A., Dror, R., Ermon, S., and Leskovec, J. Geometric latent diffusion models for 3d molecule generation, May 2023.
- Xu, Y., Corso, G., Jaakkola, T., Vahdat, A., and Kreis, K. Disco-diff: Enhancing continuous diffusion models with discrete latents, July 2024.
- Yang, K., Zhou, Z., Li, L., Wang, P., Wang, X., and Wang, Y. Subdiff: Subgraph latent diffusion model. *OpenReview*, 2024.
- Yim, J., Trippe, B. L., De Bortoli, V., Mathieu, E., Doucet, A., Barzilay, R., and Jaakkola, T. Se(3) diffusion model with application to protein backbone generation, May 2023.
- Zhang, C., Leach, A., Makkink, T., Arbesú, M., Kadri, I., Luo, D., Mizrahi, L., Krichen, S., Lang, M., Tovchigrechko, A., Lopez Carranza, N., Şahin, U., Beguir, K., Rooney, M., and Fu, Y. Framedipt: Se(3) diffusion model for protein structure inpainting, November 2023a.
- Zhang, J., Liu, Z., Wang, Y., and Li, Y. Subgdiff: A subgraph diffusion model to improve molecular representation learning, May 2024.
- Zhang, M., Qamar, M., Kang, T., Jung, Y., Zhang, C., Bae, S.-H., and Zhang, C. A survey on graph diffusion models: Generative ai in science for molecule, protein and material. 2023b.
- Zheng, Z., Zhang, B., Zhong, B., Liu, K., Li, Z., Zhu, J., Yu, J., Wei, T., and Chen, H.-F. Scaffold-lab: Critical evaluation and ranking of protein backbone generation methods in a unified framework, February 2024.
- Ziv, Y., Marsden, B., and Deane, C. Molsnapper: Conditioning diffusion for structure based drug design. *bioRxiv*, pp. 2024–03, 2024a.
- Ziv, Y., Marsden, B., and Deane, C. M. Molsnapper: Conditioning diffusion for structure based drug design, March 2024b.
- Zongying, L., Hao, L., Liuzhenghao, L., Bin, L., Junwu, Z., Yu-Chian, C. C., Li, Y., and Yonghong, T. Taxdiff: Taxonomic-guided diffusion model for protein sequence generation, February 2024.

Appendix

Contents

A Model overview	18
A.1 Glossary	18
A.2 Mindmap for models	18
A.3 Model list	20
B Extension of Diffusion Models	24
B.1 Loss function of DDPM	24
B.2 Conditional Diffusion Models	24
C Compare with other models	24
C.1 Pros, cons, and developments of diffusion models	24
D Permutation equivariance	25
D.1 Permutation Equivariant	25
D.2 Relationship between Permutation Invariance and Permutation Equivariance	26
E $SE(3)$ Group	26
E.1 Definition of $SO(3)$ and $SE(3)$	26
E.2 $SE(3)$ for the representation of protein frame	27
F EGNNs	28
F.1 Relationship between $SE(3)$ and $E(3)$	28
F.2 Concept of EGNN	28
G AlphaFold3	29
H DiffDock	29
I Benchmarks	30
I.1 Benchmarks for protein	30
I.2 Benchmarks for molecular generation	30
J Comparison with existing reviews	30

This is the supplementary material for the review paper "From thermodynamics to protein design: Diffusion models for biomolecule generation towards autonomous protein engineering"

The design of proteins with desirable properties has been a major challenge for biotechnology for decades. Techniques such as directed evolution and rational design have aided protein engineering, but are limited in their explorability. Advances in artificial intelligence have improved on traditional methods and led to semi-rational design and machine learning-assisted directed evolution. Generative approaches such as variational autoencoders and generative adversarial networks have revolutionized biotechnology, but face challenges in the inference and validation of protein structures.

Recently, diffusion models have gained interest due to advances in geometric deep learning and computer hardware. These models show high capabilities in generating proteins with stable folding. The review presented here covers diffusion models, geometric deep learning, and matrices of biomolecule generation models. We will present these knowledge backgrounds individually and compare our review with existing ones to help researchers better understand developments in this area.

A. Model overview

A.1. Glossary

We describe the terms that are important to our review.

Terms	Description
$SE(3)$ -equivariance	Given an input point cloud P , and a random rotation matrix R , the network N satisfies $N(PR) = N(P)R$. This kind of network will keep the physical structure.
Atom stability performance	Atom stability is calculated as the ratio of atoms exhibiting correct valency, while molecule stability reflects the function of the generated molecules in which each atom maintains stability.
Protein language diffusion model (pLDM)	Map the protein sequence to a word-probability latent space. using a pretrained protein language model (pLM) and train a diffusion model to learn the map between sequence representations.
Physically realizable	Designable backbones have optimal secondary structure configurations with favored tertiary structure symmetries such that they are physically realizable with the 20 natural AAs.

A.2. Mindmap for models

Fig. 5 is a overview of models and the relationships among the models.




Figure 5: Mindmap of the 56 models featured in this review: the models boxed in continuous blue line are the $SE(3)$ equivariant models, the models gray boxes (like Pepflow and PepGLAD) are the $E(3)$ equivariant models, and the blue-shaded ones are models based on AlphaFold2. The dark blue branch line indicates the dependence on model classification, and the light blue branch line suggests that the later model is based on the former.

A.3. Model list

Models mentioned in this review have been implemented as open-source tools. We list their task, input, output, dataset for training, data size, and code link in Table 3. There are 16 models for protein design, 7 models for peptide generation, 24 models for small molecule generation, and 9 models for protein-ligand interaction, i.e., 56 models in total. This table may help users with their research problems and help developers further improve them.

Table 3: List of 56 models mentioned in the manuscript with their task, input, output, dataset, data size, code link and reference.

Task	Paper	Input	output	Dataset	Data Size	Code	Ref
Protein	RFDiffusion	structures	structures	PDB	-	code	(Watson et al., 2023)
	RFAA	sequence	structures	PDB	121,800	code	(Krishna et al., 2024)
	FrameDiff	structures	structures	PDB	20,312 backbones	code	(Yim et al., 2023)
	FrameDiPT	structures	structures; Full-atom	RCEB; PDB	9K clusters	code	(Zhang et al., 2023a)
	TDS	structures	structures	-	-	code	(Wu et al., 2024)
	SMCDiff	motif	scaffolds	PDB	4,269	code	(Trippe et al., 2023)
	VFN-Diff	structures	structures	PDB	-	code	(Mao et al., 2023)
	Genie	structures	structures	SCOPE	195,214	code	(Lin & AlQuraishi, 2023)
	Genie2	structures	structures	PDB; AFDB	588,570 structures	code	(Lin et al., 2024b)
	Chroma	sequence	structures	PDB, UniProt, PFAM	28,819 structures	code	(Ingraham et al., 2023)
	AlphaFold3	sequence; SMILES	structures	PDB 2021	41,000,000 structures	code	(Abramson et al., 2024)
	PG	sequences	structures, sequences	-	-	code	(Lisanza et al., 2023)
	TaxDiff	Sequence	Sequence	Alphafold Database; PDB	-	code	(Zongying et al., 2024)
	Forcegen	-	sequence	PDB	7,026 proteins	-	(Ni et al., 2024)

From thermodynamics to protein design

Peptide	DPLM	sequence	sequence	UniRef50	-	-	(Wang et al., 2024c)
	EvoDiff	protein sequences and MSAs	a new protein sequence	OpenFold	-	code	(Alamdari et al., 2023a)
	ProT-Diff	sequence	sequence	UniprotKB	567,834 peptides	-	(Wang et al., 2024d)
	PepGLAD	binding site		PDB and literature	-	-	(Kong et al., 2024)
	Pepflow	sequences	all-atom conformations	PDB; DBAASP	-	code	(Abdin & Kim, 2023a)
	RFDiffusion for peptide	structures	Designed binder	-	-	code	(Vázquez Torres et al., 2024)
	MMCD	sequence; structures	sequence; structures	Public databases	20,129 AMPs; 4,381 ACPs	code	(Wang et al., 2024e)
	Diff-AMP	sequence	sequence	CAMP server	8,225 AMP sequences	code	(Wang et al., 2024a)
	AMP-Diffusion	sequence	sequence	dbAMP, AMP Scanner, and DRAMP	195,121 peptide sequences	-	(Chen et al., 2024b)
	Molecule	EDM	structures	structures	QM9; GEOM-Drugs	100K	-
MDM		geometries	geometries	QM9; GEOM	290K	-	(Huang et al., 2022)
GCDM		3D graph	3D graph	QM9; GEOM-Drugs	100K	code	(Morehead & Cheng, 2024)
DiffSBDD		pockets	ligands	CrossDocked; Binding MOAD	-	code	(Schneuing et al., 2023)
GeoLDM		geometries	structures	QM9; GEOM-Drugs	-	code	(Xu et al., 2023)
MiDi		graph structures	graph	QM9; GEOM-Drugs	-	code	(Vignac et al., 2023b)

From thermodynamics to protein design

DiffLinker	structures	Molecule structures	ZINC, CASF, GEOM	185,678 examples	code	(Igashov et al., 2024)
PMDM	Molecule, protein pocket	molecule structures	CrossDocked	22.5 million docked protein-ligand pairs	code	(Huang et al., 2024)
EQGAT-Diff	structures	molecule structures	QM9; GEOM-Drugs; Cross-Docked; Pub-Chem3D	-	code	(Le et al., 2023)
DiffBP	binding site	molecule structures	CrossDocked	10,000 protein-ligand paired samples	-	(Lin et al., 2024a)
Keypoint Diffusion	molecule structures	ligands	BindingMOAD	40,000	code	(Dunn & Koes, 2023)
Geodiff	molecular graphs	molecular conformations	QM9; GEOM-Drugs	200,000 conformations	code	(Xu et al., 2022)
TargetDiff	binding site	binding molecules	CrossDocked	202000,000 complexes	code	(Guan et al., 2023)
MolDiff	molecular structures	molecular structures	QM9; GEOM-Drugs	231,523 molecules	code	(Peng et al., 2023)
MolSnapper	Protein-ligand complex	molecules	CrossDocked; Binding MOAD	-	code	(Ziv et al., 2024a)
CGD	molecule graph	molecule graph	Zink	250 000 small molecules	code	(Klarner et al., 2024)
GDSS	graph structures	structures	QM9 and ZINC250k	10,000 molecules	code	(Jo et al., 2022)
CDGS	graph	graph	ZINC250k; QM9	383,340 molecules	code	(Huang et al., 2023a)
DiGress	graph	atomic coordinates	MOSES and Gucamol	-	code	(Vignac et al., 2023a)
JODO	graph	graph	QM9; GEOM-Drugs; ZINC250k; MOSES	2,621,542 molecules	code	(Huang et al., 2023b)

From thermodynamics to protein design

Protein-ligand	SubGDiff	molecular graph	graph	PCQM4Mv2	3.4 million molecules	code	(Zhang et al., 2024)
	GaUDI	molecular graph	graph	cc-PBH; PAS	509,000 molecules	code	(Weiss et al., 2023)
	SILVR	multiple super-imposed fragments	graph	COVID Moonshot dataset	-	code	(Runcie & Mey, 2023)
	SubDiff	subgraph	generative graph	GEOM-Drug; QM9	-	-	(Yang et al., 2024)
	DiffDock	Ligand and protein structures	ligand pose distributions	PDBBind	-	code	(Corso et al., 2023b)
	DiffDock-PP	protein structures	complex structures	DIPS	42,826	code	(Ketata et al., 2023)
	Neural-PLexer	Protein Sequences; ligand Molecular Graphs	Complex Structures	PL2019-74k, PDB-Bind2020; Pocket-Miner;GPCRdb	74,477 samples	code	(Qiao et al., 2023)
	DiffDock-Site	protein structures	ligand structures	PDBBind	17,000 complexes	-	(Guo et al., 2023a)
	DiSco-Diff	molecular structures	molecular structures	PDBBind	-	code	(Xu et al., 2024)
	DockGen	protein and ligand structures	ligand	PDBBind; Binding MOAD	-	code	(Corso et al., 2023a)
	FABind	protein-ligand complex	binding pose of the ligand	PDBBind	17,299 complexes	code	(Pei et al., 2024)
	FABind+	protein-ligand graph	binding pose of the ligand	PDBBind	17,644 samples	-	(Gao et al., 2024a)
	Dynamic-Bind	protein structures	ligand and protein residues	PDBBind	19,443 crystal structures	code	(Lu et al., 2024)

B. Extension of Diffusion Models

We only introduced the representation of the diffusion model in the main text. In this part, we supplement its derivation, application, and improvement.

B.1. Loss function of DDPM

Definition B.1. (KL divergence) (Li et al., 2024b) Given two distributions p and q , the KL divergence from q to p is defined as $D_{kL} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p(x) \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} dx$.

The VAE (Wei & Mahmood, 2020) loss is a bound on the true log-likelihood (also called the variational lower bound):

$$-L_{VAE} = \log p_{\theta}(x) - D_{kL}(q_{\phi}(z|x)||p_{\theta}(z|x)) \leq \log p_{\theta}(x).$$

Apply the same trick to diffusion model:

$$-\log p_{\theta}(x_0) \leq \mathbb{E}_{q(x_{0:T})}[-\log \frac{p_{\theta}(x_{0:T})}{q(x_{1:T}|x_0)}] = L_{VLB}.$$

Expanding out,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{VLB} &= L_{reconstruct} + L_{prior} + L_{denoise}, \\ \text{where } L_{prior} &= D_{kL}(q(x_T|x_0)||p_{\theta}(x_T)), \\ L_{denoise} &= \sum_{t=2}^T D_{kL}(q(x_t|x_{t+1}, x_0)||p_{\theta}(x_t|x_{t+1})), \\ L_{reconstruct} &= -\log p_{\theta}(x_0|x_1). \end{aligned}$$

B.2. Conditional Diffusion Models

Denote the conditional information as y , the goal of conditional diffusion models is to generate samples from the conditional data distribution $p(\cdot|y)$. The conditional forward process can be written as:

$$dX_t^y = -\frac{1}{2}x_t^y dt + d\omega_t \quad \text{with } x_0^y \sim p_0(\cdot|y) \text{ and } t \in [0, T]. \quad (13)$$

Similarly, for sample generation, the backward process reverses the time in (13):

$$dx_t^y = [\frac{1}{2}x_t^y + \nabla \log p_{T-t}(x_t^y|y)]dt + d\bar{\omega}_t, \text{ for } t \in [0, T),$$

here $\nabla \log p_{T-t}(x_t^y|y)$ is the so-called conditional score function.

C. Compare with other models

Diffusion models have surpassed the previous dominant generative adversarial networks (GANs) in the challenging task of image synthesis. In particular, the computational resource requirements are much higher than those of GAN and VAE. Although diffusion models tend to be slow at generating samples, their generation of high-fidelity and high diversity samples has made them a popular choice for recent protein engineering applications.

C.1. Pros, cons, and developments of diffusion models

Diffusion models have some advantages over other models:

- They give amazing results for image, audio and text synthesis, while being relatively simple to implement.
- They are related to stochastic differential equations (SDEs), and thus their theoretical properties are particularly intriguing.

But diffusion models also have some technical shortcomings:

- They cannot learn the representation of biomolecules, and need the help of graph neural networks or large language models to complete the representation of structures or sequences.
- No dimensional changes. The dimensionality of input is kept across the whole model.

Developments for enhancing diffusion models (Cao et al., 2024): (1) speed up the standard Ordinary differential equation (ODE) or SDE simulation; (2) improve Brownian motion in pixel space; (3) enhance the diffusion ODE likelihood; (4) bridging distribution techniques that utilize diffusion model concepts to connect two distinct distributions.

D. Permutation equivariance

Permutation equivariance is an important concept in geometric graph neural networks. It is also used to generate molecules in diffusion models. We provide a detailed knowledge of it here.

D.1. Permutation Equivariant




Figure 6: Permutation is reordering the elements in a group.

A group is a set G with a binary operation $G \times G \rightarrow G$ denoted gh satisfying the following properties:

- Closure: $gh \in G$ for all $g, h \in G$;
- Associativity: $(gh)l = g(hl)$ for all $g, h, l \in G$;
- Identity: there exists a unique $e \in G$ satisfying $eg = ge = g$;
- Inverse: for each $g \in G$, there is a unique inverse $g^{-1} \in G$, such that $gg^{-1} = g^{-1}g = e$.

Permutation equivariance in a group means that permutation of the elements of a set (see Fig. 6) preserves set membership.

A graph G with N nodes is defined by its node features $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times F}$ and the weighted adjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ as $(x, A) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times F} \times \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} := \mathcal{G}$, where F is the dimension of the node features. Permutation equivariance for a graph implies that any permutation of the columns of x and A is equiprobable.

Theorem D.1. (Permutation equivariance of graph neural network) Consider consistent permutations of the shift operator $\hat{s} = P^T s P$ and input signal $\hat{x} = P^T x$. Then

$$\phi(\hat{x}; \hat{s}, H) = P^T \phi(x; s, \mathcal{H}).$$

D.2. Relationship between Permutation Invariance and Permutation Equivariance

Equivariance and invariance are two similar concepts, but lead to entirely different implications (see Fig. 7).

For invariance, we expect the output to remain completely unchanged regardless of changes in input: $f(\rho_g(x)) = f(x)$.

Definition D.2. (Permutation Operation on Matrix) Let $[N] \triangleq \{1, \dots, N\}$. Denote the set of permutations $\pi : [N] \Rightarrow [N]$ as Π_N . The node permutation operation on a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is defined by $A_{i,j}^{[\pi]} = A_{\pi(i),\pi(j)}$.

Definition D.3. (Permutation Invariant Function) A function f with $\mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ as its domain is permutation invariant if $\forall A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}, \forall \pi \in \Pi_N, f(A^{[\pi]}) = f(A)$.

Lemma D.4. (Permutation Invariance of Frobenius Inner Product) For any $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, the Frobenius inner product of A, B is $\langle A, B \rangle_F = \sum_{i,j} A_{ij}B_{ij} = \text{tr}(A^T B)$. Frobenius inner product operation is permutation invariant, i.e., $\forall \pi \in \Pi_N, \langle A^{[\pi]}, B^{[\pi]} \rangle_F = \langle A, B \rangle_F$.

Theorem D.5. (Relationship between permutation equivariance and invariance) (Niu et al., 2020) If $\mathbf{s} : \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is a permutation equivariant function, then the scalar function $f_{\mathbf{s}} = \int_{\gamma[\mathbf{0}, A]} \langle \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{X}), d\mathbf{X} \rangle_F + C$ is permutation invariant, where $\langle A, B \rangle_F = \text{tr}(A^T B)$ is the Frobenius inner product, $\gamma[\mathbf{0}, A]$ is any curve from $\mathbf{0} = \{0\}_{N \times N}$ to A , and $C \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant.




Figure 7: Invariance and equivariance.

E. $SE(3)$ Group

$SE(3)$ equivariance has been repeatedly mentioned in the review and plays an important role in the structure generation of proteins, peptides, small molecules, and protein ligands. Here we give its definition, properties, and relationship with the protein framework.

E.1. Definition of $SO(3)$ and $SE(3)$

In mathematics, a rigid can be abstracted into 3-dimensional geometric coordinates. Its position can be represented by a matrix of n coordinates, and operations such as rotating and translating the object are equivalent to multiplying the coordinates by a 3-dimensional matrix. i.e.,

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 & y_2 & z_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_n & y_n & z_n \end{pmatrix} \times \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & b_1 & c_1 \\ a_2 & b_2 & c_2 \\ a_3 & b_3 & c_3 \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{denoted as } A} = \begin{pmatrix} x'_1 & y'_2 & z'_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x'_n & y'_n & z'_n \end{pmatrix}$$

Definition E.1. (Representation) An n -dimensional real representation of a group G is a map $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, assigning to each $g \in G$ an invertible matrix $\rho(g)$, and satisfying

$$\rho(e) = 1, \quad \rho(gh) = \rho(g)\rho(h), \quad \forall g, h \in G.$$

According to Definition E.1, a group can be uniquely represented by a matrix. Here, we introduce several general groups. A general linear group $GL(n)$ is the group of invertible $n \times n$ matrices. A matrix $A \in GL(n)$ is orthogonal if $Av \cdot Aw = v \cdot w$ for all vectors v and w . If A is an orthogonal matrix, it is equivalent to a rotation transformation of the object. We mark this type of transformation as $O(3)$. If A is an orthogonal matrix and its determinant is 1, it is called a special orthogonal matrix. The corresponding transformation is the combination of rotation and reflection transformation, denoted as $SO(3)$.

The orthogonal matrices form a subgroup $O(n)$ of $GL(n)$. The orthogonal matrices with determinant 1 form a subgroup $SO(n) \subset O(n) \subset GL(n)$ called the special orthogonal group.

The special Orthogonal group in 3 dimensions consists of the 3D rotation matrices:

$$SO(3) = \{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} : \gamma^T \gamma = \gamma \gamma^T = \mathbf{I}, \det \gamma = 1\}.$$

Inner product and distance on $SO(3)$:

$$\langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle_{SO(3)} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\gamma_1^T \gamma_2) \quad d_{SO(3)}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \|\log(\gamma_1^T \gamma_2)\|_F.$$

The special Euclidean group, $SE(3)$ is used to represent rigid body transformations in 3D:

$$SE(3) = \left\{ A \mid A = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : \gamma \in SO(3), s \in (\mathbb{R}^3, +) \right\}.$$

Inner product and distance on $SE(3)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_1, A_2 \rangle_{SE(3)} &= \langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle_{SO(3)} + \langle s_1, s_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} \\ d_{SE(3)}(A_1, A_2) &= \sqrt{d_{SO(3)}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)^2 + d_{\mathbb{R}^3}(s_1, s_2)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

$SE(3)$ satisfies the following four axioms:

- The set is closed under the binary operation. $A, B \in SE(3) \Rightarrow AB \in SE(3)$.
- The binary operation is associative. $A, B, C \in SE(3) \Rightarrow (AB)C = A(BC)$.
- $\exists I \in SE(3)$, s.t., $\forall A \in SE(3)$, $AI = A$.
- $\forall A \in SE(3)$, $\exists A^{-1} \in SE(3)$, $AA^{-1} = I$.

Definition E.2. (Manifold) A manifold of dimension n is a set M locally homeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^n .

Definition E.3. (Lie Group) A Lie group is a topological group that is also a differentiable manifold and such that the composition and inverse operations $G \times G \rightarrow G$ and $G \rightarrow G$ are infinitely differentiable functions.

$SE(3)$ is a continuous group, and the open set of elements of $SE(3)$ has 1-1 map onto an open set of \mathbb{R}^6 . In other words, $SE(3)$ is a differentiable manifold, i.e., a Lie group.

E.2. $SE(3)$ for the representation of protein frame

For a protein frame, the atomic coordinates can be defined as:

$$[N_n, C_n, (C_\alpha)_n] = [T_n] \cdot [N^*, C^*, C_\alpha^*],$$

n is the index of residue, $r_n = \text{Gram-Schmidt}(v_1, v_2)$, $x_n = C_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $T_n = (r_n, x_n)$ is a member of the special Euclidean group $SE(3)$.

Advantage to use $SE(3)$ equivariant graph neural networks for protein generation:




Figure 8: Visualization of a protein frame.

- Leverage symmetries can improve sample efficiency, reduce complexity, and enhance generalizability.
- Respect geometrical or physical constraints.
- Interpretability. A model constrained by the symmetry group(s) of the underlying problem may be more interpretable than a general one, not only because it is likely to have fewer parameters but also because these parameters will represent physically meaningful observables.

F. EGNNs

In this section, we present Equivariant Graph Neural Networks (EGNNs) and demonstrate their definition and relationship with $SE(3)$ equivariant neural network.

F.1. Relationship between $SE(3)$ and $E(3)$

$E(3)$ is the notation for the Euclidean group that denotes the set of isometric transformations in Euclidean space, and the transformations in $E(3)$ include translation, rotation, and reflection. The relationship between $SE(3)$ and $E(3)$ (see Fig. 9): $SE(3)$ is a subgroup of $E(3)$ that includes only translation and rotation, while $E(3)$ includes the motions of $SE(3)$ as well as reflective motions. In other words, $SE(3)$ is a subset of $E(3)$ that remains oriented.

$E(3)$ equivariant neural networks are computationally more efficient and have been shown to perform equal to, or better than, $SE(3)$ equivariant networks for the modelling of quantum chemical properties and dynamic systems (Bogatskiy et al., 2022).

F.2. Concept of EGNN

A point cloud is a finite set of 3D coordinates where every point has a corresponding feature vector. A function f is $E(3)$ -equivariant if for any point cloud x , orthogonal matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ and translation vector $t \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we have: $f(Rx + t) = Rf(x) + t$. A conditional distribution $p(x|y)$ is $E(3)$ -equivariant if for any point clouds x, y , $p(Rx + t|Ry + t) = p(x|y)$. A function f and a distribution p are $O(3)$ -equivariant if $f(Rx) = Rf(x)$ and $p(Rx|Ry) = p(x|y)$.

Definition F.1. An equivariant neural network is a neural network in which each layer is a direct sum of permutation representation representations, and all linear maps are G-equivariant.

Equivariant graph neural networks (EGNNs) according to the definition of (Satorras et al., 2022) equivariant to the Euclidean group $E(3)$ of rigid motions (rotations, translations, and reflections) in addition to the standard permutation equivariance. EGNNs have attracted attention in the natural and medical sciences because they represent a new tool for analyzing molecules and their properties. Reasons for the use of EGNNs:

- Rotations and translations in 3D space act on the entire input set of particles and lead to the same translations on their entire trajectory.




Figure 9: Information about $E(3)$ group. Top subplot: Illustration of translation, reflection and rotation. Bottom subplot: Relationship among several general groups.

- No matter which model we use, we will have to generalize over the equivariant of this task to achieve good performance.
- EGNN is more data efficient than GNN since it does not require generalization over rotations and translations of the data.

EGNNs are computationally efficient and easy to implement, but are limited in use cases and sometimes hard to abstract real-world scenarios into a coordinate system.

G. AlphaFold3

AlphaFold3 offers several improvements over its predecessor, AlphaFold2. Here, we highlight two of the most important differences and improvements that characterize AF3.

- **Spatial transformation and generative prediction:** AF3 deviates from equivariant spatial transformations such as IPA used in AF2. Instead, it uses a diffusion-based approach for structure prediction.
- **Architectural simplifications:** The Evoformer stack used in AF2 to work with MSA and residue pairs is replaced by the Pairformer stack, which works exclusively with token pairs.

Fig. 10 shows details about the mentioned blocks and helps us to understand the two main differences.

Deep learning is powerful, and AlphaFold has alleviated the trouble from various biologists of finding collaborators to perform protein modeling. It is indeed very nice to note that biologists feel confident and independent to try out their models. However, few outstanding issues provide scope for future research such as modeling of multi-domain proteins and modeling of unstructured regions.

H. DiffDock

DiffDock is a diffusion model tailored for protein-ligand docking that defines the diffusion process over the degrees of freedom associated with ligand poses, including ligand translations, rotations, and torsion angles (as

depicted in Figure 11). It achieves high selectivity and precision by employing a confidence model that forecasts confidence levels for ligand poses generated *via* reverse stochastic differential equations. This model leverages the capabilities of diffusion models and adapts them specifically for the task of protein-ligand docking, presenting a novel contribution to the field.

I. Benchmarks

I.1. Benchmarks for protein

To evaluate the performance of the models for protein backbone generation, it is crucial to establish and utilize robust benchmarks. These benchmarks not only facilitate the assessment of different generation methods, but also provide a standardized framework for comparing their strengths and limitations across various criteria. In the following, we outline several widely used benchmarks for evaluating protein backbone generation methods.

- PDB-struct (Wang et al.) suggests that encoder-decoder methods generally outperform structure-prediction-based methods in terms of refoldability, recovery, and stability metrics.
- Scaffold-Lab (Zheng et al., 2024) focuses on the evaluation of unconditional generation across metrics such as designability, novelty, diversity, efficiency, and structural properties.
- Melodia (Montalvão et al., 2024) is a Python library with a complete set of components devised for protein structural analysis and visualization using differential geometry of three-dimensional curves and knot theory. Residue-wise confidence predicted local distance different test (pLDDT) and pairwise confidence predicted alignment error (PAE).
- PINDER (Kovtun et al., 2024) offers substantial advancement in the field of deep learning-based protein-protein docking and complex modeling by addressing key limitations of existing training and benchmark datasets.
- ProteinInvBench (Gao et al., 2024b) is a benchmark for protein design, which comprises extended protein design tasks, integrated models, and diverse evaluation metrics (see Fig. 12).

I.2. Benchmarks for molecular generation

The goal of unconstrained molecular generation is to generate molecules that are:

- Valid and unique. Validity is the percentage of valid molecules measured by RDKit, uniqueness is the percentage of unique molecules among the valid molecules.
- Based on a chemical distribution corresponding to the training set.
- Novel and diverse. Novelty is the percentage of valid molecules not found in the training set. Diversity is the opposite of recovery and is meaningless if we measure it alone. If we examine sequence diversity and structural sc-TM together, we could gain a more comprehensive understanding of the designable protein space. To expand sequence diversity, we need to allow perturbations in the conformation of the protein backbone.

Continuous Automated Model Evaluation (CAMEO) (Haas et al., 2018) ligand-docking evaluation, publishes weekly benchmarking results based on models collected during a 4-day prediction window and evaluates their performance. The Frachet ChemNetDistance (FCD) measure the similarity between molecules in the training set and in the test set using the embedding learned by a neural network.

J. Comparison with existing reviews

Here we list the existing reviews on diffusion models for protein design, along with their frameworks and applications, see Table 4.

Table 4: Comparison of this review with existing surveys on Diffusion model for biomolecule generation: Frameworks and applications are enumerated

Surveys	Frameworks					Applications			
	<i>Categorization</i>	<i>Benchmarks</i>	<i>Challenges</i>	<i>Future Works</i>	<i>mathematics behind</i>	<i>Protein generation</i>	<i>Peptide design</i>	<i>Molecule generation</i>	<i>Protein-ligand interaction</i>
Ours	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
(Norton & Bhattacharya, 2024)	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓
(Guo et al., 2023b)	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓
(Zhang et al., 2023b)	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓




Figure 10: Differences between AF2 and AF3.






Figure 11: Visualization of DiffDock architecture.

Tasks: Designing proteins over single-chain, multi-chain and de-novo structures



Models: Recent strong baselines that provide open-source training code



Metrics: The most comprehensive evaluation metrics to date




Figure 12: The framework of ProteinInvBench (Gao et al., 2024b): tasks \Rightarrow models \Rightarrow metrics. Green, blue, yellow: widely considered, partially considered, newly introduced contents.