Generalizable prediction of liquid-liquid phase separation from protein sequence

Amir M. MohammadHosseini[1*], Hossein Teimouri[1*], Vincent Gureghian[2],
Rayan Najjar[2], Ariel B. Lindner[1,3, 4‡], Amir Pandi[1,3, 4‡]

[1]Sorbonne Université, CNRS, ERL U1338 Inserm, Department of Computational, Quantitative and Synthetic Biology, Paris, France
[2] University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
[3]Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Inserm, Institut de Biologie Paris-Seine, Paris, France
[4]Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Université de Technologie de Compiègne, Inserm, Biofoundry Alliance Sorbonne Université, Paris, France
[*] These authors contributed equally to this work.
[‡] To whom correspondence should be addressed: ariel.lindner@inserm.fr, amir.pandi@inserm.fr

Abstract

Liquid-liquid phase separation (LLPS) is a physicochemical process through which a homogeneous liquid solution spontaneously separates into distinct liquid phases with different compositions and properties. Driven by weak multivalent interactions, LLPS in living systems enables dynamic compartmentalization of biomolecules to promote or regulate various cellular processes. Despite recent advances, predicting phase-separating proteins and their key LLPS-driving regions remains limited by the versatility of models. Here, we developed Phaseek, a generalizable LLPS predicting model that combines contextual sequence encoding with statistical protein graph representations. Phaseek accurately predicts LLPS-prone proteins in diverse biological contexts and identifies key regions and effects of point mutations. Proteome-wide analysis across 18 species suggests evolutionary conservation of LLPS among orthologs and associated biological processes. Additionally, predictions by Phaseek highlight the key physicochemical and structural properties associated with LLPS. Provided as an open-access model with a user-friendly implementation, Phaseek serves as a multipurpose LLPS predictor for advancing fundamental and applied research.

Introduction

Liquid-liquid phase separation (LLPS) in living cells is a physicochemical process by which specific biomolecules undergo demixing to form dense and dilute coexisting phases[1,2]. The major driving force of LLPS is weak multivalent intra- and inter-molecular interactions, *e.g.*, charge-charge, cation-π, dipole-dipole, π-π interactions, hydrophobic contacts and hydrogen bonds[2–7]. LLPS creates concentrated hubs of specific biomolecules and facilitates spatial compartmentalization of cellular processes[8,9]. The dynamic nature of such condensates allows for rapid assembly/disassembly to precisely regulate specific processes within cells[8].

LLPS was discovered in aqueous solutions in the early 1900s, and various mixtures have since been shown to exhibit this property[10–12]. In biology, LLPS was first reported in 2009 when P granules, molecular condensates made up of RNA and proteins, were shown to play a crucial role in germ cell development in *Caenorhabditis elegans*[13]. Since this discovery, numerous biomolecules including hundreds of phase-separating proteins have been identified in various cellular contexts, highlighting the ubiquity of LLPS in biology[3–6,14].

Photosynthesis as an ancient and one of the most fundamental biological processes benefits from LLPS. Carboxysomes in cyanobacteria and pyrenoids in photosynthetic algae are formed through LLPS, concentrating the enzyme ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase (RuBisCO) with other proteins involved in the process[15–19]. These condensates enable carbon-concentrating mechanisms and streamline the CO_2 fixation pathway. In the context of DNA damage repair, LLPS facilitates the formation of foci that concentrate repair machinery at damage sites, thereby enhancing the efficiency of the repair process[20–22]. LLPS also plays an important role in coordinating RNA metabolism by forming condensates that contain splicing factors and specific RNA molecules, enhancing the efficiency of RNA processing[13,23–26]. Such ubiquitous and important roles of LLPS in biological processes, ranging from bacteria to humans, are reshaping our understanding of cellular organization and functions[9,27,28]. Importantly, LLPS plays a crucial role in human health and aging[29]; with dysregulation of phase separation being implicated in pathological conditions such as neurodegenerative disorders, cancer, but also viral infections[30–33]. Thus, condensates constitute potential therapeutic targets[34,35] and the prediction of phase-separating proteins can be impactful for both basic and clinical research.

Over the course of evolution, a large number of proteins developed intricate sequence patterns enabling them to acquire different structures and functions. Taking this as an opportunity, machine learning models are increasingly used for classification, regression, and generation tasks for diverse applications[36–38]. Given the widespread LLPS examples in biology, multiple predictive models have been developed[39–43,44]. These models, based on pre-defined physicochemical and sequence features, often face limitations in generalizability across diverse proteins. To address this limitation, we develop Phaseek, a full sequence-based model combining the transformers architecture and statistical protein graphs. We demonstrate that our model achieves superior performance compared to existing models in predicting phase-separating proteins and their LLPS-driving key regions. We showcase Phaseek's ability to predict changes in LLPS scores due to point mutations. We then predict phase-separating proteins across 18 organisms and investigate their

conservation among orthologs and association with Gene Ontology terms. Finally, we analyze the
proteome-wide structural and physicochemical properties associated with predicted phase
separation.

We provide the weights of the Phaseek model under an open source license and a user-friendly
implementation as a Google Colab notebook allowing users to query the prediction of LLPS score
of protein sequences and their key regions (**Code availability**).

Results

Phaseek, a generalizable model for the prediction of LLPS from protein sequence

Our LLPS prediction model, Phaseek, comprises three modules. The first module is an encoder
based on Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) architecture[45] (**Fig. 1a**). For training, we
compiled and curated previously published data, totaling ~1,500 positive and ~5,000 negative
phase-separating sequences. We augmented the set of ~3,500 positive sequences using a trained
Hidden Markov Model to reach a total of ~5,000 and split the data between training and test with a
9:1 ratio (**Methods**).

The second module, a protein graph generator, generates statistical protein graphs derived from
protein sequences using FEGS (Feature Extraction based on Graphical and Statistical Features)
method[46]. The FEGS method generates 158 unique graphical representations to encode proteins[46].
To optimize the time complexity of using these representations as statistical matrices, we used a
random forest model and calculated the SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) value for each
matrix to assess its predictive importance (**Methods**). We finally used the top 10 statistical matrices
with the highest SHAP values in parallel with our GPT architecture to produce residue-level scores
(**Fig. 1a, Supplementary Table 1).** These two modules collectively comprise our core model.

The third module is an XGBoost-based bottleneck. LLPS regions can carry the multivalency and
interactions required for phase separation and promote LLPS when fused to other proteins[44,47,48].
Defining key regions as sub-sequences with amino acids having high predicted scores, this module
boosts the contribution of these regions to the final sequence score (**Methods, Supplementary**
Fig. 1a). Transitioning from a decoder-only version of the model to the three-module version, the
AUC score improved from 0.84 to 0.93 for the evaluation set (**Methods**, **Supplementary Fig. 2**).

We compared Phaseek with other LLPS predictors, including PSPHunter[44], CatGranule 1.0[49],
CatGranule ROBOT 2.0[43], PScore[39], PSPredictor[41], and PSTP[50] (for information about each model,
see **Methods**). Using our evaluation set, Phaseek resulted in the highest AUC score: 0.93
(PSPHunter: 0.88, CatGranule 1.0: 0.78, and CatGranule 2.0: 0.67, PScore: 0.71, PSPredictor:
0.90, and PSTP: 0.87 and 0.78) (**Fig. 1b, c**). Next, we investigated the versatility and
generalizability of Phaseek by comparing the models' performances in four distinct biological
contexts.

Fig. 1. Phaseek architecture and model evaluation. (a) The core model of Phaseek comprises two modules: a GPT-based encoder that extracts contextual sequence features, and a protein graph generator that encodes statistical representations using the FEGS method. The output from both modules is integrated to produce residue-level LLPS scores. For clarity, the XGBoost-based bottleneck module, used to boost the contribution of LLPS-enriched regions to the final prediction, is not shown. **(b)** Performance of Phaseek and other models shown as ROC (Receiver Operating Characteristic) curves on the evaluation set comprising phase-separating (n = 300) and non-phase-separating (n = 337)

sequences, compiled from LLPS datasets and select studies, excluding sequences used in training. **(c)** Violin plots illustrating ROC area under the curve (AUC) scores for Phaseek and other models, evaluated using Monte Carlo Cross-Validation (MCCV)[123]. Batches containing 40 phase-separating and 40 non-phase-separating sequences from the evaluation set were selected and tested over 100 iterations. The statistical significance is indicated by the one-sided Mann–Whitney U p-values (****p < 0.0001). Violin plots represent data distributions, and boxes indicate the interquartile range (Q1–Q3) with the median marked by the center line. Models are color-coded in the figure: Phaseek (periwinkle blue), PSPhunter (deep salmon), catGRANULE I (Caribbean green), PScore (medium purple), catGRANULE II (saffron yellow), PSPredictor (coral pink), PSTP-LST-mix (bright sky blue), and PSTP-LST-kernel (deep cerulean). To ensure a fair comparison of versatility and generalizability, four extra external datasets were used: **(d)** Synthetic proteins, including synthetic phase-separating proteins (synthetic PSPs, n = 97) and synthetic non-phase-separating proteins (synthetic nonPSPs, n = 27). **(e)** Biotinylated isoxazole (B-isox)-identified proteins: phase-separating (Bisox PSPs, n = 43) and non-phase-separating (Bisox nonPSPs, n = 24). **(f)** Fusion oncoproteins: phase-separating (PSFOs, n = 115) and non-phase-separating (nonPSFOs, n = 63). **(g)** Folded phase-separating proteins (Folded-PSPs, n = 148) and disordered non-phase-separating proteins (Disordered-nonPSPs, n = 185). Protein sequences shorter than 140 amino acids, which cannot be classified by PScore, are shown in gray.

The first dataset consisted of 97 phase-separating and 27 non-phase-separating synthetic proteins[51–55]. Phaseek outperformed all models with an accuracy of 0.89 (PSPHunter: 0.67, CatGranule 1.0: 0.77, and CatGranule 2.0: 0.60, PScore: 0.80, PSPredictor: 0.80, and PSTP: 0.72 and 0.69) (**Fig. 2a**).

The second dataset corresponds to a proteome study on cell extracts from *Arabidopsis thaliana* seedlings and inflorescences[56] in which intrinsically disordered proteins were precipitated using biotinylated isoxazole (B-isox) and their LLPS behavior was experimentally confirmed (43 phase-separating and 24 non-phase-separating proteins). Again, Phaseek showed the greatest accuracy with a score of 0.85 (PSPHunter: 0.67, CatGranule 1.0: 0.73, and CatGranule 2.0: 0.60, PScore: 0.67, PSPredictor: 0.70, and PSTP: 0.67 and 0.64) (**Fig. 2b**).

The third data set consists of fusion oncoproteins (FOs), which may facilitate oncogenesis through LLPS[47], in total 115 phase-separating and 63 non-phase-separating FOs. Once again, Phaseek achieved the best accuracy with a score of 0.72 (PSPHunter: 0.61, CatGranule 1.0: 0.54, and CatGranule 2.0: 0.62, PScore: 0.58, PSPredictor: 0.60, and PSTP: 0.61 and 0.56) (**Fig. 2c**).

The fourth dataset contains 185 predicted as disordered but LLPS-negative proteins and 148 folded (non-disordered) but LLPS-positive proteins (**Methods**). Multivalent interactions in intrinsically disordered regions (IDRs) can result in phase separation but not all IDRs promote LLPS and folded proteins can also display this behavior[57,58]. Phaseek classified phase-separating and non-phase-separating proteins with an accuracy of 0.62, higher than all other models (PSPHunter: 0.43, CatGranule 1.0: 0.49, CatGranule 2.0: 0.59, PScore: 0.61, PSPredictor: 0.32, and PSTP: 0.42 and 0.50) (**Fig. 2d**).

Across these diverse biological datasets, Phaseek achieved superior performance in classifying phase-separating and non-phase-separating proteins, establishing it as a versatile and reliable tool for LLPS prediction.

Phaseek identifies LLPS key regions and predicts the effects of point mutations

Multiple diseases and pathological conditions are associated with mutations occurring in key
regions of phase separation proteins[31,48,59–62]. Thus, the identification of LLPS key regions is
important to both fundamental and translational research. To assess the ability of Phaseek to detect
LLPS key regions, we tested it against experimentally annotated sequences from four studies[63–66].
Comparing the residue-level LLPS score profiles of these sequences, Phaseek (followed by PSTP)
outperformed other models in distinguishing LLPS from non-LLPS regions (**Fig. 2a, b,**
Supplementary Fig. 3a, b) as measured by a custom match score (**Methods**). For instance, for
the human LINE-1 retrotransposable element, with an overall LLPS score of 0.82, Phaseek
captured the known LLPS key region (**Fig. 2b, c**). Notably, removing residues 47-53 (segment A)
and 132-152 (segment B) from the protein sequence, compared to random truncation, reduced the
overall LLPS score to 0.43 and 0.37, respectively (**Fig. 2c, Supplementary Fig. 4**), *i.e.*, below the
classification threshold of 0.7 (**Methods**). This finding recapitulates experimental results that the
deletion of either of these segments disrupts the LLPS phenotype[63].

Next, we analyzed variations in LLPS scores following the fusion of phase-separating peptides to
non-phase-separating proteins. For interferon-alpha A (IFN-alpha A) fused to an artificially
designed elastin-like protein (ELP)[67], all models except catGRANULE 2.0 correctly predicted LLPS
scores for IFN-alpha A (<0.5), ELP (>0.5) and IFN-alpha A-ELP (>0.5) (**Supplementary Fig. 3c**).
For the fused sequence of an artificially designed peptide (HERD 2,2), mCherry, and flavin-
containing monooxygenases (FMO)[51], only Phaseek predicted correct LLPS scores, *i.e.*, <0.5 for
mCherry and FMO, and >0.5 for HERD 2,2 and HERD 2,2-mCherry-FMO (**Supplementary Fig.**
3d). Notably, while we used 0.5 as the arbitrary comparison threshold across different models, this
observation remains valid when Phaseek's optimal threshold of 0.7 is applied (**Supplementary**
Fig. 5).

Next, we sought to investigate the effect of point mutations on LLPS. We collected 2,617
experimentally validated impactful mutations on 137 phase-separating proteins from multiple
studies[68–70] (**Data availability**). Additionally, we introduced 20 random mutations for each of the
137 proteins, yielding a total of 2,740 mutations (**Methods**). To evaluate Phaseek's ability to
capture the effects of point mutations at the sequence, amino acid, and regional level, we calculated
three custom metrics: $\Delta(\text{score})$, $\Delta(\text{aa\_score})$, and $\Sigma(\Delta(\text{aa\_score}))$, respectively (**Methods**). Using
these metrics, Phaseek significantly discriminated impactful from random mutations (**Fig. 2d,**
Supplementary Fig. 6). Notably, the $\Delta(\text{score})$ and $\Sigma(\Delta(\text{aa\_score}))$ metrics, which capture
sequence and cumulative regional level variations, resulted in significant differences (p-value =
1.1×10^{-19} and 4.6×10^{-12}), in both non-IDR and IDR regions (**Supplementary Fig. 7**). However, the
$\Delta(\text{aa\_score})$ metric, which focuses solely on the mutated residue, showed no significant difference
(p-value = 0.83) (**Supplementary Fig. 6, 7, 9**). These results suggest that Phaseek relies on
contextual information in predicting mutation effects. Among impactful mutations, polar to aromatic,
particularly serine to phenylalanine and serine to tyrosine, resulted in the highest score increase.
Meanwhile, aromatic to hydrophobic mutations, especially tyrosine to isoleucine, were associated
with the largest decreases in score (**Supplementary Fig. 8**). These findings are consistent with
prior reports[71,72].

Fig. 2. Phaseek identifies LLPS key regions and mutation effects. (a) Residue-level LLPS predictions from different models and their comparison using a custom match score (**Methods**) on four human proteins not used during Phaseek training, with experimentally validated phase-separating (blue) and non-phase-separating (red) regions. These proteins include AT-rich interactive domain-containing protein 1A (ARID1A), DNA-directed RNA polymerase II subunit, and recombinant Tau protein (see **Supplementary Fig. 3a** for ARID1A and recombinant Tau). **(b, c)** Analysis of LINE1-ORF1, containing two experimentally validated segments: residues 47–53 (Region A) and 132–152 (Region B). Residue-level LLPS predictions from various models and their comparisons are shown for the wild-type form (LLPS score: 0.82), deletion of Region A (LLPS score: 0.43), and deletion of Region B (LLPS score: 0.37). Structures were predicted using AlphaFold2. **(d)** Comparative performance of Phaseek in distinguishing impactful mutations from random mutations (violin plots on the right) and strengthening mutations from weakening mutations (violin plots on the left), using three customized evaluation metrics. See **Supplementary Fig. 6-9** for full mutation performance analysis. **(e)** A case study on human Annexin A1 (UniProtKB: P50995) showing predicted effects of six point mutations, three LLPS-weakening

(R235Q, H390P, R456H) and three LLPS-strengthening (D40G, R346C, G38R), based on experimental evidence. Changes in residue-level LLPS scores are shown on AlphaFold2-predicted structures, with decreased scores in red, increased scores in blue, and mutated residues in green (**Supplementary Fig. 10**). Predictions by catGRANULE I and PScore in panels (a, b) were scaled to a 0–1 range using the StandardScaler module in scikit-learn for comparison purposes. Models not included in panels (a, b) do not generate residue-level LLPS profiles. Model colors: Phaseek (periwinkle blue), PSPhunter (deep salmon), catGRANULE I (Caribbean green), PScore (medium purple), catGRANULE II (saffron yellow), PSTP-LST-kernel (deep cerulean). The statistical significance is indicated by the one-sided Mann–Whitney U p-values (****$p < 0.0001$).

Phaseek was evaluated on a set of sequences with experimentally characterized LLPS-promoting and -weakening mutations, and accurately identified both types (**Fig. 2d, Supplementary Fig. 9**). As an example, we examined such mutations in human Annexin II[73], which facilitates RNA transport in neurons and has been implicated in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis[73]. In line with the experimental observations, Phaseek captured the effects of both weakening (R235Q, H395P, and R456H) and strengthening (D40G, R346C, and G38R) mutations on LLPS (**Fig. 2e and Supplementary Fig. 10**).

Together, these results demonstrate that, despite being trained on whole sequences without labeled regions, Phaseek identifies sub-sequences driving LLPS and predicts the effect of mutations at residue level.

Phaseek reveals LLPS conservation among orthologs and associated biological functions

Few studies have investigated the conservation of phase separation across the tree of life[74,75,76]. Whether LLPS is conserved among orthologs has remained largely unexplored. To address this, we examined the proteomes of 18 organisms: *Escherichia coli*, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *Arabidopsis thaliana*, *Anopheles gambiae*, *Drosophila melanogaster*, *Caenorhabditis elegans*, *Danio rerio*, *Xenopus laevis*, *Gallus gallus*, *Rattus norvegicus*, *Mus musculus*, *Canis lupus familiaris*, *Bos taurus*, *Sus scrofa*, *Macaca mulatta*, *Pan troglodytes*, and *Homo sapiens*. If phase separation is a conserved feature, it is more likely that members of an orthogroup coherently show LLPS behavior, with variations arising only if orthologs adapted through evolutionary divergence[74].

In each of the 18 proteomes, we quantified the fraction of phase-separating predicted proteins. Among all organisms, *E. coli* had the lowest fraction (2%), consistent with the observation that eukaryotes have more disordered proteins than prokaryotes[77]. By contrast, *S. cerevisiae* and *A. thaliana* each reached 12%, and *H. sapiens* 27% (**Fig. 3a**). Next, we categorized the proteome sequences using OrthoFinder[78–80], resulting in 24,438 orthogroups, of which 216 had contributions from every organism (**methods**). All orthogroups were then sorted by size and further categorized by the number of organisms contributing at least one ortholog with predicted LLPS (**Fig. 3b**). Notably, a species can encode multiple instances of an ortholog, *e.g.*, as isoforms, within the same orthogroup. In the heatmap shown in **Fig. 3b**, the marked increase in the fraction of LLPS-positive orthogroups near the horizontal and diagonal margins suggests that LLPS holds functional relevance across orthologs. Additionally, we tested for outliers among orthogroups in which only one organism was absent versus those in which only one organism was present and found that *D. rerio* and *C. familiaris* as outliers, respectively (**Supplementary Fig. 11a and 11b**).

Fig. 3. Phaseek reveals LLPS conservation among orthologs and identifies biological processes involved. (a)
Fractions of proteins predicted to be phase-separating by Phaseek are shown along with the species tree generated by
OrthoFinder[78–80]. **(b)** Orthologs extracted using OrthoFinder across the 18 proteomes to study the evolutionary

conservation of LLPS. 24,438 orthogroups were identified with sizes of 1 to 18, representing the number of organisms
that each contains. Orthogroups were categorized based on: (i) the number of organisms in each group (orthogroup
size), and (ii) the number of organisms with at least one LLPS-predicted protein. For each orthogroup size, the heatmap
shows the fraction of groups with ≥1 predicted LLPS proteins for each organism (example provided in the figure). **(c)**
Gene Ontology (GO) terms enriched for the LLPS predicted fraction of 17 proteomes (all organisms but *P. falciparum*).
Semantic similarity was applied to reduce the list of enriched terms.

Among the orthogroups with contributions from all 18 organisms, the one corresponding to the
topoisomerase II enzyme family (Topo II) included 14 members with LLPS scores >0.7. Topo II
resolves tensions from DNA supercoiling and entanglements[81]. In *S. cerevisiae* and *H. sapiens*,
Topo II (TOP2α/TOP2β) undergoes LLPS via its less-conserved disordered C-terminal domain
(CTD) to couple catenation with chromatin condensation[81,82]. Multiple sequence alignment further
illustrates how phase-separating CTDs can retain high LLPS scores despite low conservation
scores, suggesting that LLPS behavior can be conserved despite changes in the amino acid
sequence (**Supplementary Fig. 12**).

To identify biological processes involving LLPS, we used proteome predictions of the 18 organisms
but *Plasmodium Falciparum,* as its annotation package (org.Pf.plasmo.db on Bioconductor) is not
maintained. For each organism, we enriched the set of genes for the LLPS-positive proteins for
Gene Ontology (GO) terms and applied semantic similarity to identify the most relevant terms
(**Methods and Supplementary Table 2**).

In the Molecular Function category, the majority of enriched terms were related to binding, coherent
with the phenomenon of LLPS (**Fig. 3c**). Among the top-results, nucleoside-triphosphatase
regulator activity (GO:0060589) is shared across 13 organisms, ATP hydrolysis activity
(GO:0016887) is shared across 11 and ATP binding (GO:0005524) across 10 which is in line with
the central role of ATP in LLPS regulation[83–85]. Interestingly, the aforementioned Topo II enzyme
corresponds to the parental term catalytic activity, acting on a nucleic acid (GO:0140640) enriched
in 10 organisms. In the Cellular Compartment category, the term nucleus (GO:0005634) was
enriched in 15 organisms while transcription regulator complex (GO:0005667) and MCM complex
(GO:0042555) were found enriched across 14 organisms. In the Biological Process category, the
top-result is cellular component organization (GO:0016043) enriched in 13 organisms followed by
homophilic cell adhesion via plasma membrane adhesion molecules (GO:0007156) enriched in 12
organisms (see **Code availability**).

Orthologs display LLPS behavior in a coordinated fashion, suggesting evolutionary conservation.
The biological functions enriched across organisms recapitulate processes known to involve LLPS
and suggest novel areas of investigation.

Phaseek unravels physicochemical and structural determinants of LLPS at the proteome
level

The LLPS phenotype is driven by amino acid sequences with specific physicochemical and
structural properties[86]. We studied such features using the proteomes of 18 organisms for which
the LLPS behavior of individual proteins was predicted by Phaseek. We extracted the secondary

structures and physicochemical features of these sequences to investigate their correlations with
the predicted LLPS propensity (**Fig. 4a**, **Methods**).

First, we compared the secondary structures predicted by AlphaFold[87] (helices, sheets, turns,
bends, and IDRs) between random and key regions (**Methods**), where key regions were defined
as subsequences predicted to have a high LLPS propensity. Compared to key regions, random
regions contained significantly more ordered structures such as helices (median fraction of 0.422
vs 0.037, respectively) (**Fig. 4b**, see **Supplementary Fig. 13** for species-specific plots). In contrast,
key regions were significantly enriched in disordered structures (median of 0.913 vs 0.188 in
random regions). This supports the widely accepted notion that IDRs are important drivers of
LLPS[7].

Second, we examined the relationship between predicted LLPS propensity (the score of the full-
length sequence) and 12 physicochemical features across proteomes by computing Spearman
correlations (**Fig. 4c**, **Supplementary Fig. 14**). One of the physicochemical features, IDR score, is
the average of the disorder propensity for individual residues predicted by AIUPred[88]. Among all
features, IDR score exhibited the highest correlation with LLPS score (Spearman ρ = 0.45). Indeed,
disordered regions facilitate effective multivalent inter-/intra-molecular interactions[89]. In contrast,
hydropathy, the fraction of hydrophobic residues, and the fraction of aromatic residues showed
inverse correlations (ρ = -0.41, -0.40, and -0.35, respectively). Hydrophobic and aromatic
interactions favor protein folding and (in extreme cases) solid-like assemblies[7]. Polyproline II (PPII)
helix propensity and glycine/proline fraction were positively correlated (ρ = 0.33 and 0.27). PPII
helix propensity has been reported to contribute to protein-protein interactions[90] and protein-nucleic
acid interactions[91]. Moreover, glycine and proline residues have been found to be essential in
phase separation[44]. Aromatic clustering, net charge, and charged amino acid patterning (*e.g.*,
Kappa, representing the tendency of positive/negative amino acids to form clusters) showed the
lowest correlations (ρ = -0.09, -0.07 and 0.04, respectively). Although the patterning of charged
and aromatic residues has been associated with phase separation[56,92,93], LLPS often depends only
on a specific region within a sequence.

We focused on the physicochemical analysis of LLPS-promoting regions (key regions) and
compared them to random regions (**Methods**). We compared medians and common-language
effect sizes (CLES)[94] to quantify differences between their distributions. Key regions exhibited a
median aromatic clustering score of 0.34 lower than random regions (CLES = 0.22, meaning key
regions have higher values in 22%, or lower values in 78%, of all pairwise comparisons), and a
median Kappa of 0.043 higher (CLES = 0.59) (**Fig. 4d, Supplementary Fig. 15, 16**). Thus, key
regions exhibited higher Kappa values, indicating greater charge blockiness, which can enhance
inter-/intramolecular interactions[92,95]. The differences in aromatic clustering suggest key regions
display a greater dispersion of aromatic residues, balancing between LLPS and aggregation[7,93,96].

Overall, these results show that physicochemical features associated with LLPS hold true at the
proteome level.

Fig. 4. Structural and physicochemical properties associated with LLPS across 10 proteomes. (a) Only 10 out of the 18 proteomes used in this study had predicted secondary structures available in the AlphaFold Protein Structure Database (AlphaFold DB). We analyzed secondary structures (b), physicochemical features of full-length sequences (c), and physicochemical features of key versus random regions (d) to investigate how these properties correlate with the protein LLPS propensity. **(b)** Violin plots compare secondary structure distributions for random and key regions across the 10 proteomes with AlphaFold data (*E. coli*, *P. falciparum*, *S. cerevisiae*, *A. thaliana*, *D. melanogaster*, *C. elegans*, *D. rerio*, *R. norvegicus*, *M. musculus*, and *H. sapiens*). A one-sided Mann–Whitney U test produced p < 0.0001 for all five structural classes. Boxes indicate the interquartile range (Q1–Q3) and medians. See **Supplementary Fig. 13** for secondary structure analysis of individual proteomes. **(c)** Spearman correlation coefficients between physicochemical feature s and Phaseek LLPS scores of the same 10 proteomes. See **Supplementary Fig. 14** for species-specific plots, as well as the combined 18-organism plot. **(d)** Density plots of physicochemical feature distributions in random versus key regions for the same 10 proteomes, with medians shown. One-sided Mann–Whitney U tests yielded p < 0.0001 for all comparisons shown. Distributions for all physicochemical features across both the 10 proteomes and the full set of 18 proteomes are shown in **Supplementary Fig. 15** and **Supplementary Fig. 16**, respectively. Feature labels in (c, d) use shorthand: aromatic (fraction of F, W, Y), hydrophobic (A, V, I, L, M), Gly/Pro (G and P), polar (S, T, N, Q, C, H), positive (K, R), and negative (D, E).

Discussion

Here, we introduced Phaseek, a sequence-based LLPS prediction model that integrates the transformers architecture, FEGS statistical matrices, and region-boosting bottleneck (**Fig. 1, Supplementary Fig. 1b**). We benchmarked Phaseek against existing LLPS predicting models

using data unseen by any of the models and corresponding to four distinct biological contexts: synthetic proteins (**Fig. 1d**), *A. thaliana* B-isox assay (**Fig. 1e**), fusion oncoproteins (**Fig. 1f**), and phase separating proteins with/without IDRs (**Fig. 1g**). While other models could discriminate a subset of the data with a comparable accuracy, Phaseek showed overall superior performance.

Despite being trained on amino acid sequences without explicit annotation of subsequences, Phaseek identifies key regions involved in LLPS and predicts the impact of point mutations (**Fig. 2**). For key regions, we challenged Phaseek with four human proteins, unseen to the model, for which LLPS regions had been experimentally determined. Phaseek outperformed other models in distinguishing key phase-separating regions from the rest of the protein sequence (**Fig. 2a-c, Supplementary Fig. 3**). For point mutations, Phaseek significantly distinguished impactful from random mutations and predicted whether they promote or weaken the LLPS propensity. This ability makes Phaseek a valuable tool for hypothesis-driven study of LLPS.

We applied Phaseek to study the evolutionary conservation of LLPS among orthologs and to identify associated molecular functions, biological processes, and cellular compartments across 18 proteomes. Our results suggest that LLPS tends to be evolutionarily conserved (**Fig. 3b**). Variations can occur; an ortholog might have been modified during evolution to meet species physiological conditions. For example, *D. melanogaster*'s BuGZ protein, unlike its orthologs, forms hydrogel-like material rather than liquid condensates[74]. Some biological functions identified by enrichment analysis are shared across all studied organisms and recapitulate processes known to involve LLPS and suggest novel areas of investigation (**Fig. 3c**).

It must be noted that the scores produced by Phaseek are not direct indicators of the extent of phase separation, condensate size, dynamics, or critical concentration across different sequences. Rather, they reflect the likelihood that a sequence harbors phase-separating region(s) and undergoes LLPS. Therefore, a sequence with a higher score is not necessarily expected to require fewer specific conditions for phase separation than the one with a lower score. However, if the scores in comparison are for mutated variants of the same sequence, they can be correlated with shifts in LLPS propensity. Proteins involved in LLPS are categorized into three major groups: scaffolds, regulators, and clients[97,98]. Scaffolds, which drive the formation of condensates, are further divided into self-phase-separating and partner-dependent types[97,98]. Clients are recruited into scaffold-driven condensates but do not independently initiate phase separation. Regulators influence LLPS behavior through mechanisms such as post-translational modifications. While Phaseek's training data included both self-phase-separating and partner-dependent sequences to enhance generalizability, future models may be developed for predicting LLPS within a specific subclass of these proteins. The discovery of diverse phase-separating proteins can lead to improvements in the predictive ability of models that is of interest to both fundamental and applied research.

Methods

Train, test and evaluation data

To construct our positive dataset, we leveraged LLPS dataset resources, including LLPSDB[98,99],
DrLLPS[98,99], PhaSeDB[100], and PhaSePro[97], along with a manually curated dataset of 611
sequences. In total, this yielded 1,275 LLPS-positive polypeptides. For our negative dataset, we
used 5,258 sequences compiled for PSPredictor[41].

We filtered out sequences exceeding a length of 512 and applied CD-HIT[101] (Cluster Database at
High Identity with Tolerance) clustering with a similarity threshold of 0.9 to eliminate highly similar
sequences. This resulted in a final dataset of 436 positive and 4,858 negative sequences (**Data**
availability). Both datasets were then randomly split into training and test sets in a 9:1 ratio.

Due to the limited availability of phase-separating protein sequences, we employed an
oversampling strategy to augment the size and diversity of our positive training set. IDRs are widely
recognized as key drivers of LLPS[7]. To preserve these regions during data augmentation, we
selectively introduced mutations only within the structured (folded) regions of protein sequences,
leaving disordered regions intact. We trained a CategoricalHMM (categorical hidden markov
model) using the hmmlearn library[102] on a separated set of folded regions from our phase-
separating peptides (**Data availability**), with residues having AIUPred IDR scores of <0.5
considered folded.

The trained HMM was used to sample new amino acid sequences of the same length as each
original sequence. We repeated this augmentation process multiple times per sequence, ultimately
increasing the size of the positive set from 436 to a total of 4,151 sequences.

The positive evaluation set included sequences not used during training and tuning, as well as
synthetic sequences compiled from five studies[51–55]. The negative evaluation set comprised unused
sequences from the training split, supplemented with the PSPHunter[44] negative test set to increase
diversity.

Folded/disordered (non-)phase-separating data

To identify folded phase-separating (folded PSPs) and disordered non-phase-separating
(disordered-nonPSPs), we utilized AIUPred to calculate the average disorder score associated with
each protein sequence across DrLLPS, PhaSePro, and PhaSeDB databases. Using a strict cut off
of 0.8 on the average AIUPred IDR score, we filtered out the non-phase-separating sequences.
For Folded-nonPSPs we considered 0.2 as threshold and selected the phase-separating
sequences with IDR score below 0.2. Sequences overlapping with the train/test sets or failing CD-
HIT filtering were excluded from further analysis.

Mutation data

We obtained 2,410 mutations assigned as missense mutations from the DisPhaseDB[66] database.
These mutations influence LLPS in disease-associated proteins, although they have not been
specifically classified as either LLPS-strengthening or LLPS-weakening in the database.
Additionally, we gathered 207 mutations, labeled as LLPS-strengthening (n = 93) or LLPS-

weaking (n = 114) from DrLLPS, PSMutPred[69] and literature[60,70,103–108,109]. These resulted in a
total of 2,617 impactful mutations from 137 distinct proteins.

For the background mutations used in comparative analysis, 2,740 random mutations were
generated by introducing 20 random amino acid substitutions per sequence across the same 137
proteins. To assess the ability of Phaseek to distinguish impactful mutations from random ones, all
impactful mutations including the 2,410 missense, 93 LLPS-strengthening, and 114 LLPS-
weakening mutations were compared against the random mutation set. To further evaluate whether
Phaseek can differentiate LLPS-strengthening from LLPS-weakening mutations, only the 93
strengthening and 114 weakening mutations were used.

Three distinct scores were defined to evaluate model performance to detect impactful mutations:

1. Δ(score): The difference in LLPS score between the mutated sequence and the corresponding
wild-type sequence.
430
431   2. Δ(aa_score): The change in LLPS score for the single mutated residue before and after mutation.
432
3. Σ(Δ(aa_score)): The cumulative LLPS score difference across all residues whose individual LLPS
propensity values changed as a result of the mutation, calculated only for positions where the
absolute score difference exceeds a threshold of 1e-4.

Human Annexin A11 (P50995 · ANX11_HUMAN)[73,110] was selected to illustrate the effect of point
mutations on residue-level scoring (**Fig. 2, Supplementary Fig. 10**). One strengthening and one
weakening mutation were chosen for this demonstration.

Model architecture and training

Our core model consists of the encoder and the protein graph generator. The encoder module
takes as input a protein sequence, as an array of one-dimensional token indices, and outputs an
array of token embeddings. It is built based on a classical GPT architecture with 6 attention heads
per layer and 6 layers in total. We employed a token embedding size of 192 and a block size of
512. The protein graph module operates in parallel with the encoder to generate graphical space
representations of protein sequences. Each sequence is encoded into 10 distinct statistical
matrices based on sorting methods derived from the FEGS method[46] (see Matrix selection and
Protein graph sections below). After padding, these vectors are merged via weighted summation,
producing a single extended matrix. In the final pooling step, outputs from the encoder and protein
graph modules are integrated. The resulting output is then passed through a MLP that reduces the
dimensionality of each token, followed by a median operation to yield a 2-dimensional probability
vector. The integrated core model, comprising the encoder and the protein graph generator, was
trained on the augmented training set (see Train, test and evaluation data section). Optimization
was performed using the AdamW optimizer, with the cross entropy loss function applied to quantify
prediction errors. The model demonstrated convergence after 35 epochs, achieving the minimum
test loss at this point (**Code availability**).

Matrix selection

Each protein sequence in our dataset was encoded by the FEGS method[46] into 158 matrices, whose eigenvalues were concatenated into a 158-dimensional feature vector. A random forest classifier was subsequently trained on the training set based on the resulting vectors (**Code availability**). To evaluate the contribution of each of the 158 matrices in the scoring process, we employed the SHAP method, a game theoretic approach for interpreting the outputs of machine learning models. This analysis enabled us to quantify the relative contribution of each matrix by calculating its SHAP value. Based on this, we identified and selected the ten most impactful matrices during the scoring process (**Supplementary Table 1**).

Protein graph

We used the FEGS method[46] to construct the corresponding statistical matrices for each protein sequence. To leverage the physicochemical properties of amino acids, each amino acid is mapped to a unique point in Cartesian space based on the specific physicochemical properties selected from the AAIndex database[46], as described in Equation 1. The amino acids are then sorted and assigned in ascending order. For a given protein containing N amino acids as S = S_1, S_2, S_3, …, S_n, the relative position for each amino acid is calculated using Equation 2, where $\psi_{(0,0)}$ = (0, 0, 0), and $f_{\Omega 1, \Omega 2}$ denotes the frequency of the amino acid pair Ω_1, Ω_2 in the subsequence of the first i amino acids.

Equation 1: $\phi(\Omega_i) = (cos(\frac{2\pi i}{20}), sin(\frac{2\pi i}{20}), 1)$

Equation 2: $\psi(S_i) = \psi(S_{i-1}) + \phi(S_i) + \sum f_{\Omega_1, \Omega_2} \cdot \varphi(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$

Residue-level LLPS profile of proteins

We implemented a sliding window whose size varies based on protein length, ranging from a minimum of 5 to a maximum of 50 amino acids. This window slides across the full sequence, centering on each residue so that the target amino acid of interest lies at the midpoint. Subsequently, the window is divided into segments, with a length of half the window size. Finally, the LLPS scores for each segment are calculated by the core model and processed by a weighted summation layer to produce the final residue-level score. Weights are generated and assigned using an adjusted Gaussian distribution, giving higher importance to residues closer to the central amino acid (**Supplementary Fig. 1**).

To assess the models' ability to accurately distinguish LLPS-promoting regions from those with low-propensity, we defined a custom match scoring function focused on two key criteria: (i) the model's accuracy to classify regions as LLPS-promoting or low LLPS propensity, and (ii) its ability to produce a significant difference in scores between these two region types.

Residues were classified as LLPS-positive or LLPS-negative based on a score threshold of 0.5. The corresponding accuracy score was calculated according to the experimentally validated LLPS profiles at the residue level.

Additionally, to validate the significance of the differences in assigned LLPS scores, we calculated
the average score difference between LLPS-promoting and low-propensity regions. Finally, the
mean of the two scores was computed.

Scoring method

We introduced a boosted scoring mechanism to better capture the contribution of key regions to
LLPS. A gradient boosting classifier (XGBoost) was trained on residue-level LLPS scores
generated by the core model to leverage local phase separation propensities.

The final score is obtained by combining the scores of the core model and the XGBoost bottleneck
module. This strategy enhances the accuracy of LLPS prediction by identifying and emphasizing
the contributions of key regions involved in phase separation (**Supplementary Fig. 1**).

Other LLPS predictors used in this study

PSPHunter is a random forest model that utilizes 60 sequence-derived features including RNA-
DNA binding site affinity and post-translational modification sites, and is specialized in identifying
essential key residues in LLPS[44]. CatGranule 1.0 is a statistical algorithm that considers the
contributions of structural disorder, nucleic acid binding propensities, sequence length, and amino
acid content[49]. CatGranule ROBOT 2.0 can predict LLPS at single amino acid resolution using a
multi-layer perceptron model (MLP) based on physicochemical and structural features[43]. PScore is
a machine learning model trained to specifically capture pi-pi and pi-cation interactions that
promote LLPS[39]. PSPredictor is a word2vec-coded model trained using a gradient-boosting
decision tree[41]. Finally, PSTP (with two versions available) is an MLP model that uses the ESM-2
protein language model[111], and ALBATROSS IDR prediction model[112] to encode the input
sequences[50].

Key region and random region derivation

To define the key regions, we first smoothed the residue-level scores of each sequence with a
sliding window of size 7. Key regions were defined as consecutive segments where the smoothed
scores remained at or above 0.7 for a minimum of 20 residues. If the average score within any 7-
residue window dropped below 0.7, the region was considered discontinued.

Random regions, ranging from 20 to 250 residues in length, were sampled from each protein
sequence across the proteomes.

Evaluation parameters

To evaluate the model's performance and interpret the results, we employed several standard
metrics (TN, TP, FN and FP denote true negative, true positive, false negative, and false positive,
respectively):

- AUC (area under the ROC curve) assesses the ability of the classifier to differentiate positive from
negative classes regardless of the classification threshold. Higher AUC indicates better
performance (Equation 3).

Equation 3: $AUC = \int \frac{TP}{TP+FN} d(\frac{FP}{FP+TN})$

- Recall measures the capability of the model to identify the actual positive cases. It is defined as the
proportion of true-positives out of all actual positive cases (Equation 4).

Equation 4: $Recall = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$

- Precision, or positive predictive value, measures the proportion of predicted positive cases that are
actually positive (Equation 5).

Equation 5: $Precision = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}$

- F1-Score combines precision and recall into a single metric, offering a balanced measure of
performance, especially useful when dealing with imbalanced data (Equation 6).

Equation 6: $F1\ Score = \frac{2 \times Precision \times Recall}{Precision + Recall}$

Secondary structure derivation

Predicted structures of proteins for 10 proteomes were obtained in PDB format from the AlphaFold
Protein Structure Database[113]. Secondary structure information was extracted using the DSSP
(Dictionary of Secondary Structure in Proteins) package[114,115]. Structural elements were
categorized into five groups: helices (H, G, I, P), sheets (B, E), turns (T), bends (S), and irregular
or flexible regions (-), with the latter classified as disordered regions (**Supplementary Table 3**).

Ortholog analysis

The proteome of 18 organisms was obtained from the UniProt proteome database
(**Supplementary Table 4**), including *E. coli*, *P. falciparum*, *S. cerevisiae*, *A. thaliana*, *A. gambiae*,
D. melanogaster, *C. elegans*, *D. rerio*, *X. laevis*, *G. gallus*, *R. norvegicus*, *M. musculus*, *C. lupus*
familiaris, *B. taurus*, *S. scrofa*, *M. mulatta*, *P. troglodytes*, and *H. sapiens*.

For each organism, we used a single protein sequence per gene. The LLPS scores of these
sequences were predicted by Phaseek and assigned as phase-separating with a threshold of 0.7.
Using OrthoFinder[78–80], 328,887 genes (93.7% of the total) were grouped into 24,438 orthogroups.
Half of the genes belonged to orthogroups containing 18 or more genes (G50 = 18) (see **Data**
availability). Among these, 216 orthogroups contained sequences from all species, including 9
orthogroups composed exclusively of single-copy genes. The tree in Fig. 3a was generated using
Dendroscope[116].

LLPS investigation in Topoisomerase II enzyme orthologs:

We explored the orthogroups with members from all 18 organisms to identify protein sequences
with conserved LLPS properties across the tree of life. Only orthogroups containing a minimum of
nine LLPS-positive members were selected, resulting in 45 candidates. Among these, the
Topoisomerase II family stood out (min = 0.64, max = 0.76, median = 0.73). Given the enzyme's
fundamental role in DNA supercoiling resolution and genome organization during transcription and
replication, we investigated whether the elevated LLPS scores might reflect a conserved role for
phase separation in Topoisomerase II function. To investigate further, we conducted a literature
search and found that Topoisomerase II orthologs in two evolutionarily distant organisms,
Saccharomyces cerevisiae and *Homo sapiens*, have been shown to undergo phase separation[81].

Functional enrichment

To associate the LLPS phenomenon with biological processes, we predicted LLPS scores for all
proteins of seventeen organisms (**Supplementary Table 2**). For each organism, we filtered
proteins with a score of 0.7 or higher and enriched the corresponding gene sets for Gene Ontology
(GO) terms, which hierarchically represent biological processes.

We used the annoDb package of each organism to map genes and GO terms (**code availability**)
and performed conditional hypergeometric tests as implemented in the gostats[117] package
(v2.70.0) to ensure that a parent term was only reported if it is more enriched than any of its child
term.

To reduce the list of enriched terms, we applied semantic similarity using the rrvgo[118] package
(v1.16.0) with default method (Rel) and threshold (0.7). Enrichment results for each organism are
provided in a notebook together with the code to reproduce this analysis (**Data availability**).

Physicochemical features

Aromatic clustering[93] was calculated as

Equation 8: $Aromatic\ Clustering\ =\ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}P_i\ \ where\ \ P_i\ =\ \frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{b}+\frac{1}{c}+\cdots$

a, b, and c are the distances between aromatic residues. Proteome sequences with no aromatic
residues present were excluded from the analysis.

Disorder scores were calculated using AIUPred[88]

We used localCIDER[119] to calculate kappa (κ)[120], hydropathy, polyproline II helix (PPII) propensity,
net charge, and amino acid fractions in different categories including negative residue fraction
(nagative), positive residue fraction (positive), glycine and proline residue fraction (Gly/Pro), polar
residue fraction (polar), aromatic residue fraction (aromatic), and hydropathic residue fractions
(hydrophobic).

The charge blockiness parameter Kappa (κ)[120] quantifies the extent of charged amino acid mixing
(R, K, D, E) and is defined as

$$\text{Equation 7: } \kappa = \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta_{max}}\right)$$

where δ defines the average deviation from charge symmetry across sequence regions (blobs)
using a sliding window (size of 5), and δ_{max} is the maximum δ for the sequence given its
composition. A κ value of 0 indicates charge disparity, while 1 represents maximum charge
blockiness. A negative κ value (*e.g.*, -1, see the minor peak in **Fig. 4d**) corresponds to uncharged
sequences.

Hydropathy is based on the Kyte-Doolittle hydrophobicity scale, where each amino acid is assigned
a hydropathy index reflecting its water-vapor transfer free energy change and its side-chain
distribution between the protein's interior and exterior[121].

PPII helix propensity is based on the Hisler's scale, whereby each amino acid is assigned a
polyproline propensity score measured using a peptide host-guest system and isothermal titration
calorimetry[122].

Data availability

The training and test data is available on https://github.com/AMIRMOHAMMAD-OSS/Phaseek,
along with the detailed pathway enrichment analysis data for each organism (associated with **Fig.**
3c). The predicted LLPS score of the 18 proteomes (associated with **Fig. 3, 4**), physicochemical
and structural data (**Fig. 4, Supplementary Fig. 13-16**) are available on
https://zenodo.org/records/16728261. Data underlying **Fig. 1b-g**, **Fig. 2a-e**, **Fig. 3c**, **Fig. 4b**,
Supplementary Fig. 2-4, **6-12** are provided as **Source Data File**.

Code availability

The code associated with the model, along with the trained model, is provided on
https://github.com/AMIRMOHAMMAD-OSS/Phaseek. The code for pathway enrichment analysis
is also available on the same GitHub repository. A user-friendly Google Colab notebook of Phaseek
is available through this link.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by ATIP-Avenir young group leader program by INSERM-CNRS and
MOPGA (Make Our Planet Great Again) young researcher fellowship by the French government
(AP), and the Fondation Bettencourt Schueller (AP and ABL). The authors wish to thank Mostafa
Elraies, Negin Hadisadegh, and Roxana Ghasemi for their help in collecting initial training data and
Amir Reza Aliakbari and Sadrodin Barikbin for revising the code developed in this work.

Author contributions

AMM and HT gathered data, developed the model and performed the predictions and together with
AP analyzed the results. VG performed enrichment analyses. AMM and HT prepared the draft of
the manuscript with contributions from other authors. RN, ABL, and AP supervised the work.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Hyman, A. A. & Simons, K. Cell biology. Beyond oil and water--phase transitions in cells. *Science* **337**, 1047–1049 (2012).

2. Martin, E. W. & Holehouse, A. S. Intrinsically disordered protein regions and phase separation: sequence determinants of assembly or lack thereof. *Emerg Top Life Sci* **4**, 307–329 (2020).

3. Hyman, A. A., Weber, C. A. & Jülicher, F. Liquid-liquid phase separation in biology. *Annu. Rev. Cell Dev. Biol.* **30**, 39–58 (2014).

4. Guo, Q., Shi, X. & Wang, X. RNA and liquid-liquid phase separation. *Noncoding RNA Res* **6**, 92–99 (2021).

5. Rippe, K. Liquid-Liquid Phase Separation in Chromatin. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* **14**, (2022).

6. Su, Q., Mehta, S. & Zhang, J. Liquid-liquid phase separation: Orchestrating cell signaling through time and space. *Mol. Cell* **81**, 4137–4146 (2021).

7. Dignon, G. L., Best, R. B. & Mittal, J. Biomolecular Phase Separation: From Molecular Driving Forces to Macroscopic Properties. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **71**, 53–75 (2020).

8. Banani, S. F., Lee, H. O., Hyman, A. A. & Rosen, M. K. Biomolecular condensates: organizers of cellular biochemistry. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **18**, 285–298 (2017).

9. Azaldegui, C. A., Vecchiarelli, A. G. & Biteen, J. S. The emergence of phase separation as an organizing principle in bacteria. *Biophys. J.* **120**, 1123–1138 (2021).

10. Saeki, S., Kuwahara, N., Nakata, M. & Kaneko, M. Phase separation of poly(ethylene glycol)-water-salt systems. *Polymer* **18**, 1027–1031 (1977).

11. Koningsveld, R., Kleintjens, L. A. & Shultz, A. R. Liquid–liquid phase separation in multicomponent polymer solutions. IX. Concentration-dependent pair interaction parameter from critical miscibility data on the system polystyrene–cyclohexane. *Journal of Polymer Science Part A-2: Polymer Physics* **8**, 1261–1278 (1970).

12. Schaaf, P., Lotz, B. & Wittmann, J. C. Liquid-liquid phase separation and crystallization in binary

653 polymer systems. *Polymer* **28**, 193–200 (1987).

654 13. Brangwynne, C. P. *et al.* Germline P granules are liquid droplets that localize by controlled

655 dissolution/condensation. *Science* **324**, 1729–1732 (2009).

656 14. Hou, C. *et al.* PhaSepDB in 2022: annotating phase separation-related proteins with droplet

657 states, co-phase separation partners and other experimental information. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **51**,

658 D460–D465 (2023).

659 15. Wang, H. *et al.* Rubisco condensate formation by CcmM in β-carboxysome biogenesis. *Nature*

660 **566**, 131–135 (2019).

661 16. Freeman Rosenzweig, E. S. *et al.* The Eukaryotic CO-Concentrating Organelle Is Liquid-like and

662 Exhibits Dynamic Reorganization. *Cell* **171**, 148–162.e19 (2017).

663 17. Wunder, T. & Mueller-Cajar, O. Biomolecular condensates in photosynthesis and metabolism.

664 *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.* **58**, 1–7 (2020).

665 18. Atkinson, N. *et al.* Introducing an algal carbon-concentrating mechanism into higher plants:

666 location and incorporation of key components. *Plant Biotechnol. J.* **14**, 1302–1315 (2016).

667 19. Wang, Y., Stessman, D. J. & Spalding, M. H. The CO2 concentrating mechanism and

668 photosynthetic carbon assimilation in limiting CO2 : how Chlamydomonas works against the

669 gradient. *Plant J.* **82**, 429–448 (2015).

670 20. Altmeyer, M. *et al.* Liquid demixing of intrinsically disordered proteins is seeded by poly(ADP-

671 ribose). *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8088 (2015).

672 21. Levone, B. R. *et al.* FUS-dependent liquid-liquid phase separation is important for DNA repair

673 initiation. *J. Cell Biol.* **220**, (2021).

674 22. Wang, Y.-L. *et al.* Liquid-liquid phase separation in DNA double-strand breaks repair. *Cell Death*

675 *Dis.* **14**, 746 (2023).

676 23. Brangwynne, C. P., Mitchison, T. J. & Hyman, A. A. Active liquid-like behavior of nucleoli

677 determines their size and shape in Xenopus laevis oocytes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**,

678 4334–4339 (2011).

24. Li, P. *et al.* Phase transitions in the assembly of multivalent signalling proteins. *Nature* **483**, 336–

340 (2012).

25. Duchemin, A. *et al.* DHX15-independent roles for TFIP11 in U6 snRNA modification, U4/U6.U5

tri-snRNP assembly and pre-mRNA splicing fidelity. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 6648 (2021).

26. Liao, S. E. & Regev, O. Splicing at the phase-separated nuclear speckle interface: a model.

Nucleic Acids Res. **49**, 636–645 (2021).

27. Noble, D. It's time to admit that genes are not the blueprint for life. *Nature* **626**, 254–255 (2024).

28. Shin, Y. & Brangwynne, C. P. Liquid phase condensation in cell physiology and disease. *Science*

357, (2017).

29. Saqr, B. M. G. A. *et al.* Ageing drop by drop: Disturbance of the membrane-less organelle

biogenesis as an aging hallmark. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* **742**, 151088 (2025).

30. Zbinden, A., Pérez-Berlanga, M., De Rossi, P. & Polymenidou, M. Phase Separation and

Neurodegenerative Diseases: A Disturbance in the Force. *Dev. Cell* **55**, 45–68 (2020).

31. Mehta, S. & Zhang, J. Liquid-liquid phase separation drives cellular function and dysfunction in

cancer. *Nat. Rev. Cancer* **22**, 239–252 (2022).

32. Boeynaems, S. *et al.* Protein Phase Separation: A New Phase in Cell Biology. *Trends Cell Biol.*

28, 420–435 (2018).

33. Yao, Y. *et al.* LncRNA-MEG3 Regulates Muscle Mass and Metabolic Homeostasis by Facilitating

SUZ12 Liquid-Liquid Phase Separation. *Adv Sci (Weinh)* **12**, e2417715 (2025).

34. Niu, X. *et al.* Biomolecular condensates: Formation mechanisms, biological functions, and

therapeutic targets. *MedComm (2020)* **4**, e223 (2023).

35. Delmore, J. E. *et al.* BET bromodomain inhibition as a therapeutic strategy to target c-Myc. *Cell*

146, 904–917 (2011).

36. Esmaili, F., Pourmirzaei, M., Ramazi, S., Shojaeilangari, S. & Yavari, E. A Review of Machine

Learning and Algorithmic Methods for Protein Phosphorylation Site Prediction. *Genomics*

Proteomics Bioinformatics **21**, 1266–1285 (2023).

37. Idhaya, T., Suruliandi, A. & Raja, S. P. A Comprehensive Review on Machine Learning

Techniques for Protein Family Prediction. *Protein J* **43**, 171–186 (2024).

38. Xu, Y. *et al.* Deep Dive into Machine Learning Models for Protein Engineering. *J Chem Inf Model*

60, 2773–2790 (2020).

39. Vernon, R. M. *et al.* Pi-Pi contacts are an overlooked protein feature relevant to phase

separation. *Elife* **7**, (2018).

40. Chen, Z. *et al.* Screening membraneless organelle participants with machine-learning models that

integrate multimodal features. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **119**, e2115369119 (2022).

41. Chu, X. *et al.* Prediction of liquid-liquid phase separating proteins using machine learning. *BMC*

Bioinformatics **23**, 72 (2022).

42. Hou, S. *et al.* Machine learning predictor PSPire screens for phase-separating proteins lacking

intrinsically disordered regions. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 2147 (2024).

43. Monti, M. *et al.* Accurate predictions of liquid-liquid phase separating proteins at single amino

acid resolution. *bioRxiv* (2024) doi:10.1101/2024.07.19.602785.

44. Sun, J. *et al.* Precise prediction of phase-separation key residues by machine learning. *Nat.*

Commun. **15**, 2662 (2024).

45. Brown, T. B. *et al.* Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. *arXiv [cs.CL]* (2020)

doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2005.14165.

46. Mu, Z. *et al.* FEGS: a novel feature extraction model for protein sequences and its applications.

BMC Bioinformatics **22**, 297 (2021).

47. Tripathi, S. *et al.* Defining the condensate landscape of fusion oncoproteins. *Nat Commun* **14**,

6008 (2023).

48. Boulay, G. *et al.* Cancer-Specific Retargeting of BAF Complexes by a Prion-like Domain. *Cell*

171, 163–178.e19 (2017).

49. Bolognesi, B. *et al.* A Concentration-Dependent Liquid Phase Separation Can Cause Toxicity

upon Increased Protein Expression. *Cell Rep* **16**, 222–231 (2016).

50. Feng, M. *et al.* PSTP: Decoding latent sequence grammar for protein phase separation through

transfer learning and attention. *bioRxiv* (2024) doi:10.1101/2024.10.29.620820.

51. Hilditch, A. T. *et al.* Assembling membraneless organelles from de novo designed proteins. *Nat*

Chem **16**, 89–97 (2024).

52. Quiroz, F. G. & Chilkoti, A. Sequence heuristics to encode phase behaviour in intrinsically

disordered protein polymers. *Nat Mater* **14**, 1164–1171 (2015).

53. Simon, J. R., Carroll, N. J., Rubinstein, M., Chilkoti, A. & López, G. P. Programming molecular

self-assembly of intrinsically disordered proteins containing sequences of low complexity. *Nat*

Chem **9**, 509–515 (2017).

54. MacEwan, S. R. *et al.* Phase Behavior and Self-Assembly of Perfectly Sequence-Defined and

Monodisperse Multiblock Copolypeptides. *Biomacromolecules* **18**, 599–609 (2017).

55. Ramšak, M. *et al.* Programmable de novo designed coiled coil-mediated phase separation in

mammalian cells. *Nat Commun* **14**, 7973 (2023).

56. Zhang, H. *et al.* Large-scale identification of potential phase-separation proteins from plants using

a cell-free system. *Mol Plant* **16**, 310–313 (2023).

57. Feng, Z., Jia, B. & Zhang, M. Liquid-Liquid Phase Separation in Biology: Specific Stoichiometric

Molecular Interactions vs Promiscuous Interactions Mediated by Disordered Sequences.

Biochemistry **60**, 2397–2406 (2021).

58. Zhang, H. *et al.* Liquid-liquid phase separation in biology: mechanisms, physiological functions

and human diseases. *Sci China Life Sci* **63**, 953–985 (2020).

59. Farahi, N., Lazar, T., Tompa, P., Meszaros, B. & Pancsa, R. Phase-separating fusion proteins

drive cancer by dysregulating transcription through ectopic condensates. (2023)

doi:10.1101/2023.09.20.558425.

60. Conicella, A. E., Zerze, G. H., Mittal, J. & Fawzi, N. L. ALS Mutations Disrupt Phase Separation

Mediated by α-Helical Structure in the TDP-43 Low-Complexity C-Terminal Domain. *Structure* **24**,

1537–1549 (2016).

61. Chandra, B. *et al.* Phase Separation Mediates NUP98 Fusion Oncoprotein Leukemic

Transformation. *Cancer Discov* **12**, 1152–1169 (2022).

62. Mahapatra, A. & Newberry, R. W. Liquid-liquid phase separation of α-synuclein is highly sensitive

to sequence complexity. *bioRxiv* (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.08.03.551831.

63. Newton, J. C. *et al.* Phase separation of the LINE-1 ORF1 protein is mediated by the N-terminus

and coiled-coil domain. *Biophys. J.* **120**, 2181–2191 (2021).

64. Kim, Y. R. *et al.* Prion-like domain mediated phase separation of ARID1A promotes oncogenic

potential of Ewing's sarcoma. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 6569 (2024).

65. Boehning, M. *et al.* RNA polymerase II clustering through carboxy-terminal domain phase

separation. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **25**, 833–840 (2018).

66. Kanaan, N. M., Hamel, C., Grabinski, T. & Combs, B. Liquid-liquid phase separation induces

pathogenic tau conformations in vitro. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 2809 (2020).

67. Hu, J., Wang, G., Liu, X. & Gao, W. Enhancing Pharmacokinetics, Tumor Accumulation, and

Antitumor Efficacy by Elastin-Like Polypeptide Fusion of Interferon Alpha. *Adv Mater* **27**, 7320–

7324 (2015).

68. Navarro, A. M. *et al.* DisPhaseDB: An integrative database of diseases related variations in liquid-

liquid phase separation proteins. *Comput Struct Biotechnol J* **20**, 2551–2557 (2022).

69. Feng, M. *et al.* Decoding Missense Variants by Incorporating Phase Separation via Machine

Learning. *Nat Commun* **15**, 8279 (2024).

70. Mensah, M. A. *et al.* Aberrant phase separation and nucleolar dysfunction in rare genetic

diseases. *Nature* **614**, 564–571 (2023).

71. Lin, Y., Currie, S. L. & Rosen, M. K. Intrinsically disordered sequences enable modulation of

protein phase separation through distributed tyrosine motifs. *J Biol Chem* **292**, 19110–19120

(2017).

72. Wang, J. *et al.* A Molecular Grammar Governing the Driving Forces for Phase Separation of

Prion-like RNA Binding Proteins. *Cell* **174**, 688–699.e16 (2018).

73. Liao, Y.-C. *et al.* RNA Granules Hitchhike on Lysosomes for Long-Distance Transport, Using

Annexin A11 as a Molecular Tether. *Cell* **179**, 147–164.e20 (2019).

74. Chin, A. F., Zheng, Y. & Hilser, V. J. Phylogenetic convergence of phase separation and mitotic

function in the disordered protein BuGZ. *Protein Sci* **31**, 822–834 (2022).

75. Babl, L. *et al.* CTP-controlled liquid-liquid phase separation of ParB. *J Mol Biol* **434**, 167401

(2022).

76. Dasmeh, P. & Wagner, A. Natural Selection on the Phase-Separation Properties of FUS during

160 My of Mammalian Evolution. *Mol Biol Evol* **38**, 940–951 (2021).

77. Ward, J. J., Sodhi, J. S., McGuffin, L. J., Buxton, B. F. & Jones, D. T. Prediction and functional

analysis of native disorder in proteins from the three kingdoms of life. *J Mol Biol* **337**, 635–645

(2004).

78. Emms, D. M. & Kelly, S. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for comparative

genomics. *Genome Biol* **20**, 238 (2019).

79. Emms, D. M. & Kelly, S. STRIDE: Species Tree Root Inference from Gene Duplication Events.

Mol Biol Evol **34**, 3267–3278 (2017).

80. Emms, D. M. & Kelly, S. STAG: Species tree inference from all genes. *bioRxiv* (2018)

doi:10.1101/267914.

81. Jeong, J., Lee, J. H., Carcamo, C. C., Parker, M. W. & Berger, J. M. DNA-Stimulated Liquid-

Liquid phase separation by eukaryotic topoisomerase ii modulates catalytic function. *Elife* **11**,

(2022).

82. Ho, W.-L. & Huang, J.-R. The return of the rings: Evolutionary convergence of aromatic residues

in the intrinsically disordered regions of RNA-binding proteins for liquid-liquid phase separation.

Protein Sci **31**, e4317 (2022).

83. Liu, F. & Wang, J. ATP Acts as a Hydrotrope to Regulate the Phase Separation of NBDY

Clusters. *JACS Au* **3**, 2578–2585 (2023).

84. Dang, M., Li, T. & Song, J. ATP and nucleic acids competitively modulate LLPS of the SARS-

CoV2 nucleocapsid protein. *Commun Biol* **6**, 80 (2023).

85. Zhu, Q., Wu, Y. & Luo, R. Understanding and fine tuning the propensity of ATP-driven liquid-

Liquid Phase Separation with oligolysine. *ChemRxiv* (2023) doi:10.26434/chemrxiv-2023-2fl3h.

86. Badaczewska-Dawid, A. E., Uversky, V. N. & Potoyan, D. A. BIAPSS: A Comprehensive

Physicochemical Analyzer of Proteins Undergoing Liquid-Liquid Phase Separation. *Int J Mol Sci*

23, (2022).

87. Jumper, J. *et al.* Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature* **596**, 583–

589 (2021).

88. Erdős, G. & Dosztányi, Z. AIUPred: combining energy estimation with deep learning for the

enhanced prediction of protein disorder. *Nucleic Acids Res* **52**, W176–W181 (2024).

89. Uversky, V. N., Kuznetsova, I. M., Turoverov, K. K. & Zaslavsky, B. Intrinsically disordered

proteins as crucial constituents of cellular aqueous two phase systems and coacervates. *FEBS*

Lett **589**, 15–22 (2015).

90. Siligardi, G. & Drake, A. F. The importance of extended conformations and, in particular, the PII

conformation for the molecular recognition of peptides. *Biopolymers* **37**, 281–292 (1995).

91. Hicks, J. M. & Hsu, V. L. The extended left-handed helix: a simple nucleic acid-binding motif.

Proteins **55**, 330–338 (2004).

92. Miyagi, T. *et al.* The Patterning and Proportion of Charged Residues in the Arginine-Rich Mixed-

Charge Domain Determine the Membrane-Less Organelle Targeted by the Protein. *Int J Mol Sci*

23, (2022).

93. Holehouse, A. S., Ginell, G. M., Griffith, D. & Böke, E. Clustering of Aromatic Residues in Prion-

like Domains Can Tune the Formation, State, and Organization of Biomolecular Condensates.

Biochemistry **60**, 3566–3581 (2021).

94. McGraw, K. O., & Wong, S. P. A common language effect size statistic. Psychological Bulletin,

111.2, 361–365. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.111.2.361.

95. Lin, Y.-H. & Chan, H. S. Phase Separation and Single-Chain Compactness of Charged

Disordered Proteins Are Strongly Correlated. *Biophys J* **112**, 2043–2046 (2017).

96. Martin, E. W. *et al.* Valence and patterning of aromatic residues determine the phase behavior of

prion-like domains. *Science* **367**, 694–699 (2020).

97. Mészáros, B. *et al.* PhaSePro: the database of proteins driving liquid-liquid phase separation.

Nucleic Acids Res **48**, D360–D367 (2020).

98. Ning, W. *et al.* DrLLPS: a data resource of liquid-liquid phase separation in eukaryotes. *Nucleic*

Acids Res **48**, D288–D295 (2020).

99. Li, Q. *et al.* LLPSDB: a database of proteins undergoing liquid-liquid phase separation in vitro.

Nucleic Acids Res **48**, D320–D327 (2020).

100. You, K. *et al.* PhaSepDB: a database of liquid-liquid phase separation related proteins. *Nucleic*

Acids Res **48**, D354–D359 (2020).

101. Fu, L., Niu, B., Zhu, Z., Wu, S. & Li, W. CD-HIT: accelerated for clustering the next-generation

sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **28**, 3150–3152 (2012).

102. GitHub - hmmlearn/hmmlearn: Hidden Markov Models in Python, with scikit-learn like API. *GitHub*

https://github.com/hmmlearn/hmmlearn.

103. Wang, L. *et al.* Rett syndrome-causing mutations compromise MeCP2-mediated liquid-liquid

phase separation of chromatin. *Cell Res* **30**, 393–407 (2020).

104. Li, M. *et al.* LLPS of FXR proteins drives replication organelle clustering for β-coronaviral

proliferation. *J Cell Biol* **223**, (2024).

105. Xu, B. *et al.* Distinct Effects of Familial Parkinson's Disease-Associated Mutations on α-Synuclein

Phase Separation and Amyloid Aggregation. *Biomolecules* **13**, (2023).

106. O'Carroll, A. *et al.* Pathological mutations differentially affect the self-assembly and

polymerisation of the innate immune system signalling adaptor molecule MyD88. *BMC Biol* **16**,

149 (2018).

107. Dao, T. P. *et al.* ALS-Linked Mutations Affect UBQLN2 Oligomerization and Phase Separation in

a Position- and Amino Acid-Dependent Manner. *Structure* **27**, 937–951.e5 (2019).

108. Kim, H. J. *et al.* Mutations in prion-like domains in hnRNPA2B1 and hnRNPA1 cause multisystem

proteinopathy and ALS. *Nature* **495**, 467–473 (2013).

109. Xie, Q. *et al.* Phase separation in cancer at a glance. *J Transl Med* **21**, 237 (2023).

110. Nahm, M. *et al.* mutations in ALS cause dysregulation of calcium homeostasis and stress granule

dynamics. *Sci Transl Med* **12**, (2020).

111. Lin, Z. *et al.* Evolutionary-scale prediction of atomic-level protein structure with a language model.

Science **379**, 1123–1130 (2023).

112. Lotthammer, J. M., Ginell, G. M., Griffith, D., Emenecker, R. J. & Holehouse, A. S. Direct

prediction of intrinsically disordered protein conformational properties from sequence. *Nat*

Methods **21**, 465–476 (2024).

113. Database, A. P. S. AlphaFold Protein Structure Database. https://alphafold.ebi.ac.uk/download.

114. Joosten, R. P. *et al.* A series of PDB related databases for everyday needs. *Nucleic Acids Res*

39, D411–9 (2011).

115. Kabsch, W. & Sander, C. Dictionary of protein secondary structure: pattern recognition of

hydrogen-bonded and geometrical features. *Biopolymers* **22**, 2577–2637 (1983).

116. Huson, D. H. & Scornavacca, C. Dendroscope 3: an interactive tool for rooted phylogenetic trees

and networks. *Syst Biol* **61**, 1061–1067 (2012).

117. Falcon, S. & Gentleman, R. Using GOstats to test gene lists for GO term association.

Bioinformatics **23**, 257–258 (2007).

118. Sayols, S. rrvgo: a Bioconductor package for interpreting lists of Gene Ontology terms. *MicroPubl*

Biol **2023**, (2023).

119. Ginell, G. M. & Holehouse, A. S. Analyzing the Sequences of Intrinsically Disordered Regions

with CIDER and localCIDER. *Methods Mol Biol* **2141**, 103–126 (2020).

120. Das, R. K. & Pappu, R. V. Conformations of intrinsically disordered proteins are influenced by

linear sequence distributions of oppositely charged residues. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **110**,

13392–13397 (2013).

121. Kyte, J. & Doolittle, R. F. A simple method for displaying the hydropathic character of a protein. *J*

Mol Biol **157**, 105–132 (1982).

122. Elam, W. A., Schrank, T. P., Campagnolo, A. J. & Hilser, V. J. Evolutionary conservation of the

polyproline II conformation surrounding intrinsically disordered phosphorylation sites. *Protein Sci*

22, 405–417 (2013).

123. Picard, R. R. & Cook, R. D. Cross-validation of regression models. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **79**, 575–

583 (1984).