

# Prot42\*: a Novel Family of Protein Language Models for Target-aware Protein Binder Generation

Mohammad Amaan Sayeed<sup>1</sup>, Engin Tekin<sup>2</sup>, Maryam Nadeem<sup>1</sup>, Nancy A. ElNaker<sup>1</sup>, Aahan Singh<sup>1</sup>, Natalia Vassilieva<sup>2</sup>, and Boulbaba Ben Amor<sup>†1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Inception Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Abu Dhabi, UAE.

<sup>2</sup>Cerebras Systems, Sunnyvale, CA, USA.

## Abstract

Unlocking the next generation of biotechnology and therapeutic innovation demands overcoming the inherent complexity and resource-intensity of conventional protein engineering methods. Recent GenAI-powered computational techniques often rely on the availability of the target protein's 3D structures and specific binding sites to generate high-affinity binders, constraints exhibited by models such as AlphaProteo and RFdiffusion. In this work, we explore the use of Protein Language Models (pLMs) for high-affinity binder generation. We introduce Prot42, a novel family of Protein Language Models (pLMs) pretrained on vast amounts of unlabeled protein sequences. By capturing deep evolutionary, structural, and functional insights through an advanced autoregressive, decoder-only architecture inspired by breakthroughs in natural language processing, Prot42 dramatically expands the capabilities of computational protein design based on language only. Remarkably, our models handle sequences up to 8,192 amino acids, significantly surpassing standard limitations and enabling precise modeling of large proteins and complex multi-domain sequences. Demonstrating powerful practical applications, Prot42 excels in generating high-affinity protein binders and sequence-specific DNA-binding proteins. Our innovative models are publicly available, offering the scientific community an efficient and precise computational toolkit for rapid protein engineering. Explore our Foundation models at [huggingface.co/inceptionai](https://huggingface.co/inceptionai).




Figure 1: An example of generated protein binder to bind the Human InsR - Insulin Receptor protein (PDB ID 4zxb) in particular Site 1 (PDB ID 4oga) in panel (c) showing high binding affinity; (b) the natural binder (Ins - Insulin); and (a) the Insulin Receptor (Target protein).

\*Prot42 is part of the Omics42 platform which includes also a family of genomic LMs and a family of chemical LMs named Gene42 and Chem42, respectively. Refer to **Omics42** blog at [huggingface.co/inceptionai](https://huggingface.co/inceptionai) for further details.

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author: Boulbaba Ben Amor [boulbaba.amor@inceptionai.ai](mailto:boulbaba.amor@inceptionai.ai)

# 1 Introduction

Protein binders, including antibodies and engineered proteins, play pivotal roles in biotechnology and therapeutic applications ranging from diagnostics to targeted drug delivery [Bradbury et al. \[2011\]](#), [Leader et al. \[2008\]](#). Traditional experimental methods for generating specific protein binders are resource-intensive and limited by combinatorial complexity. Structure-based computational approaches have emerged as promising alternatives, with notable advances including AlphaProteo [Zambaldi et al. \[2024\]](#) and RFdiffusion [Watson et al. \[2023b\]](#), which achieve high experimental success rates while requiring significantly fewer candidates to screen compared to previous methods. Despite these advances, current approaches present key limitations: they fundamentally depend on target protein 3D structures and explicit binding site specifications, creating bottlenecks for targets with limited structural data. Protein language models (pLMs) offer promising alternatives by operating primarily at the sequence level [Yang et al. \[2022b\]](#), [Elnaggar et al. \[2021\]](#), [Rives et al. \[2021\]](#), leveraging large-scale unlabeled protein sequence data to learn representations that capture evolutionary relationships and structural properties [Rao et al. \[2021b\]](#). However, current pLMs face critical limitations in maximum sequence length and generative capabilities. Models like ESM-1b [Rives et al. \[2021\]](#) and ProtBert [Elnaggar et al. \[2021\]](#) demonstrate strong encoding abilities but lack native generative functionalities and typically constrain input to around 1,024 amino acids. This limits their effectiveness in modeling complex proteins and binding interfaces [Xu and et al. \[2022\]](#). Recent advances like Evo-2, a biological foundation model trained on 9.3 trillion DNA base pairs, have expanded capabilities with context windows up to one million tokens [Brix et al. \[2024\]](#), but primarily model DNA sequences rather than directly addressing protein-specific functionalities, highlighting the need for specialized protein-level generative models.

In this work, we introduce Prot42—a family of protein language models (pLMs) that harnesses the generative power of auto-regressive, decoder-only architectures, inspired by cutting-edge advancements in natural language processing, such as the LLaMA model [Touvron et al. \[2023\]](#). We pre-train two Prot42 variants, with 500 million and 1.1 billion parameters, initially supporting sequences up to 1,024 amino acids. Through continuous pretraining, we extend their context length to 8,192 residues, unlocking the ability to capture complex long-range dependencies essential for modeling large proteins, multidomain assemblies, and intricate molecular interactions. This enhanced representation power is pivotal for generating high-affinity protein binders, accelerating the discovery of novel biomolecular interactions. We detail our model architecture, pretraining methodologies, and our context-length scaling strategy, highlighting its impact on sequence modeling accuracy. Furthermore, we evaluate Prot42 using perplexity-based assessments, demonstrating its improved predictive performance across extended sequence contexts. To showcase its real-world applications, we present 1) Protein Binder Generation, with a particular focus on 2) Sequence-specific DNA-binding proteins. Our findings illustrate how Prot42’s advanced generative capabilities redefine the frontiers of computational protein design, enabling rapid, precise, and scalable protein engineering. As an initial demonstration of Prot42’s design power, [Figure 1](#) presents a high-affinity binder, computationally generated to target the  $\alpha$ -subunit of the Insulin Receptor (InsR), compared to the natural insulin binder (PDB ID 4oga).

## 2 Related Works

Protein language models (pLMs) have emerged as powerful tools in computational biology by learning rich representations directly from extensive unlabeled protein sequence databases. This approach effectively bridges the gap between the large number of known protein sequences and the relatively small subset (<0.3%) with experimentally verified functions [Yang et al. \[2022b\]](#). pLMs capture intricate evolutionary and biochemical patterns, surpassing traditional features based on physicochemical or statistical analyzes [Chou \[2001\]](#), [Dubchak et al. \[1995\]](#), [Shen and Chou \[2007\]](#), [Altschul \[1997\]](#), [Zou \[2011\]](#). Consequently, they have significantly improved various tasks, including annotation of protein functions, structural prediction, and novel sequence generation [Yang et al. \[2022b\]](#). Early deep learning models adapted natural language processing (NLP) frameworks such as word2vec and doc2vec to protein sequences, effectively capturing evolutionary and functional motifs [Mikolov et al. \[2013\]](#), [Le and Mikolov \[2014\]](#), [Yang \[2018\]](#), [Asgari and Mofrad \[2015\]](#), [Bepler and Berger \[2019\]](#), [Rao \[2019\]](#). These initial models laid the foundation for deeper and more sophisticated architectures pre-trained on larger datasets, leading to substantial improvements in protein representation quality. Notable early

examples include UniRep [Alley \[2019\]](#) and ProtXLNet [Elnaggar \[2021\]](#), which leveraged autoregressive next amino acid prediction strategies.

## Protein Language Models

Transformer-based architectures marked a significant leap forward. Models such as TAPE Transformer [Rao \[2019\]](#), ProtBert, ProtAlbert, ProtElectra, and ProtT5 [Elnaggar et al. \[2021\]](#) have adopted masked language modeling (MLM) approaches, significantly advancing protein representation learning. ProtBert, a key model from the ProtTrans family, utilizes a BERT-adapted bidirectional transformer encoder architecture, consisting of 30 layers and 16 attention heads per layer with approximately 420 million parameters. ProtBert was pre-trained on the massive BFD dataset, containing around 2.1 billion protein sequences, significantly enriching its capability to represent evolutionary variations. ProtBert has shown robust performance in various protein prediction tasks, although slightly behind ESM-1b, with a mean reciprocal rank (MRR) around 0.23 [Elnaggar et al. \[2021\]](#), [Edera et al. \[2022\]](#), [Xu and et al. \[2022\]](#). ESM-1 (Evolutionary Scale Modeling) introduced transformer-based pLMs trained using masked language modeling on UniRef50 database, a dataset comprising clusters of UniProt sequences at 50% sequence identity [Rives et al. \[2021\]](#). ESM-1b, a prominent variant, utilizes a deep transformer architecture consisting of 34 self-attention layers and approximately 650 million parameters, achieving state-of-the-art performance in protein function and structure prediction tasks, including remote homology detection and mutational effect predictions. When augmented with auxiliary contact prediction tasks, ESM-1b notably achieves MRR of approximately 0.517 [Xu and et al. \[2022\]](#), [Rives et al. \[2021\]](#), [Rao et al. \[2021b\]](#). ESM-2 expanded upon ESM-1 by increasing model complexity and refining training protocols, enhancing its representational capabilities. It utilized larger datasets and more sophisticated training regimes, achieving superior results on protein functional annotation and structure prediction tasks compared to previous versions [Lin et al. \[2023\]](#). The recently introduced ESM-3 ? significantly scales the model parameters and introduces advanced architectural innovations designed to capture intricate structural motifs and long-range dependencies more effectively. These improvements solidify its position as a state-of-the-art transformer-based PLM, offering enhanced capabilities in structural and functional protein modeling tasks [Lin et al. \[2023\]](#). Structural information, including multiple sequence alignments (MSA), three-dimensional (3D) structures, and surface features, has also been integrated into pLMs, enhancing their representational learning power [Rao et al. \[2021a\]](#), [Biswas et al. \[2021\]](#), [Sturmfels et al. \[2020\]](#), [Senior \[2020\]](#), [Jumper \[2021\]](#), [Gainza \[2020\]](#), [Sverrisson et al. \[2021\]](#), [Kipf et al. \[2020\]](#). However, sequence-based methods remain dominant because of the significantly larger availability of sequence data compared to structural data. Benchmarks such as CASP [Moult \[2005\]](#), CAFA [Radivojac \[2013\]](#), TAPE [Rao \[2019\]](#), FLIP [Dallago \[2021\]](#), TDA [Chen \[2022\]](#), ATOM3D [Townshend \[2021\]](#), and PEER [Xu and et al. \[2022\]](#) systematically evaluate these models, consistently demonstrating the superiority of transformer-based pLMs.

## Computational Design of Protein Binders

Protein binders, including antibodies and engineered proteins, play pivotal roles in biotechnology and therapeutic applications ranging from diagnostics and imaging to targeted drug delivery [Bradbury et al. \[2011\]](#), [Leader et al. \[2008\]](#). Traditionally, generating highly specific protein binders relies extensively on experimental techniques such as phage display and directed evolution [Smith \[1985\]](#), [Packer and Liu \[2015\]](#). Despite their efficacy, these methods are resource-intensive, time-consuming, and limited by the combinatorial complexity inherent in protein sequences.

While recent advancements in protein binder design have leveraged both structure-based and sequence-based approaches, each method remains constrained in several significant ways. Structure-based methods such as AlphaProteo [Zambaldi et al. \[2024\]](#), RFDiffusion [Watson et al. \[2023a\]](#), and MASIF-Seed [Gainza et al. \[2020\]](#) rely heavily on extensive high-resolution structural data, restricting their applicability to protein targets with well-defined three-dimensional conformations. For instance, AlphaProteo demonstrates experimental success rates of 9-88% across diverse targets, significantly outperforming previous methods. However, AlphaProteo requires screening between 54-172 designs per target, with previous similar approaches needing thousands to hundreds of thousands of designs to achieve comparable results. Similarly, RFDiffusion [Watson et al. \[2023b\]](#) employs diffusion models operating in 3D structural space to create novel protein binders, achieving success rates of 0-33% across various targets while typically screening 95-15,000 candidates per target. Both approaches have

yielded impressive results for therapeutic candidates, but they fundamentally rely on the availability of target protein 3D structures and explicit binding site specifications. This structural dependency and computational intensity create bottlenecks in rapidly designing binders for targets with limited or no structural data.

Conversely, recent sequence-based models, including PepMLM [Ferruz et al. \[2022\]](#), ProGen2 [Nijkamp et al. \[2023\]](#), and moPPIt [Chen et al. \[2024\]](#), have demonstrated promising generative capabilities but remain primarily effective for shorter peptides and struggle to generalize to larger, therapeutically relevant protein binders [Chen et al. \[2024\]](#). Additionally, these methods typically require auxiliary task-specific training objectives or manual curation of functional motifs, further limiting their applicability. While moPPIt advances epitope-specific binding through its multi-objective optimization approach, it remains computationally unvalidated for disordered targets and would benefit from experimental confirmation of its predicted binding interactions.

Despite these advances, there remains a significant gap in the field for protein language models that combine extended context length capabilities with true generative power, especially for designing full-length protein binders with complex binding interfaces and long-range dependencies. This gap motivates our development of Prot42, which specifically addresses these limitations through its architecture and training methodology.

## Sequence-specific DNA-binding Proteins Design

Sequence-specific DNA-binding proteins are crucial regulators of gene expression in all organisms. Transcription factors (TF) represent a primary example of this class, binding to specific DNA sequences - typically within promoter or enhancer regions - to regulate the transcription of target genes [\[Spandidos Publications, 2024\]](#). By recruiting or blocking RNA polymerase and interacting with various cofactors, TFs precisely coordinate when and where genes are activated or silenced, thus directing essential cellular functions and establishing cell identity. Numerous vital biological processes, such as development, cell cycle control, and responses to environmental stress, rely on sophisticated networks of DNA-binding proteins that act collaboratively. Disruptions or mutations in these proteins can lead to abnormal gene expression, contributing to disease development, including cancers driven by misregulated TFs. In addition, other sequence-specific DNA-binding proteins, such as bacterial restriction enzymes (which recognize and cleave foreign DNA sequences) and DNA repair or recombination proteins (targeting particular DNA motifs), play crucial roles in maintaining genomic integrity. Collectively, sequence-specific DNA binding proteins interpret genomic regulatory information, ensuring precise gene activation and maintaining normal cellular function [\[Spandidos Publications, 2024\]](#). Given their fundamental biological significance, computational methods for identifying and characterizing DNA-binding proteins have attracted extensive research interest. Historically, traditional machine learning approaches employed features such as amino acid composition, conserved motifs, and evolutionary profiles, establishing foundational insights. However, deep learning techniques, particularly convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and recurrent neural networks (RNNs), which take advantage of extensive and comprehensive datasets, have significantly improved the accuracy of DNA-binding residue and motif predictions [\[IEEE, 2024, Kumar et al., 2024\]](#). Integrating protein language models (pLMs), such as ProtTrans, with multi-window CNN architectures has further improved performance, capturing intrinsic biochemical properties and sequence motifs essential for DNA-binding recognition, as demonstrated by a remarkable area under the ROC curve (AUC) of 0.89 [\[Liu et al., 2024\]](#). Furthermore, graph-based neural networks that integrate three-dimensional structural contexts via residue contact maps and spatial graphs have further elevated predictive capabilities. These methods, supported by breakthroughs in protein structure prediction such as AlphaFold2, now offer highly accurate computational tools for genome annotation, elucidation of gene regulatory networks, and the development of targeted gene editing technologies. Advances in protein foundational models not only bolster predictive accuracy, but also open transformative possibilities for the generation of novel DNA-binding proteins. Recent computational design methodologies, exemplified by the work of Glasscock et al., [\[Glasscock et al., 2024a\]](#) utilize powerful generative capabilities inherent in foundational protein models to engineer novel proteins that recognize specific DNA sequences through major groove interactions. These designed proteins exhibited precise target sequence specificity and affinities in the nanomolar range (30–100 nM). Structural validation through crystal structures underscored the high accuracy and reliability of these computational models. Importantly, these newly generated proteins demonstrated effective modulation of transcriptional activity in both *Escherichia*

*coli* and mammalian cells, underscoring their practical potential. This integration of protein foundational models with computational design significantly advances our ability to create sequence-specific DNA-binding proteins that are easily deployable, highlighting their vast applicability in gene regulation and genome-editing applications [Glasscock et al., 2024a].

### 3 Methodology

Leveraging Prot42, we demonstrate for the first time an instruction-tuning approach to generate high-affinity, long length protein binders directly from target sequences alone, without incorporating structural information or additional auxiliary training objectives. By utilizing a novel multimodal strategy that integrates Gene42’s genomic embeddings with Prot42’s protein embeddings, we further extend our capabilities to generate sequence-specific DNA-binding proteins. This approach eliminates dependence on explicit structural constraints or predefined binding motifs, highlighting the intrinsic capacity of computational models to design functional protein binders across diverse molecular contexts.

#### 3.1 Data Preparation

UniRef50 comprises 63.2 million amino acid sequences, which are tokenized using a vocabulary of 20 standard amino acids. To account for any uncommon or ambiguous residues, we use X token representing any amino acid. Each sequence is processed with a maximum context length of 1,024 tokens, and sequences exceeding this limit are excluded, resulting in a filtered dataset of 57.1 million sequences with an initial packing density of 27%. To optimize data utilization and improve computational efficiency, we employ variable sequence length (VSL) packing, which maximizes token occupancy within the fixed context length. This approach significantly enhances packing density, reducing the dataset to 16.2 million packed sequences while achieving a packing efficiency of 96%. This refined dataset ensures a more efficient use of computational resources while preserving sequence diversity and integrity.

Model	Prot42-B	Prot42-L	Prot42-L 2K	Prot42-L 4K	Prot42-L 8K
# of parameters	500M	1.1B	1.1B	1.1B	1.1B
Sequence Length	1024	1024	2048	4096	8192
Effective Length	983	983	1331	2662	5324
Tokens per Batch	1M	1M	1M	1M	1M
Batch size	1024	1024	756	378	189
Base Frequency	10k	10k	10k	10k	10k
Hidden size	1,408	2,048	2,048	2,048	2,048
# of hidden layers	16	24	24	24	24
# of attention heads	16	32	32	32	32
Transformer FFN Dim.	5632	5440	5440	5440	5440
Optimizer	AdamW	AdamW	AdamW	AdamW	AdamW
Betas	0.9, 0.95	0.9, 0.95	0.9, 0.95	0.9, 0.95	0.9, 0.95
Eps	1e-8	1e-8	1e-8	1e-8	1e-8
Weight Decay	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Max grad norm	1	1	1	1	1
Learning rate (Linear)	0 to 4.8e-4	0 to 4.8e-4	-	-	-
Iterations (Linear)	0 to 2000	0 to 3950	-	-	-
Learning rate (Cosine)	4.8e-4 to 4.8e-5	4e-4 to 1e-5	4e-4 to 1e-5	4e-4 to 1e-5	4e-4 to 1e-5
Iterations (Cosine)	2000 to 126000	3950 to 237000	1860 to 3726	3726 to 4305	4305 to 4472

Table 1: **Hyperparameters used for pretraining (left) and continuous pretraining (right) of the Prot42 models.**

#### 3.2 Model Architecture and Pretraining

Prot42 is an autoregressive transformer decoder model following the LLaMA architecture Touvron et al. [2023]. We pre-train two model variants with parameter counts of 500 million (500M) and 1.1 billion (1.1B), each utilizing a maximum sequence length (MSL) of 1024 tokens. We denote the 500M-parameter model as **Prot42-B** (base) and the 1.1B-parameter model as **Prot42-L** (large).

To optimize hyperparameter selection for training, we adopt maximal update parametrization ( $\mu P$ ) Yang et al. [2022a]. Our hyperparameter tuning process is carried out using a smaller 81M parameter proxy model, from which optimal parameters are identified and subsequently transferred to the 500M

and 1.1B target models by  $\mu$  transfer Yang et al. [2022a]. During pre-training we keep number of tokens per batch constant at 1 million, apply peak learning rate of 4.8e4 with 10x cosine decay and initial linear warm-up schedule. We utilize Cerebras CS-2 for our training runs. The Cerebras CS-2 system is an AI accelerator that features 850,000 AI optimized compute cores, 40GB of on-chip SRAM, 20 PB/s memory bandwidth, and 220 PB/s interconnect Cerebras Systems [2021]. Table 1 shows our model architecture and pre-training configuration in detail.

### Continuous Pretraining for a Larger Context Length

The Prot42-L model was further fine-tuned to accommodate extended context lengths, achieved through a gradually increased MSL. Initially, training started with an MSL of 1,024 tokens, which constitute 10% of the total training steps. This phase was followed by a 10x cosine-decay schedule, during which the context length was progressively increased to 2,048, 4,096, and 8,192 tokens. Throughout these stages, the number of non-padding tokens per batch was maintained at a constant 1 million tokens. Table 2 presents the dataset splits used for context extension, while the hyper-parameter details are provided in Table 1.

MSL	# Samples	Val Size	Train Size	BS	Steps	Effective # Tokens	Effective MSL
1024	8,257,804	639,244	7,618,560	4,096	1,860	1,872,337,306	245
2048	1,485,108	74,255	1,410,853	756	1,866	1,878,127,514	1331
4096	230,559	11,527	219,032	378	579	583,150,797	2662
8192	35,161	3,516	31,645	189	167	168,503,296	5324

Table 2: Context Length (MSL: Maximum Sequence Length) Extension Dataset of Prot42.

### Model Evaluation using Validation Perplexity

To evaluate the performance of our model before downstream task validation, we employed perplexity (PPL), a standard metric for evaluating autoregressive language models. For a tokenized amino acid sequence  $X = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ , PPL is defined as the exponentiated average negative log-likelihood:  $PPL(X) = \exp -\frac{1}{t} \sum_i \log p_\theta(x_i | x_{<i})$ , where  $\log p_\theta$  is the log-likelihood of the  $i$ th token conditioned on preceding tokens  $x_{<i}$ , and  $t$  is the context length. Figure 2 shows the PPL of Prot42-L models with different context lengths on the validation dataset. We varied input sequence lengths from 1k to 8k to thoroughly test model capabilities. All models initially show relatively high perplexity (9-10) at 1024 tokens, with a substantial improvement at 2048 tokens, decreasing to approximately 6.5.

Our base model and those fine-tuned for shorter contexts show comparable performance patterns up to their respective maximum context lengths. The 8k context model demonstrates particularly interesting behavior – while it shows slightly higher perplexity in mid-range sequences (2048-4096 tokens), it uniquely processes sequences up to 8192 tokens, reaching its lowest perplexity of 5.1 at maximum length. This declining perplexity curve beyond 4096 tokens indicates that our 8k model effectively leverages the expanded context window to capture long-range dependencies in protein sequences. Such capability is crucial for accurately modeling multidomain proteins and protein complexes that frequently exceed standard 1k or 2k residue thresholds of typical protein language models. Our extended context window represents a significant advancement in protein sequence modeling, enabling more accurate representation of complex proteins and protein-protein interactions essential for effective protein binder generation.

### Embeddings Evaluation

Proteins orchestrate a wide range of cellular processes, with subcellular localization serving as a key determinant of function, interaction networks, and regulatory mechanisms. Accurate prediction of a protein’s localization is critical for unraveling its biological role and guiding applications in drug discovery, synthetic biology, and functional annotation. This section evaluates the representational power of the embeddings generated by Prot42-L, assessing their effectiveness in capturing biologically meaningful protein localization patterns across cellular compartments. Traditional protein prediction methodologies have predominantly relied on Multiple Sequence Alignments (MSAs) to infer functional and structural information. However, recent advances have highlighted that embedding-based predictions using protein language models (pLMs), trained solely on amino acid sequences, often meet or




Figure 2: Validation Perplexity (PPL) of Prot42-L models with different context length on the validation dataset. The input sequence lengths are varied from 1k to 8k.

exceed the performance of state-of-the-art MSA-based methods in various prediction tasks [Schmirler et al. \[2024\]](#).

The subcellular localization dataset comprises **PEER benchmark database** and **UniProt** annotated proteins, covering **10 subcellular compartments**: nucleus, cytoplasm, mitochondrion, endoplasmic reticulum, Golgi apparatus, lysosome/vacuole, peroxisome, extracellular space, peroxisome, and plasma membrane (more details are given in the appendix). Each protein sequence was represented as a high-dimensional vector of size  $32 \times 2048$ . To ensure an effective global representation that captures comprehensive localization-specific contexts, we computed the mean token level of the embeddings of the **Prot42-L** model throughout the protein sequence. To visually evaluate the quality of the embeddings and compartmental differentiation, we applied stochastic neighbor embedding distributed by  $t$  (**t-SNE**) to reduce the dimensionality, allowing a clear visualization of protein groups based on subcellular locations (Figure 3). The t-SNE plots demonstrate distinct clusters corresponding to major cellular compartments such as the nucleus, mitochondrion, and extracellular regions, emphasizing the model’s capability to discern proteins based on intrinsic localization-specific features. Meanwhile, proteins associated with the cytoplasm and the Golgi apparatus demonstrated partially overlapping distributions, reflecting the dynamic interactions and shared functional roles between these compartments. The observed clusters align closely with the established cellular topography as previously described by [Chen et al. \[2014\]](#), confirming the effectiveness of the model in capturing the representations of subcellular localization proteins.




Figure 3: t-SNE visualization of **Prot42-L** protein embeddings across 10 subcellular localization compartments. Proteins cluster based on their localization as captured by **Prot42-L** embeddings.

The embeddings learned by **Prot42-L** not only differentiate proteins according to their subcellular compartments, but also provide a versatile foundation for downstream predictive tasks. These high-dimensional representations can easily be integrated into various neural network architectures,

including feedforward artificial neural networks (ANNs), convolutional neural networks (CNNs), and more sophisticated architectures that utilize structural and functional protein features. Further improvements could involve fine-tuning these broadly trained protein language models on task-specific datasets, or training specialized models tailored to protein families, such as antibodies, to enhance the accuracy and specificity of protein annotation. The ability of **Prot42-L** to encode subcellular localization through embeddings has significant implications for downstream applications in protein function prediction, drug target identification, and synthetic biology. Using these learned representations, our findings highlight the quality of **Prot42-L** embeddings, paving the way for advances in protein localization prediction, targeted drug development, synthetic biology, and large-scale functional annotation initiatives and downstream tasks.

### 3.3 Protein Binder Generation

Proteins do not function in isolation; they interact, bind, and form complex networks that drive cellular processes. Designing proteins that can specifically bind to a target protein is a fundamental problem in molecular biology, with applications ranging from therapeutics to synthetic biology. Let  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathcal{X}$  represent the amino acid sequence of a **target protein**, where  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is the  $i$ -th amino acid in the sequence, and  $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_m) \in \mathcal{Y}$  represent the amino acid sequence of a **binding protein** that binds to the target protein. The goal is to model the conditional probability distribution  $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ , which represents the probability of the binding protein sequence  $\mathbf{y}$  given the target protein sequence  $\mathbf{x}$ . To achieve this, we use a sequence-to-sequence model inspired by machine translation, trained on a dataset  $\mathcal{B} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}$  consisting of pairs of target and binder sequences sampled from known protein interactions. Each pair  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{B}$  is structured as  $\mathbf{s} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \text{SEP}, \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_m)$ , where SEP is a special separator token to distinguish between the target and binding protein sequences. During training, we optimize the autoregressive loss function:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = - \sum_{i=n+2}^{n+m+1} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{s}_i | \mathbf{s}_{<i}),$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  represents the model parameters, and the summation runs over the entire sequence  $\mathbf{s}$  from both the target and binding protein sequences. After training, the model can generate binding protein sequences for a given target protein sequence. The process begins by conditioning the model on the target protein sequence  $\mathbf{x}$ , followed by the separator token SEP, and an initial methionine residue ('M') to prime the generation process, as protein sequences typically begin with methionine in the training distribution. The binding protein sequence is generated autoregressively as:

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^m p(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{x}, \text{SEP}, \mathbf{y}_{<i}),$$

where  $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_m)$  is the binding protein sequence being generated, and  $\mathbf{y}_{<i}$  represents the sequence of previously generated binding proteins. To ensure the generation of diverse and high-quality binding proteins, we use a stochastic sampling approach incorporating temperature scaling, nucleus sampling (top- $p$ ), and top- $k$  filtering. The probability of selecting the  $i$ -th token during sampling is given by:

$$p_{\text{sample}}(\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{x}, \text{SEP}, \mathbf{y}_{<i}) \propto \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(z_i/T)}{\sum_{j \in V'} \exp(z_j/T)} & \text{if } i \in V' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $T$  is the temperature parameter controlling randomness,  $z_i$  is the logit for token  $\mathbf{y}_i$ , and  $V'$  is the subset of vocabulary tokens determined by the top- $k$  and nucleus sampling thresholds. This sampling strategy helps balance exploration and quality, resulting in high-quality, diverse binding protein sequences. Thus, the entire protein binding sequence generation process can be represented as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = M_p(\mathbf{X}, \text{SEP}, \mathbf{M}),$$



where  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$  is the generated binding protein sequence,  $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  is the input target protein sequence. The model ensures that the generated sequence  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_m)$  depends on both the target protein sequence and previously generated tokens.

Figure 4 provides an example of this process, illustrating the binding interaction between a generated binder and its target. In this case, the target protein  $\mathbf{X}$  corresponds to VEGF-A, and the generated binder  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$  is designed for Chain V. The model learns  $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$  and generates  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$  autoregressively, following the structured input  $\mathbf{s} = (\mathbf{x}, \text{SEP}, \mathbf{y})$ . During inference, it conditions on  $\mathbf{X}$ , initializes decoding with SEP and methionine (M), and samples  $\mathbf{y}_i$  using:  $p_{\text{sample}}(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{x}, \text{SEP}, \mathbf{y}_{<i})$ . The structural views in Figure 4 show  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$  binding to  $\mathbf{X}$ , with binding affinity  $A(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}, \mathbf{X})$  quantifying interaction strength. More results on the generation procedure will be discussed in Section 4.2.




Figure 4: Illustration of the protein binding sequence generation process. Top: Target protein Vascular endothelial growth factor VEGF-A (PDB ID 1bj1) in complex with neutralizing antibody. Bottom: Multiple views and representations of a binding protein (in blue) generated by our Prot42 model for Chain V of VEGF-A. The model conditions on the target sequence  $\mathbf{X}$  (VEGF-A), followed by SEP token and initial methionine residue, generating binding sequence  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$  autoregressively using  $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ . The generated binder demonstrates a **Binding Affinity of 6.6**, showcasing the model’s capability to design proteins with specific binding properties.

### 3.4 DNA Sequence-specific Binders Generation

Beyond protein-protein interactions, designing proteins that bind to specific DNA sequences opens new frontiers in gene regulation and genome engineering. Given a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  of DNA-protein sequence pairs, our goal is to generate protein sequences  $\hat{X}_p$  that interact effectively with a target DNA. Let  $(X_d^{(1)}, X_d^{(2)}, X_p) \in \mathcal{D}$  represent a DNA-protein pair, where  $X_d^{(1)} = (d_1^{(1)}, d_2^{(1)}, \dots, d_n^{(1)})$  and  $X_d^{(2)} = (d_1^{(2)}, d_2^{(2)}, \dots, d_n^{(2)})$  are two DNA sequences, each of length  $n$ , belonging to a predefined vocabulary  $\mathcal{V}_d$ , and  $X_p = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m)$  is a sequence of  $m$  amino acid tokens representing the protein. The GFM model  $M_d$  encodes both DNA sequences  $X_d^{(1)}$  and  $X_d^{(2)}$  into sequences of latent embeddings  $\mathbf{H}_d^{(1)} = (h_1^{(1)}, h_2^{(1)}, \dots, h_n^{(1)})$  and  $\mathbf{H}_d^{(2)} = (h_1^{(2)}, h_2^{(2)}, \dots, h_n^{(2)})$ , where each  $h_t^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{1408}$  represents the hidden state of the genomic model for DNA sequence  $X_d^{(i)}$ .

The protein model  $M_p$  encodes  $X_p$  into a sequence of hidden representations  $\mathbf{E}_p = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m)$ , where each  $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2048}$  captures structural and functional properties of the protein.

To incorporate DNA context into protein sequence generation, DNA embeddings from both sequences are projected into the hidden dimension of the protein model using learnable transformations:

$$\mathbf{H}_d^{(1)'} = \theta_{d_1} \mathbf{H}_d^{(1)}, \quad \mathbf{H}_d^{(2)'} = \theta_{d_2} \mathbf{H}_d^{(2)},$$

where  $\theta_{d_1} \in \mathbb{R}^{1408 \times 2048}$  and  $\theta_{d_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{1408 \times 2048}$ . These transformed DNA embeddings are integrated into the protein representations using a cross-attention mechanism. Attention scores are computed as

$A = \text{Softmax}\left(\frac{QK^\top}{\sqrt{2048}}\right)$ , where the query, key, and value projections are defined as;

$$Q = \theta_q \left( \mathbf{H}_d^{(1)} \oplus \mathbf{H}_d^{(2)} \right), \quad K = \theta_k \mathbf{E}_p, \quad V = \theta_v \mathbf{E}_p,$$

with learnable weight matrices  $\theta_q, \theta_k, \theta_v \in \mathbb{R}^{2048 \times 2048}$ . The resulting DNA-conditioned protein representations are given by  $\mathbf{C}_p = AV$ , which are combined with the original protein embeddings as  $\mathbf{E}'_p = \mathbf{E}_p + \mathbf{C}_p$ . These transformed representations  $\mathbf{E}'_p$  are then passed through the protein decoder layers.

The generation of the protein sequence follows an autoregressive process in which each token  $\hat{p}_t$  is predicted based on previously generated tokens and DNA-informed features. The probability distribution over the protein vocabulary  $\mathcal{V}_p$  is given by  $p_t = \text{Softmax}(\theta_h e'_t + \theta_c C_t)$ , where  $\theta_h, \theta_c$  are learnable parameters, and the next protein token is selected as  $\hat{p}_t = \arg \max_j (p_{t,j})$ . This process continues until a termination token is reached. Thus, the entire DNA-to-protein sequence generation process can be represented as;

$$\hat{X}_p = M_p(\mathbf{H}_d^{(1)'}, \mathbf{H}_d^{(2)'})$$

During inference, DNA embeddings  $\mathbf{H}_d^{(1)}$  and  $\mathbf{H}_d^{(2)}$  are passed to  $M_p$ , where the generation of the protein sequence begins with a fixed token, ‘‘M’’ as explained previously. By fixing the ‘‘M’’ token, the model can focus on generating the rest of the protein sequence while keeping the DNA context in mind. Figure 5 illustrates an example in which the designed protein interacts with DNA chains  $X_d^{(1)} = (\text{ACCTGACGCGA})$  and  $X_d^{(2)} = (\text{TTCGCGTCAGG})$ . The model generates a protein sequence  $\hat{X}_p$  leveraging DNA-informed representations  $\mathbf{H}_d^{(1)'}$  and  $\mathbf{H}_d^{(2)'}$ , enforcing sequence-specific interactions. This generated binder is compared against a reference DNA-binding protein (PDB ID: 8TAC).




Figure 5: Generated binder example to specific DNA Chains C (ACCTGACGCGA) and D (TTCGCGTCAGG) in comparison with designed DNA binding protein (PDB ID 8TAC).

## 4 Experimental Evaluation

In this section, we report experimental evaluation performances of our Prot42-L model and fine-tuned variants on **1)** Prediction of protein function, prediction of subcellular localization, prediction of structure, prediction of protein-protein interaction, and prediction of protein-ligand interaction [Xu et al. \[2023\]](#); **2)** Protein binder generation for different challenging targets taken from literature [Watson et al. \[2023b\]](#) and [Zambaldi et al. \[2024\]](#); and **3)** DNA Sequence-specific binders generation on targets taken from literature [Glasscock et al. \[2024b\]](#). While the last two experiments focus on generation to help computationally design binders, the first experiment show state-of-the-art results on downstream prediction tasks.

## 4.1 Evaluation on PEER Benchmarks

In this section, we present the evaluation of our protein foundational model, Prot42, on the PEER benchmark. The PEER benchmark provides a comprehensive and multitask evaluation framework for **Protein sEquence undERstanding (PEER)**, covering a diverse set of downstream tasks. These tasks encompass prediction of protein function, prediction of subcellular localization, prediction of structure, prediction of protein-protein interaction, and prediction of protein-ligand interaction [Xu et al. \[2023\]](#). To assess the performance of Prot42, we compare it with existing models on the PEER benchmark leaderboard. We report the performance of our model on all 14 benchmark tasks and provide a comparative analysis against the top five models of the PEER benchmark. Our results highlight the generalization and effectiveness of Prot42 in different protein modeling tasks, demonstrating its ability to learn meaningful representations for various biological contexts.

PEER tasks <a href="#">Xu et al. [2023]</a>	Metric	CNN	CNN+Contact	CNN+SSP	ESM1b	ProtBert	Transformer	Prot42
<b>Protein Function Prediction</b>								
Fluorescence Prediction	Accuracy	0.682	0.680	0.683	0.679	0.679	0.643	<b>0.685</b>
Stability Prediction	Spearman’s Rho	0.637	0.661	0.695	0.694	<b>0.771</b>	0.649	0.756
Beta-lactamase Activity Prediction	Spearman’s Rho	0.781	0.835	0.811	0.839	0.731	0.261	<b>0.876</b>
Solubility Prediction	Accuracy	0.644	0.706	0.699	0.702	0.682	0.701	<b>0.752</b>
<b>Protein Subcellular Localization Prediction</b>								
Subcellular Localization	Accuracy	0.587	0.591	0.566	<b>0.781</b>	0.765	0.560	0.780
Binary Localization Prediction	Accuracy	0.827	0.827	0.818	0.924	0.913	0.757	<b>0.936</b>
<b>Protein Structure Prediction</b>								
Contact Prediction	L/5 precision	0.100	-	0.057	<b>0.458</b>	0.397	0.175	0.279
Fold Classification	Accuracy	0.109	0.111	0.117	0.282	0.169	0.085	<b>0.344</b>
Secondary Structure Prediction	Accuracy	0.661	0.661	-	<b>0.827</b>	0.822	0.596	0.759
<b>Protein-Protein Interaction Prediction</b>								
Yeast Protein Interaction	Accuracy	0.551	0.545	0.541	0.570	<b>0.637</b>	0.541	0.604
Human Protein Interaction	Accuracy	0.626	0.651	0.664	<b>0.782</b>	0.773	0.596	0.738
PPI Affinity Prediction	RMSE	2.796	<b>1.732</b>	2.270	2.281	2.195	2.499	2.735
<b>Protein-Ligand Interaction Prediction</b>								
Protein-Ligand Interaction (PLI)	RMSE	1.376	1.328	1.295	1.559	1.562	1.455	<b>1.250</b>
PLI Affinity BindingDB	RMSE	1.497	1.501	1.481	1.556	1.549	1.566	<b>1.350</b>

Table 3: Performance comparison on various protein foundational tasks across different models. **Bold** indicates the best performance per task (Results on existing techniques are reported as they are from the PEER Leaderboard<sup>2</sup>).

Our proposed model, Prot42, was evaluated on these tasks to benchmark its predictive capabilities comprehensively. Prot42 consistently demonstrated superior or highly competitive performance compared to baseline models, highlighting its robustness and generalizability. Specifically, **1)** Prot42 achieved superior performance in predicting stability, solubility, and beta-lactamase activity, highlighting its potential in high-resolution protein engineering tasks; **2)** In localization tasks (Binary and Subcellular), Prot42 performance rivaled established models, indicating its utility in functional annotation; **3)** Structural prediction tasks (Contact, Fold, Secondary Structure) showed strong results, reflecting Prot42’s ability to capture structural nuances; **4)** For Protein-Protein and Protein-Ligand Interaction predictions, Prot42 demonstrated high precision and reliability, confirming its suitability for complex biological interaction modeling and pharmaceutical applications. In the protein-ligand interaction predictions, we utilized Chem42 for generating chemical embeddings. We also performed comparative analyses with ChemBert as an alternative chemical representation model, where we still outperformed existing methodologies with performance metrics approaching those achieved with Chem42 [Singh et al. \[2025\]](#). Overall, Prot42 demonstrates excellent potential across diverse biological prediction scenarios, highlighting its utility for advanced research and practical applications in bioengineering and pharmaceutical sciences.

## 4.2 Protein Binders generation

To rigorously assess the effectiveness of Prot42 for protein binder generation, we compared our model against AlphaProteo, a state-of-the-art model specifically designed for protein binder prediction. We selected AlphaProteo as our benchmark due to its established performance in generating high-affinity binders for clinically relevant targets.

- 2wh6<sup>3</sup> (anti-apoptotic BHRF1): The BHRF1 protein, encoded by the Epstein-Barr virus (EBV), is a viral homolog of the Bcl-2 family and functions as an anti-apoptotic factor. The crystal

<sup>3</sup><https://www.rcsb.org/structure/2WH6>

structure (PDB ID: 2WH6) reveals a characteristic Bcl-2-like fold composed of multiple  $\alpha$ -helices forming a hydrophobic groove, which facilitates the binding and sequestration of pro-apoptotic proteins such as Bim and Bak. By inhibiting mitochondrial outer membrane permeabilization (MOMP), BHRF1 enhances cell survival, contributing to viral persistence and immune evasion.

- 6m0j<sup>4</sup> (SARS-CoV-2 spike receptor-binding domain bound): The receptor-binding domain (RBD) of the SARS-CoV-2 spike (*S*) protein is a critical region that mediates viral entry into host cells by interacting with the human angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) receptor. The RBD, located within the S1 subunit, undergoes conformational changes between “up” and “down” states, regulating its accessibility for ACE2 binding. This domain contains key residues essential for receptor recognition and viral attachment, making it a primary target for neutralizing antibodies and vaccine development. Mutations in the RBD can influence viral transmissibility, immune escape, and therapeutic efficacy.
- 3di3<sup>5</sup> (glycosylated human interleukin-7 receptor alpha ectodomain): The glycosylated human interleukin-7 receptor alpha (*IL-7R $\alpha$* ) is a transmembrane glycoprotein that plays a crucial role in lymphocyte development and homeostasis. It is a component of the heterodimeric IL-7 and thymic stromal lymphopoietin (TSLP) receptor complexes. N-linked glycosylation of *IL-7R $\alpha$*  is essential for proper folding, stability, and receptor-ligand interactions, influencing signal transduction pathways that regulate T-cell survival and proliferation. Dysregulation of *IL-7R $\alpha$*  expression or glycosylation has been implicated in immune deficiencies and leukemogenesis.
- 5o45<sup>6</sup> (PD-L1): Programmed death-ligand 1 (*PD-L1*), also known as B7-H1 or CD274, is a transmembrane protein expressed on antigen-presenting cells and various tumor cells. It plays a crucial role in immune regulation by binding to its receptor, programmed death-1 (*PD-1*), on T cells, leading to immune suppression and tolerance. This interaction is a key mechanism in immune evasion by tumors, making *PD-L1* a significant target for cancer immunotherapy. Inhibiting *PD-L1* with immune checkpoint inhibitors enhances T cell activity, restoring anti-tumor immune responses.
- 1www<sup>7</sup> (Tropomyosin receptor kinase A): The Tropomyosin receptor kinase A (*TrkA*), also known as neurotrophic receptor tyrosine kinase 1 (*NTRK1*), is a receptor tyrosine kinase that plays a crucial role in neuronal development, differentiation, and survival. It is activated by its ligand, nerve growth factor (NGF), leading to autophosphorylation and downstream signaling through the MAPK, PI3K-Akt, and PLC $\gamma$  pathways. *TrkA* mutations and fusions are associated with oncogenic signaling in various cancers, making it a therapeutic target for selective tyrosine kinase inhibitors.
- 4hsa<sup>8</sup> (interleukin 17a): Interleukin 17A (*IL-17A*) is a pro-inflammatory cytokine produced primarily by T helper 17 (Th17) cells. It plays a crucial role in host defense against bacterial and fungal infections by inducing the expression of antimicrobial peptides and inflammatory mediators. *IL-17A* signals through the *IL-17* receptor complex, activating downstream pathways such as NF- $\kappa$ B and MAPK, leading to the recruitment of neutrophils and enhanced immune responses. Dysregulation of *IL-17A* is associated with autoimmune diseases, including psoriasis, rheumatoid arthritis, and inflammatory bowel disease.
- 1tnf<sup>9</sup> (TNF $\alpha$ ): Tumor Necrosis Factor alpha (TNF $\alpha$ ) is a pro-inflammatory cytokine primarily produced by macrophages and other immune cells. It plays a crucial role in immune responses, inflammation, and apoptosis. TNF $\alpha$  exerts its effects by binding to TNF receptors (TNFR1 and TNFR2), activating signaling pathways such as NF- $\kappa$ B and MAPK, which regulate cell survival, differentiation, and immune modulation. Dysregulation of TNF $\alpha$  is implicated in various inflammatory diseases, including rheumatoid arthritis, Crohn’s disease, and cancer.

---

<sup>4</sup><https://www.rcsb.org/structure/6m0j>

<sup>5</sup><https://www.rcsb.org/structure/3di3>

<sup>6</sup><https://www.rcsb.org/structure/5o45>

<sup>7</sup><https://www.rcsb.org/structure/1WWW>

<sup>8</sup><https://www.rcsb.org/3d-view/4HSA>

<sup>9</sup><https://www.rcsb.org/structure/1TNF>

**Experimental Setting** For fine-tuning Prot42 to generate protein binders, we utilized the STRING database Szklarczyk et al. [2021], a comprehensive resource for protein-protein interactions. STRING integrates experimental data, computational predictions, and text mining to provide confidence scores for protein interactions across multiple organisms. We applied stringent filtering criteria to extract high-quality binding pairs:

1. Only interaction pairs with confidence scores  $\geq 90\%$  were selected, ensuring high reliability of the binding relationships.
2. Sequences were limited to  $\leq 250$  amino acids in length to focus on manageable, single-domain binding proteins, such that  $n, m \leq 250$ .
3. We excluded redundant pairs to prevent overfitting and ensure diversity in the training dataset.

After filtering, our final dataset consisted of 74,066 protein-protein interaction pairs from the STRING database. We divided this into a training set  $\mathcal{D}_{pb}^{train}$  with 59,252 samples and a validation set  $\mathcal{D}_{pb}^{val}$  with 14,814 samples (approximately 80%/20% split). The validation set  $\mathcal{D}_{pb}^{val}$  was primarily used to track training loss and optimize the model’s learning process.

Hyperparameter	Value
Optimizer	AdamW
Learning rate	$3 \times 10^{-5}$
Learning rate schedule	Cosine decay with linear warm-up
Warm-up steps	1000
Minimum learning rate	$1 \times 10^{-6}$
Momentum parameters ( $\beta_1, \beta_2$ )	0.9, 0.999
Weight decay	0.01
Batch size	64
Training epochs	5
Maximum sequence length	512 tokens
Gradient clipping	1.0
Precision	Mixed precision (fp16)

Table 4: Hyperparameters used for fine-tuning the protein binder generation models.

We utilized the same target proteins and binding hotspots that were validated in AlphaProteo studies. These targets represent diverse therapeutic domains: BHRF1 (an Epstein-Barr virus protein that promotes cancer by inhibiting apoptosis), Sc2RBD (SARS-CoV-2 receptor binding domain, critical for viral entry into host cells), IL-7RA (Interleukin-7 receptor alpha, implicated in leukemia and HIV pathogenesis), PD-L1 (Programmed death-ligand 1, a key target in cancer immunotherapy), TrkA (Tropomyosin receptor kinase A, involved in chronic pain and autoimmune conditions), VEGF-A (Vascular endothelial growth factor, critical in cancer and eye disease progression), and TNFalpha (Tumor necrosis factor alpha, a central mediator in autoimmune disease).

Unlike AlphaProteo, which directly incorporates binding site information in its generation process, Prot42 operates solely on sequence inputs. To address this difference, we implemented a two-stage approach: (1) a generation phase, where for each target, we generated 500 candidate binder sequences using Prot42-L with the 8K context window; and (2) a filtering phase, where we modeled the 3D structure of each target-binder complex using Boltz-1 and retained only sequences positioned within 6-8 Å of all identified binding hotspots. The diversity of our sampling approach yielded a rich exploration of the sequence space, producing binding candidates with varying properties, predicted affinities and ranked using computational validation metrics discussed in evaluation metrics paragraph (4.2)

**Evaluation Metrics** We established a comprehensive evaluation framework to assess the quality of generated protein binders, focusing primarily on binding affinity and interface characteristics. Our analysis utilizes Prodigy (PROtein binDing enerGY prediction), a well-established tool for quantifying protein-protein interactions based on structural features.

For each generated binder, we first predicted the 3D structure of the target-binder complex using Boltz-1, a state-of-the-art structure prediction model specifically designed for multimeric protein complexes. The resulting complexes were then analyzed using the following metrics:

1. **Binding Free Energy ( $\Delta G$ ):** The core metric for assessing binding strength, estimated in kcal/mol using Prodigy’s empirical scoring function. Lower (more negative) values indicate

stronger predicted binding, with values below -9.0 kcal/mol typically indicating high-affinity interactions.

2. **Dissociation Constant ( $K_d$ ):** Calculated from  $\Delta G$  using the relationship:

$$K_d = e^{\Delta G/RT} \quad (1)$$

where  $R$  is the gas constant and  $T$  is temperature (310K). This metric provides a concentration-dependent measure of binding affinity in molar units, facilitating comparison with experimental binding assays.

3. **Interface Characteristics:** Several interface properties were quantified, including interface area ( $\text{\AA}^2$ ), the number of residue pairs at the binding interface (within  $5.5\text{\AA}$ ), and the distribution of polar and non-polar contacts across the interface.




Figure 6: Examples of generated protein binders (green molecular surfaces - structures in different colors) to target protein sequences provided in the PDB IDs: 1yo5, 1jj6, 1a1f, 8tac, 1oct and 2o4a.

**Binding Affinity Comparison** Figure 7 presents the dissociation constants ( $K_d$ , in nM) for the highest-affinity binders generated by our model compared to both in silico and laboratory-validated AlphaProteo binders. Lower values indicate stronger binding.

Our results demonstrate that Prot42 consistently generated binders with comparable or superior predicted binding affinities across all tested targets. Particularly notable results include the following: for IL-7RA, our model generated binders with a predicted  $K_d$  of 5.3 nM, comparable to AlphaProteo’s 6.3 nM; for PD-L1, Prot42 predicted binders with  $K_d$  of 5.2 nM, outperforming AlphaProteo’s 8.2 nM; for TrkA, our model achieved a remarkable  $K_d$  of 4.4 nM, significantly better than AlphaProteo’s 13.2 nM; and for VEGF-A, Prot42 generated binders with  $K_d$  of 6.6 nM, substantially stronger than AlphaProteo’s 13.4 nM.

Notably, for targets where AlphaProteo has laboratory-validated results, our in silico predictions suggest comparable or better binding. For example, with IL-7RA, our predicted  $K_d$  of 5.3 nM compares favorably with AlphaProteo’s laboratory-validated  $K_d$  of 0.1 nM, especially considering the typical discrepancy between computational predictions and experimental measurements.

Figure 8 illustrates our top-ranked generated binder for the receptor-binding domain (RBD) of the SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein (PDB ID 6m0j). For this target, we utilized residues 333-526 of chain E, which encompasses the complete RBD domain responsible for host cell recognition. We conditioned our Prot42 model to generate a binding protein with a minimum length of 50 amino acids to ensure sufficient interface area for stable interaction. The generated binder was specifically filtered from a candidate pool based on proximity ( $6-8\text{\AA}$ ) to critical hotspot residues E485, E489, E494, E500 and E505 which constitute the receptor-binding motif (RBM). These residues are known to form critical interactions with the peptidase domain of human angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2). By




Figure 7: **Comparison of binding affinities ( $K_d$ , nM) for top binders against therapeutic targets.** Green bars represent Prot42 predictions (in silico), blue bars represent AlphaProteo in silico predictions, and light blue bars show laboratory-validated AlphaProteo binders. Lower values indicate stronger binding. The y-axis uses a logarithmic scale to accommodate the wide range of affinity values.




Figure 8: Zooming on the generated protein binder for the RBD of SARS-CoV-2 (PDB ID 6m0j) with the contact region between both proteins and Target hotspot residues.

targeting this specific epitope, our designed binder is predicted to function as a competitive inhibitor, effectively blocking the interaction between the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein and ACE2, thus potentially neutralizing viral entry into host cells.

### 4.3 DNA Sequence-specific Binders Generation

This task focuses on designing proteins that are capable of binding to target DNA sequences. To achieve this, we used the 2010 Protein-DNA Interface Database (PDIdb) 2010 dataset, as outlined in [Norambuena and Melo \[2010\]](#). The dataset contains 922 unique DNA-protein pairs, which were used as a basis for our model. For the evaluation of our DNA-Protein model, we extracted DNA segments from various PDB structures, including 1TUP, 1BC8(56), 1YO5(57), 1L3L(44), 2O4A(58), 1OCT(59), 1A1F(60), and 1JJ6(61).

In addition to this, we used DeepPBS [Mitra et al. \[2023\]](#) to assess the binding specificity of the




Figure 9: Examples of generated protein binders (green molecular surfaces - structures in different colors) to DNA sequences provided in the PDB IDs: 1yo5, 1jj6, 1a1f, 8tac, 1oct and 2o4a.

generated proteins. DeepPBS is a model designed to capture the physicochemical and geometric contexts of protein-DNA interactions. It predicts binding specificity, represented as a position weight matrix (PWM), based on a given protein-DNA structure. High specificity interactions are expected to maximize affinity across various DNA base possibilities, and the importance scores generated by DeepPBS for these interactions correlate with the corresponding binding affinities. A PWM is defined as an  $N \times 4$  matrix, where  $N$  is the length of the DNA sequence of interest, and the four positions correspond to the four DNA bases: adenine (A), cytosine (C), guanine (G), and thymine (T). Each column of the PWM represents the probabilities of the four bases occurring at that specific position within the sequence. Figure 9 illustrates several examples of protein binders to different target DNA sequences as they are given in PDB ID 1yo5, 1jj6, 1a1f, 8tac, 1oct and 2o4a. The figure shows both structures in cartoon representation and molecular surfaces to highlight the ability of our approach to account for the structures when generating the protein binders.

## 5 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced Prot42, a pioneering family of Protein Language Models (pLMs) designed to generate high-affinity protein binders solely from sequence information. Prot42 demonstrates that the latent evolutionary and functional information embedded within raw protein sequences is sufficient to drive highly accurate, large-scale protein generation, without requiring structural input. By leveraging an auto-regressive, decoder-only architecture, our models overcome traditional constraints on sequence length and generative fidelity, enabling the capture of complex long-range dependencies and intricate multi-domain relationships—key for designing functional protein binders with unprecedented precision. Through extensive evaluations, Prot42 has proven its ability to synthesize sequence-specific Protein and DNA binding proteins, significantly accelerating the binder design process while reducing dependence on labor-intensive experimental discovery. Unlike structure-dependent approaches, our method highlights the untapped generative potential of sequence-based modeling, demonstrating that protein functionality can be accurately inferred, optimized, and expanded through language modeling alone. Looking ahead, we plan to validate Prot42-generated binders experimentally, complementing computational assessments with real-world functional tests. This step will solidify the model’s utility in practical applications and refine its predictive accuracy, bridging the gap between AI-driven sequence generation and experimental biotechnology. By continuing to enhance sequence-based generative modeling, Prot42 paves the way for scalable, data-driven protein engineering, unlocking new frontiers in synthetic biology and therapeutic development.

## Acknowledgment

The authors are thankful to MIT Jameel Clinic for releasing Boltz-1, an open-source model designed to accurately model complex biomolecular interactions. All structures of our protein binders in complex with targets are produced using Boltz-1. All protein visualizations reported in this paper are obtained using the UCSF ChimeraX software.



## References

- Ethan C. et al. Alley. Unified rational protein engineering with sequence-based deep representation learning. *Nature Methods*, 16:1315–1322, 2019.
- Stephen F. et al. Altschul. Gapped blast and psi-blast: a new generation of protein database search programs. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 25:3389–3402, 1997.
- Ehsaneddin Asgari and Mohammad R.K. Mofrad. Continuous distributed representation of biological sequences for deep proteomics and genomics. *PLoS One*, 10:e0141287, 2015.
- Tristan Bepler and Bonnie Berger. Learning protein sequence embeddings using information from structure. *ICLR*, 2019.
- Surojit Biswas, Grigory Khimulya, Ethan C. Alley, Kevin M. Esvelt, and George M. Church. Low-n protein engineering with data-efficient deep learning. *Nature Methods*, 18:389–396, 2021.
- Andrew R.M. Bradbury, Sachdev Sidhu, Stefan Dübel, and John McCafferty. Beyond natural antibodies: the power of in vitro display technologies. *Nature Biotechnology*, 29:245–254, 2011.
- Garyk Brixi, Matthew G. Durrant, Jerome Ku, Michael Poli, Greg Brockman, Daniel Chang, Gabriel A. Gonzalez, Samuel H. King, David B. Li, Aditi T. Merchant, Mohsen Naghipourfar, Eric Nguyen, Chiara Ricci-Tam, David W. Romero, Gwanggyu Sun, Ali Taghibakshi, Anton Vorontsov, Brandon Yang, Myra Deng, Liv Gorton, Nam Nguyen, Nicholas K. Wang, Etowah Adams, Stephen A. Baccus, Steven Dillmann, Stefano Ermon, Daniel Guo, Rajesh Ilango, Ken Janik, Amy X. Lu, Reshma Mehta, Mohammad R.K. Mofrad, Madelena Y. Ng, Jaspreet Pannu, Christopher Ré, Jonathan C. Schmok, John St. John, Jeremy Sullivan, Kevin Zhu, Greg Zynda, Daniel Balsam, Patrick Collison, Anthony B. Costa, Tina Hernandez-Boussard, Eric Ho, Ming-Yu Liu, Thomas McGrath, Kimberly Powell, Dave P. Burke, Hani Goodarzi, Patrick D. Hsu, and Brian L. Hie. Genome modeling and design across all domains of life with evo 2. *bioRxiv*, 2024. doi: 10.1101/2025.02.18.638918. URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.18.638918>.
- Inc. Cerebras Systems. Cerebras systems: Achieving industry best ai performance through a systems approach, 2021. URL <https://cerebras.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Cerebras-CS-2-Whitepaper.pdf>.
- Cho-Yi Chen, Andy Ho, Hsin-Yuan Huang, Hsueh-Fen Juan, and Hsuan-Cheng Huang. Dissecting the human protein-protein interaction network via phylogenetic decomposition. *Sci. Rep.*, 4, 11 2014. doi: 10.1038/srep07153.
- Ting-Fang Chen, David Juergens, Callum Morrison, et al. moppit: multi-objective protein-protein interaction transformer for sequence-based binder design. *bioRxiv*, 2024.
- Xiangxiang et al. Chen. Tda: A comprehensive benchmark for drug discovery using protein representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.07346*, 2022.
- Kuo-Chen Chou. Prediction of protein cellular attributes using pseudo-amino acid composition. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Genetics*, 43:246–255, 2001.
- Christian et al. Dallago. Flip: Benchmark tasks in fitness landscape inference for proteins. *bioRxiv*, 2021.
- Inna Dubchak, Ilya Muchnik, Stephen R. Holbrook, and Sung-Hou Kim. Prediction of protein folding class using global description of amino acid sequence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 92:8700–8704, 1995.
- Andrea Agostino Edera, Stefano Ferretti, and Claudio Cava. Enhanced identification of membrane transport proteins: a hybrid approach combining protbert-bfd and convolutional neural networks. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 23:1–15, 2022.
- Ahmed Elnaggar, Michael Heinzinger, and et al. Prottrans: Toward understanding the language of life through self-supervised learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(10):7112–7127, 2021.

- Ahmed et al. Elnaggar. Prottrans: Towards cracking the language of life’s code through self-supervised learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2021.
- Noelia Ferruz, Stefan Schmidt, and Birte Höcker. Protgpt2 is a deep unsupervised language model for protein design. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):4348, 2022.
- Pablo et al. Gainza. Deciphering interaction fingerprints from protein molecular surfaces using geometric deep learning. *Nature Methods*, 17:184–192, 2020.
- Pau Gainza, Freyr Sverrisson, Federico Monti, et al. Deciphering interaction fingerprints from protein molecular surfaces using geometric deep learning. *Nature Methods*, 17(2):184–192, 2020.
- Cameron J. Glasscock, Robert Pecoraro, Ryan McHugh, Lindsey A. Doyle, Wei Chen, Olivier Boivin, Beau Lonnquist, Emily Na, Yuliya Politanska, Hugh K. Haddock, David Cox, Christoffer Norn, Brian Coventry, Inna Goreschnik, Dionne Vafeados, Gyu Rie Lee, Raluca Gordan, Barry L. Stoddard, Frank DiMaio, and David Baker. Computational design of sequence-specific dna-binding proteins. *bioRxiv*, 2024a. doi: 10.1101/2024.01.12.575617. URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.12.575617>.
- Cameron J. Glasscock, Robert Pecoraro, Ryan McHugh, Lindsey A. Doyle, Wei Chen, Olivier Boivin, Beau Lonnquist, Emily Na, Yuliya Politanska, Hugh K. Haddock, David Cox, Christoffer Norn, Brian Coventry, Inna Goreschnik, Dionne Vafeados, Gyu Rie Lee, Raluca Gordan, Barry L. Stoddard, Frank DiMaio, and David Baker. Computational design of sequence-specific dna-binding proteins. *bioRxiv*, 2024b. doi: 10.1101/2024.01.12.575617. URL <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.12.575617>.
- IEEE. Recent computational advancements in predicting dna-binding proteins. In *IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, 2024. doi: 10.1109/BIBM62325.2024.10821747. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/BIBM62325.2024.10821747>.
- John et al. Jumper. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *Nature*, 596:583–589, 2021.
- Thomas Kipf, Ethan Fetaya, Kuan-Chieh Wang, Max Welling, and Richard Zemel. Contrastive learning of structured world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.12247*, 2020.
- Gaurav Kumar, Reshmi Mishra, Zhaolei Li, and Dong Xu. Enhanced prediction of dna and rna binding proteins using multi-class deep learning. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 52(2):982–995, 2024. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkad1131. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkad1131>.
- Quoc Le and Tomas Mikolov. Distributed representations of sentences and documents. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1188–1196, 2014.
- Benjamin Leader, Quentin J. Baca, and David E. Golan. Protein therapeutics: a summary and pharmacological classification. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 7:21–39, 2008.
- Zeming Lin, Halil Akin, Roshan Rao, Brian Hie, Zhongkai Zhu, Wenting Lu, Allan dos Santos Costa, Maryam Fazel-Zarandi, Tom Sercu, Salvatore Candido, and Alexander Rives. Evolutionary-scale prediction of atomic-level protein structure with a language model. *Science*, 379(6637):1123–1130, 2023. doi: 10.1126/science.ade2574. URL <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ade2574>.
- Yu-Chen Liu, Yi-Jing Lin, Yan-Yun Chang, Cheng-Che Chuang, and Yu-Yen Ou. Deciphering the language of protein-dna interactions: A deep learning approach combining contextual embeddings and multi-scale sequence modeling. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 436(22):168769, 2024. doi: 10.1016/j.jmb.2024.168769. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2024.168769>.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*, 2013.
- Raktim Mitra, Jinsen Li, Jared M Sagendorf, Yibei Jiang, Tsu-Pei Chiu, and Remo Rohs. DeepPbs: Geometric deep learning for interpretable prediction of protein–dna binding specificity. *bioRxiv*, pages 2023–12, 2023.
- John Moult. A decade of casp: progress, bottlenecks and prognosis in protein structure prediction. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 15:285–289, 2005.

- Erik Nijkamp, Jeffrey A Ruffolo, Eli N Weinstein, Nikhil Naik, and Ali Madani. Progen2: Exploring the boundaries of protein language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13536*, 2023.
- Tomás Norambuena and Francisco Melo. The protein-dna interface database. *BMC bioinformatics*, 11:1–12, 2010.
- Michael S. Packer and David R. Liu. Methods for the directed evolution of proteins. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 16:379–394, 2015.
- Predrag et al. Radivojac. A large-scale evaluation of computational protein function prediction. *Nature Methods*, 10:221–227, 2013.
- Roshan Rao, Jason Liu, Robert Verkuil, Joshua Meier, John F. Canny, Pieter Abbeel, Tom Sercu, and Alexander Rives. Msa transformer. *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021a.
- Roshan et al. Rao. Evaluating protein transfer learning with tape. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- Roshan M Rao, Joshua Meier, Tom Sercu, Sergey Ovchinnikov, and Alexander Rives. Transformer protein language models are unsupervised structure learners. *bioRxiv*, pages 2020–12, 2021b.
- Alexander Rives, Joshua Meier, Tom Sercu, and et al. Biological structure and function emerge from scaling unsupervised learning to 250 million protein sequences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(15):e2016239118, 2021.
- Richard Schmirler, Michael Heinzinger, and Burkhard Rost. Fine-tuning protein language models boosts predictions across diverse tasks. *Nature Communications*, 15:7407, 2024. doi: 10.1038/s41467-024-51844-2.
- Andrew W. et al. Senior. Improved protein structure prediction using potentials from deep learning. *Nature*, 577:706–710, 2020.
- Hong-Bin Shen and Kuo-Chen Chou. Signal-3l: A 3-layer approach for predicting signal peptides. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications*, 363:297–303, 2007.
- Aahan Singh, Engin Tekin, Maryam Nadeem, Nancy A. ElNaker, Mohammad Amaan Sayeed, Natalia Vassilieva, and Boulbaba Ben Amor. Chem42: a family of chemical language models for target-aware ligand generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:XXXX.XXXXX*, 2025. Corresponding authors:.
- George P. Smith. Filamentous fusion phage: novel expression vectors that display cloned antigens on the virion surface. *Science*, 228:1315–1317, 1985.
- Spandidos Publications. Transcription factors and gene regulation. <https://www.spandidos-publications.com>, 2024. Accessed: 4 March 2025.
- Pascal Sturmfels, Jesse Vig, Ali Madani, Nazneen Fatema Rajani, and Jennifer Listgarten. Profile prediction: An alignment-based pre-training task for protein sequence models. *bioRxiv*, 2020.
- Freyr Sverrisson, Jean Feydy, Bruno E. Correia, and Michael M. Bronstein. Fast end-to-end learning on protein surfaces. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 15272–15281, 2021.
- Damian Szklarczyk, Annika L Gable, Katerina C Nastou, David Lyon, Rebecca Kirsch, Sampo Pyysalo, Nadezhda T Doncheva, Marc Legeay, Tao Fang, Peer Bork, et al. The string database in 2021: customizable protein–protein networks, and functional characterization of user-uploaded gene/measurement sets. *Nucleic acids research*, 49(D1):D605–D612, 2021.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.

- Raphael J. L. et al. Townshend. Atom3d: Tasks on molecules in three dimensions. *NeurIPS 2020 Workshop on Machine Learning for Structural Biology*, 2021.
- James L Watson, David Juergens, Nathaniel R Bennett, et al. De novo design of protein interactions with learned surface fingerprints. *Nature*, 614(7948):540–547, 2023a.
- Joseph L Watson, David Juergens, Nathaniel R Bennett, Brian L Trippe, Jason Yim, Helen E Eisenach, Woody Ahern, Andrew J Borst, Robert J Ragotte, Lukas F Milles, et al. De novo design of protein structure and function with rfdiffusion. *Nature*, 620(7976):1089–1100, 2023b.
- Minghao Xu and et al. Peer: A comprehensive and multi-task benchmark for protein sequence understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02096*, 2022.
- Minghao Xu, Zuobai Zhang, Jiarui Lu, Zhaocheng Zhu, Yangtian Zhang, Chang Ma, Runcheng Liu, and Jian Tang. Peer: A comprehensive and multi-task benchmark for protein sequence understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13968*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13968>.
- Greg Yang, Edward J. Hu, Igor Babuschkin, Szymon Sidor, David Farhi, Jakub Pachocki, Xiaodong Liu, Weizhu Chen, and Jianfeng Gao. Tensor programs v: Tuning large neural networks via zero-shot hyperparameter transfer. In *NeurIPS 2021*, March 2022a. URL <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/tuning-large-neural-networks-via-zero-shot-hyperparameter-transfer/>.
- Kevin K. et al. Yang. Learned protein embeddings for machine learning. *Bioinformatics*, 2018.
- Kun Yang, Zeming Wu, Justin Bedo, and Ying Yu. Evaluating the advancements in protein language models for encoding strategies in protein function prediction: a comprehensive review. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 23(6):bbac342, 2022b.
- Vinicius Zambaldi, David La, Alexander E Chu, Harshnira Patani, Amy E Danson, Tristan OC Kwan, Thomas Frerix, Rosalia G Schneider, David Saxton, Ashok Thillaisundaram, et al. De novo design of high-affinity protein binders with alphaproteo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.08022*, 2024.
- Quan et al. Zou. Prediction of protein structural classes based on pseudo amino acid composition: a critical assessment. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 273:1–8, 2011.