pLM-SAV: A Δ-Embedding Approach for Predicting Pathogenic Single Amino Acid Variants

Orsolya Gereben[1], Hedvig Tordai[1], Lana Khamisi[1], Tamás Hegedűs[1,2]

[1]Department of Biophysics and Radiation Biology, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary,
[2]Biophysical Virology Research Group, HUN-REN-SU, Budapest, Hungary,

Corresponding author: Tamás Hegedűs, hegedus.tamas@hegelab.org

Abstract

Predicting whether single amino acid variants (SAVs) in proteins lead to pathogenic outcomes is a critical challenge in molecular biology and precision medicine. Experimental determination of the effects of all possible mutations or those observed in pathogenic individuals is infeasible. While existing state-of-the-art tools such as AlphaMissense show promise, their performance remains insufficient for diagnostic applications, they are often challenging to run locally. To address these limitations, we developed pLM-SAV, a simple yet effective predictor leveraging protein language models (pLMs). Our method computes delta-embeddings by subtracting the embedding of the mutant sequence from that of the wild type sequence. These delta-embedding vectors serve as input for a convolutional neural network used for training and prediction. To prevent data leakage, we trained our model on a well-characterized, labeled set of Eff10k and evaluated it on a non-homologous subset of ClinVar data. Our results demonstrate that this approach performs exceptionally well on the Eff10k test folds and reasonably on ClinVar test sets. Notably, pLM-SAV excels in resolving ambiguous predictions by AlphaMissense. We also found that an ensemble method, REVEL, outperforms both AlphaMissense and pLM-SAV, thus, we integrated these REVEL-enhanced predictions into our widely used AlphaMissense web application, https://alphamissens.hegelab.org. Our results demonstrate that an SAV predictor trained on labeled data can achieve high predictive performance. We anticipate that incorporating delta-embeddings into other mutation effect predictors or mutant structure prediction methods will further enhance their accuracy and utility in diverse biological contexts.

Introduction

Understanding the functional consequences of single amino acid variants (SAVs) is a major goal in molecular biology, human genetics, and precision medicine [1,2]. SAVs can alter protein structure, dynamics, interactions, or stability, and are often associated with human disease [3,4]. As high-throughput sequencing continues to uncover vast numbers of novel variants, which include many variants of uncertain significance (VUS), reliable in silico tools are needed to predict whether a given amino acid substitution is likely to be pathogenic or benign. However, experimental validation of all possible variants is impractical, and often impossible, especially for large protein families or non-model organisms [5,6].

Over the past decade, many computational methods have been developed to estimate the functional impact of SAVs. Among the most widely used are rule-based and supervised learning models that combine evolutionary conservation with structural, biophysical, or annotation-derived features. An important early method is SNAP2 [7]. SNAP2 is a supervised predictor trained using 10-fold cross-validation on the Eff10k dataset. It combines a wide range of features, including evolutionary and structural data, such as sequence alignments, secondary structure, solvent accessibility, and biophysical properties. It also integrates curated annotations and functional signals from resources like SWISS-Prot, Pfam, PROSITE, and AAindex, making it a feature-rich and biologically informed model.

REVEL (Rare Exome Variant Ensemble Learner) [8] is a powerful ensemble predictor combining multiple tools to prioritize likely pathogenic variants, and has been widely adopted in clinical genomics pipelines. DeepMind's AlphaMissense [9] provides predictions for 71 million single-nucleotide missense variants and a superset of 216 million possible amino acid substitutions. It builds on the AlphaFold2 framework, using structure-based features to train a deep learning model. AlphaMissense has shown strong performance on standard benchmarks such as ClinVar and ProteinGym, but its diagnostic utility is still limited. Moreover, it is restricted to human proteins, and its models are not easily deployed or retrained locally.

Among the more recent generation of embedding-based predictors is VESPA, developed by Marquet et al. [10]. VESPA infers conservation using protein language model (pLM) embeddings and supplements this information with BLOSUM substitution scores and amino acid substitution probabilities. Importantly, VESPA and its variant

VESPAI were trained on the Eff10k dataset using a methodology similar to ours in this study, making them highly relevant for direct comparison. Several methods have been developed that exploit pLMs in diverse ways to predict SAV effects [11,12].

The emergence of protein language models (pLMs) has transformed computational biology by enabling high-quality sequence embeddings learned from massive databases of unlabeled protein sequences. These models, such as ProtT5 [13] and Ankh [14] capture rich contextual and evolutionary information without the need for multiple sequence alignments. Protein embeddings generated by pLMs have already shown promise for downstream tasks, including structure prediction, function annotation, and variant effect estimation [15,16].

Here, we explore whether delta-embeddings — the difference between the embedding vectors of the wild-type and mutant protein sequences — encode meaningful information for SAV effect prediction. While embeddings from pLMs implicitly capture residue-level context, it is unclear whether simple subtraction can expose mutation-specific effects that are useful for classification. To address this, we developed pLM-SAV, a lightweight convolutional neural network (CNN) model trained on delta-embeddings derived from either ProtT5 or Ankh [13,14]. The model was trained on a clustered, non-redundant subset of the Eff10k dataset [7,10] and evaluated on ClinVar proteins with no sequence similarity to the training data, ensuring robust generalization. Additionally, we assessed pLM-SAV's performance on ambiguous cases predicted by AlphaMissense and REVEL, and compared it to other predictors on the ProteinGym benchmark.

Methods

Datasets. Eff10k, a dataset originally developed for SNAP2 [7]was obtained from the authors. It contains 100,737 binary SAV-effect annotations from 9,594 proteins. To prevent data leakage, the dataset was partitioned for cross-validation (CV), ensuring proteins with similar sequences remained within the same group. The clustering approach of Marquet *et al.* [10], where protein sequences were grouped using PSI-BLAST with an E-value threshold of <1e-3, was adopted by us and the data set covered 99,926 variants (39,299 classified as neutral and 60,627 labeled as effect) with an effect-to-neutral ratio of approximately 1.5.The dataset was divided into 10 folds, which resulted in one large fold (Fold 0, containing 44,024 variants) and nine approximately equal-sized folds. This

clustering strategy ensured that no homologous sequences were shared across CV splits, preserving the integrity of model training and evaluation.

PMD4k is a subset of the Eff10k dataset derived from the Protein Mutant Database (PMD) [17]. It has been used for testing in previous SAV effect prediction methods, including SNAP2 [7] and VESPA [10]. The dataset comprises 51,266 variants, including 13,497 classified as neutral and 37,769 as effect. It can be further divided into 676 human proteins with 2,788 neutral and 6,863 effect variants, and 3,343 non-human proteins with 10,709 neutral and 30,906 effect variants. To prevent data leakage, only predictions for variants in PMD4k proteins assigned to the test fold were considered for score calculation in each pLM-SAV model, following the approach used by Rost and colleagues [7,10].

ClinVar entries containing benign and pathogenic missense mutations with at least one star were used for additional testing. To ensure the test set remained independent of the training data, PSI-BLAST [18] filtering was applied to remove proteins in the test set that were sequence-similar to those in the training and validation folds. This approach led to slightly different test subsets for our training methods 'A' and 'B' (see method description below) and ensured a strict and robust evaluation. For method 'A,' this resulted in the CV-A set, containing 17,677 variants (15,867 benign and 1,810 pathogenic). For method 'B,' the CV-B set included 83,642 variants (58,159 benign and 25,483 pathogenic).

Further comparisons were conducted with AlphaMissense (AM) [9] and REVEL [8]. AlphaMissense data was retrieved from our relational PostgreSQL database [19], while REVEL data was downloaded from REVEL's official site (https://sites.google.com/site/revelgenomics/downloads). REVEL variants were identified using Ensembl transcript IDs and GRCh38 positions, mapped with Ensembl EMBL files (version GRCh38.113, https://ftp.ensembl.org/pub/release-113/embl/homo_sapiens), utilizing custom Python scripts. Variants common to AM, REVEL, and either the CV-A or CV-B test sets were selected, resulting in the CCV-A set with 11,144 variants (1,131 benign and 10,013 pathogenic) and the CCV-B set with 46,475 variants (33,217 benign and 13,258 pathogenic).

To further assess pLM-SAV's reliability, we examined AlphaMissense's ambiguous set. Variants common between AM's ambiguous category and REVEL were selected for evaluation, focusing on cases where AM struggled. Since score calculation required true labels, only ambiguous AM variants with REVEL predictions and reliable ClinVar

annotations were included, forming the AMambRCV set with 5,503 variants from 2,069 proteins. This set was not independent of our training and validation sets.

The division between ambiguous or certain predictions based on either AM or REVEL scores were performed for the independent CCV-A and CCV-B sets as well resulting in 581 ambiguous variants for CCV-A and 2,676 for CCV-B according to the AM split and 899 ambiguous variants for CCV-A and 5,404 for CCV-B according to the REVEL split.

Additionally, we compared AlphaMissense predictions using the multiplexed assays of variant effect (MAVE), also known as Deep Mutational Scanning (DMS), from the ProteinGym benchmark (version 0.1) [20]. This benchmark consists of 1.5 million variants derived from 87 assays covering 72 unique proteins.

Training strategy. Training was conducted on the Eff10k dataset using a nested k-fold cross-validation framework, incorporating separate validation and test sets, to rigorously assess predictor performance while minimizing overfitting and data leakage. In method 'A', all 10 folds were utilized (k=10), whereas in method 'B' only folds 1 to 9 were used (k=9). Fold 0 was excluded in method 'B' due to its disproportionately large size, approximately seven times larger than the average of the other folds in terms of both mutations and proteins. To ensure strict independence, the test set contained no proteins sequentially similar to those in the training and validation folds to prevent data leakage.

Training was optimized using BCEWithLogitsLoss, which provides high numerical stability. To account for varying fold sizes, weighting was applied. Early stopping was implemented by monitoring the difference between training and validation losses to prevent overfitting. The optimal probability threshold for binary classification was determined by evaluating the MCC (Matthews correlation coefficient) scores across thresholds from 0.1 to 0.9 in increments of 0.01, and selecting the threshold that produced the highest respective score.

In each iteration of k-fold cross-validation, the training set was merged from k-2 folds, the validation set consisted of one fold for tuning model parameters and assessing performance, and a separate fold was held out as the test set to evaluate generalizability. This process resulted in 90 trained models for method 'A' and 72 for method 'B', as one model was saved per test-validation combination. The best-performing model for each test fold was selected, yielding 10 best models per training cycle for method 'A' and 9 for method 'B'. This nested structure ensured that every fold was used as a test set exactly

once throughout the full cross-validation cycle. All reported training results represent averages across the best models, as selecting a single overall best model for a training cycle could lead to overfitting. For method 'B', Fold 0 combined with the corresponding test fold was also used as a hybrid prediction.

CNN training with delta embeddings. For each protein variant, embeddings were generated for the full amino acid sequence of both the wild-type and mutant proteins using ProtT5-XL-U50 (referred to as ProtT5) and the Ankh protein language model [13,14] To capture the representational difference of a mutation, the embedding vector of the mutant sequence was subtracted from that of the wild-type sequence on a per-residue basis ($\Delta embedding_i = embedding_{WT,i} - embedding_{mut,i}$). Notably, while the difference in embeddings was most pronounced at the mutation site, significant variations were also observed in the surrounding residues within the selected window. After evaluating different window sizes (not shown), a seven-residue window comprising three residues before and three residues after the mutation was selected to best represent the localized difference between the two sequences (Figure 1). The resulting feature array for each variant consisted of 7×Δembedding, with 7×1,024 dimensions for ProtT5 and 7×1,536 for Ankh. These 7×Δembedding arrays were then used as input to a convolutional neural network (CNN) to classify each variant as neutral or effect for the training set (benign or pathogenic for ClinVar, AM and REVEL).

Given the relatively small size of our training dataset, we opted for a compact neural network with narrow layers, offering both efficient training and fast inference times. The architecture consists of two 1D convolutional layers, each followed by a ReLU activation, scaling the output to 8 channels with a kernel size of three. After the second convolution, layer normalization is applied, followed by a residual connection to enhance training efficiency and performance. The ELU activation function is then used. To further reduce dimensionality, global pooling is applied before passing the output through a fully connected layer with sigmoid activation. Additionally, two dropout layers are incorporated to mitigate overfitting. The neural network was implemented using PyTorch [21], and the class definitions are available on Zenodo (https://zenodo.org/15502499).



Figure 1: Δ-embeddings capture mutation effects beyond the mutation site. The Δ-embeddings encode information about the mutation not only at the mutation site but also in neighboring positions. The heatmap illustrates the squared differences between wild-type and mutant embeddings for Cytochrome c isoform 1 (UniProt acc: P00044), demonstrating that the mutation's effect extends across multiple residues. This observation supports the use of a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) to effectively capture and interpret these local patterns.

<u>Performance metrics used.</u> The performance of the predictions was assessed using standard evaluation metrics. Using the conventional definitions - TP (true positive), FP (false positive), TN (true negative), and FN (false negative) - the following metrics were calculated: (1) True positive rate (TPR), recall_effect, sensitivity = TP/(TP+FN) (2) True negative rate (TNR), recall_neutral, specificity = TN/(TN+FP) (3) $Precision_{effect}$ = TP + TP/FP (4) $Precision_{neutral}$ = TN/(TN+FN) (5) $F1_{effect}$ = $2*(precision_{effect}*recall_{effect})/(precision_{effect}+recall_{effect})$ (6) $F1_{neutral}$ = $2*(precision_{neutral} * recall_{neutral}) / (precision_{neutral}+recall_{neutral})$ (7) Accuracy = (TP+TN)/(TP+TN+FP+FN) (8) MCC = $(TP*TN-FP*FN) / ((TP+FP) * (TP+FN) * (TN+FN) * (TN+FP))^{-½}$. The AUC (Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve) was computed as the area under the FPR versus (1 - TNR) curve. The corrected sample standard deviation of performance was determined from the results of the best models, based on 10 models for method 'A' and 9 models for method 'B' in the case of pLM-SAV, and bootstrapping (n=1,000) was used in case of AlphaMissense and REVEL data.

For the ProteinGym v0.1 benchmark, performance was evaluated using the methodology described in the original study [20]and AlphaMissense [9]. Since this benchmark includes variants with multiple amino acid mutations, raw scores were calculated separately for each mutation within a multi-mutant variant (assuming independent effects, although this assumption may not always hold). These scores were summed to obtain a combined score. A sigmoid function was applied to the summed score, generating a single prediction per multi-mutant variant.

Spearman's rank correlation was computed separately for each assay. The results were then averaged at the protein level, as some proteins had multiple assays. A final mean of Spearman correlation was calculated across 72 proteins in the benchmark. To ensure that a positive correlation reflects agreement between assay values and predictions, the sign of the Spearman correlation coefficients was inverted. Although some studies (including AlphaMissense) report the absolute value of Spearman correlation instead of the signed value, we followed the ProteinGym v0.1 benchmark recommendations and retained the original signed correlation. Consequently, the AlphaMissense Spearman correlation for this benchmark was recalculated for consistency with this methodology.

Results

Performance of delta-embedding-based predictors. Four different training cycles were conducted using methods ‘A’ (including all 10 folds) and ‘B’ (including 9 folds) on the Eff10k dataset, with Δ-embeddings derived from either Ankh or ProtT5 language models. The decision to handle Fold 0 separately stemmed from the observation that it was approx. 7 times larger than the other folds. The average performance metrics of the best models for each training method are presented in Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 1. In all cases, these metrics exceeded their respective statistical significance thresholds, such as 0.8 and 0.5 for AUC and MCC, respectively. Among all variations, method ‘B’ and the Ankh combination yielded the best performance. Additionally, method ‘B’ allowed for independent predictions on Eff10k Fold 0, in combination with the respective test folds. The combined predictions yielded lower scores compared to the test fold predictions, and method ‘B’ outperformed method ‘A’ overall. These observations suggest that fold 0 is inherently more difficult to predict than the other folds.

To further assess the generalization performance of our models, predictions were also made on two ClinVar datasets, CV-A (for method 'A') and CV-B (for method 'B'). We created these datasets to contain only proteins that are entirely independent of the training and validation sets, without sequence similarity to any proteins in these sets. Among all tested models, only the method 'B'/Ankh combination produced statistically significant results across all metrics in ensemble predictions (Figure 2 and Supplementary Table S1). In every case, the Ankh model outperformed ProtT5, confirming its superior ability to capture information rich sequence representations. Importantly, the superior performance of method 'B' suggests that Eff10k Fold 0 negatively impacts not only predictions but also the training process.



Figure 2: pLM-SAV performance on Eff10k sets demonstrates the effectiveness of Δ-embeddings. AUC (**A**) and MCC (**B**) values were calculated for Eff10k folds (Fold i) using method A (orange) and method B (raspberry). Additionally, evaluations for Eff10k were performed for Fold i combined with Fold 0 using method B (purple), as well as for a ClinVar-derived protein set, filtered to prevent sequence-based data leakage. The pLM-SAV evaluation was conducted using embeddings generated with Ankh (striped columns) and ProtT5 (plain columns). Values labeled with a* and b* are significantly different from values labeled with a and b as references, respectively. Differences were tested using the Wilcoxon-rank test, and were considered significant at $p < 0.05$, or non-significant (labeled with a= or b=) otherwise.

Comparison of pLM-SAV to SAV effect predictors. To evaluate the performance of our approach, we compared it to supervised and rule-based methods. These methods were assessed on the PMD4k set, which is a subset of Eff10k. Therefore, we followed a careful procedure to ensure that predictions were only made for PMD4k proteins that appeared in the independent test fold, mirroring the methodology used in previous studies. No single method consistently outperformed all others across every metric (Figure 3A and Supplementary Table S2). SNAP2 achieved the highest MCC score of 0.280, while the pLM-SAV Ankh models performed nearly as well, with scores of 0.274 and 0.271, also comparable to VESPA and its variant, VESPAl. For MCC, the supervised models (pLM-SAV and VESPA) outperformed the rule-based methods. In contrast, for accuracy, the rule-based ConSeq-19-equal method, which categorizes all non-native variants at conserved positions as having an effect, achieved the highest score of 0.715 (Supplementary Table S2). These results demonstrate that Δ-embeddings alone can successfully capture the effect of single amino acid variants, producing predictions that are competitive with complex models incorporating explicit evolutionary and structural features.

To further assess performance, we evaluated predictions on PMD4k split into human and non-human proteins, allowing a direct comparison to SNAP2's development study [7]. This also allowed additional comparisons made with the widely used methods PolyPhen-2 [22] and SIFT [23]. As before, predictions were made only for independent test fold proteins, ensuring a fair evaluation. For human variants, the pLM-SAV 'B' Ankh model achieved the best scores in both MCC (0.292) and $F1_{neutral}$ (0.497) (Figure 3B and Supplementary Table S3). For non-human variants, pLM-SAV models consistently achieved the highest scores. However, as with previous comparisons, no single method emerged as the best across all metrics.

Importantly, the mean values and standard deviations for methods other than pLM-SAV in case of PMD4k were obtained from related publications [7,10] thus statistical significance between these methods and ours could not be evaluated.



Figure 3: pLM-SAV performance is comparable to supervised and rule-based methods. Mean MCC values and standard errors for PMD4k (**A**) and human versus non-human split of PMD4k (**B**) datasets were collected from published sources, as detailed in the Methods and main text. pLM-SAV Ankh 'A' and 'B' were not statistically different (Wilcoxon rank-sum test, p<=0.05).

<u>pLM-SAV improves prediction of ambiguous AlphaMissense and REVEL variants.</u> The performance of our pLM-SAV predictor was compared to the state-of-the-art SAV predictor AlphaMissense and to the ensemble-based REVEL method. To ensure a fair comparison,

independent test sets were selected from ClinVar, including only proteins with no sequence similarity to those used in training or validation (sets CCV-A and CCV-B). These sets contained variants for which both AlphaMissense and REVEL predictions were available. Prediction scores (AUC and MCC) across the full datasets were generally lower for pLM-SAV models compared to AlphaMissense and REVEL. When the datasets were divided into ambiguous and certain prediction subsets, pLM-SAV models consistently outperformed both AlphaMissense and REVEL on the ambiguous subsets across all evaluated metrics (Figure 4 and Supplementary Table S4). Using pLM-SAV method 'A', both Ankh and ProtT5 embeddings yielded higher AUC, MCC, and $F1_{effect}$ scores compared to AlphaMissense on its ambiguous subset (Supplementary Table S4). In the case of the ambiguous REVEL subset, only pLM-SAV Ankh exceeded REVEL across all three metrics (AUC, MCC, $F1_{effect}$), whereas pLM-SAV ProtT5 did not (Supplementary Table S4). Similar patterns were observed with method 'B', where both pLM-SAV Ankh and ProtT5 outperformed AlphaMissense on its ambiguous variants. For ambiguous REVEL variants under method 'B', pLM-SAV Ankh again outperformed REVEL in all metrics, while ProtT5 showed improvement in AUC only.



Figure 4: Comparison of the pLM-SAV predictions to AlphaMissense (AM) and REVEL. The test set contained proteins sequentially not similar to those in the training and validation of the pLM-SAV Ankh model (method 'B', set CCV-B). Metrics were calculated for ambiguous, certain and all predictions, splitting the data set according to the ambiguous/certain criteria of AlphaMissense or REVEL. Differences were tested using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test, and were considered significant at $p < 0.05$, indicated by *.

Encouraged by these promising results on the ambiguous subsets of both AlphaMissense and REVEL within the ClinVar test sets, we extended our analysis to a larger ambiguous AlphaMissense dataset (AMambRCV). To assess whether pLM-SAV could outperform these methods on a broader scale, we selected the largest possible variant set that included ambiguous AlphaMissense and REVEL predictions, labeled by ClinVar data. pLM-SAV consistently outperformed AlphaMissense, except in the case of $F1_{neutral}$, while REVEL achieved the highest overall performance among the three methods (Figure 5 and Supplementary Table S5). Given this, for variants with ambiguous AlphaMissense predictions, it may be beneficial to refer to REVEL predictions when available.



Figure 5: AUC and MCC scores of pLM-SAV, AlphaMissense, and REVEL predictions for the AMambRCV set. This set includes ambiguous AlphaMissense and REVEL predictions with ClinVar labels. Differences were tested using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test and considered significant at $p < 0.05$ (indicated by *).

<u>Comparison with the ProteinGym v0.1 benchmark.</u> To evaluate the predictive power of pLM-SAV on a MAVE (or DMS) benchmark, where mutation effects are represented by continuous values rather than binary labels, we used ProteinGym version 0.1 [20], which was also employed in the AlphaMissense study. Although the best-performing pLM-SAV model yielded a lower average Spearman rank correlation (0.382) compared to

AlphaMissense (0.512), pLM-SAV performed in a similar range as the unsupervised ESM-1b on this benchmark (0.358) [24].



Figure 5: Comparison of the Spearman's correlation for AlphaMissense and pLM-SAV (method 'B' with Ankh).

Discussion

In this study, we demonstrated that a simple Δ-embedding-based architecture, pLM-SAV, can achieve performance comparable to more complex SAV effect prediction methods. By leveraging the representational power of protein language models (pLMs), and focusing on the difference between wild-type and mutant embeddings, we showed that even a lightweight convolutional neural network can extract informative features for binary classification of SAVs.

Our results confirm the viability of using Δ-embeddings for SAV effect prediction. The best-performing pLM-SAV models (particularly those using the Ankh language model and trained with method 'B') consistently achieved strong predictive performance on the Eff10k test folds and on independent ClinVar subsets (Figure 2). Notably, pLM-SAV showed solid performance across both human and non-human proteins in the PMD4k benchmark and performed in a similar range as VESPA and SNAP2 (Figure 3). This suggests that Δ-embeddings alone can efficiently capture the functional effects of

mutations, even without explicit structural, evolutionary, or annotation-based features. It is important to note that while we highlight the strong performance of pLM-SAV with its lightweight setup, developing and training protein language models is a complex and computationally expensive task. These models encode information with a level of complexity potentially comparable to that extracted from MSAs and other biological data sources.

While pLM-SAV did not outperform top-tier methods such as AlphaMissense [9] or REVEL [8] across the full dataset evaluations (Figure 4), it showed a distinct advantage in predicting the effects of variants within ambiguous regions (Figure 4-5), where AlphaMissense and REVEL provide low-confidence or uncertain outputs. In these difficult subsets, pLM-SAV outperformed both AlphaMissense and REVEL in most metrics, especially when using Ankh embeddings. This suggests that Δ-embeddings provide a complementary signal that can resolve uncertain cases, and therefore could be integrated into ensemble models or meta-predictors to improve overall reliability. We leveraged this insight and evaluated how pLM-SAV and REVEL perform on AlphaMissense predictions with ambiguous scores (Figure 5). Since REVEL outperformed both pLM-SAV and AlphaMissense on this subset, we incorporated REVEL predictions into our web application (alphamissense.hegelab.org) [19] to enhance its utility.

It is important to emphasize that our approach is trained on labeled data derived from the Eff10k dataset [7], where class labels indicate whether a mutation has any measurable effect, regardless of its pathogenicity. In contrast, the ClinVar-based evaluation relies on a strict benign versus pathogenic distinction. This mismatch in classification categories could partly explain the lower performance observed in some ClinVar test sets, especially in the CV-A subset, which is significantly smaller and more label-imbalanced than CV-B. Lastly, our model's performance on the ProteinGym benchmark further supports the relevance of Δ-embeddings. Although pLM-SAV did not reach the performance of AlphaMissense in this benchmark, it matched the unsupervised ESM-1b model [24], suggesting that it captures biologically meaningful variation despite being trained on binary labels.

Overall, pLM-SAV offers a fast and easily deployable solution for SAV effect prediction. It generalizes well across datasets, performs robustly on ambiguous variants, and requires fewer input features than traditional methods. We expect that future developments incorporating delta-embeddings into larger architectures, or combining them

with structural or evolutionary signals, may further improve predictive accuracy and clinical relevance.

Data and code availability

The data and code used in this article can be downloaded from Zenodo (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15502499). The associated web server is freely available at https://alphamissense.hegelab.org.

Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office (grant numbers: K 127961, K 137610, TKP2021-EGA-23, and HU-RIZONT-2024-00003) and National Academy of Scientist Education. We acknowledge the computational resources made available on the Komondor GPU cluster of the Governmental Information-Technology Development Agency.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

O. Gereben: Writing – original draft, Investigation, Methodology; H. Tordai: Data curation, Visualization, Writing – review and editing; L. Khamisi: Data curation, Writing – review and editing; T. Hegedűs: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Funding acquisition, Writing – original draft.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT in order to improve language. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

References

[1] Karczewski KJ, Francioli LC, Tiao G, Cummings BB, Alföldi J, Wang Q, et al. The mutational constraint spectrum quantified from variation in 141,456 humans , Genome Aggregation Database Consortium. Nature 2020;581:19. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2308-7.

[2] Lek M, Karczewski KJ, Minikel E V., Samocha KE, Banks E, Fennell T, et al. Analysis of protein-coding genetic variation in 60,706 humans. Nature 2016;536:285. https://doi.org/10.1038/NATURE19057.

[3] Arnold S, Buchanan DD, Barker M, Jaskowski L, Walsh MD, Birney G, et al. Classifying MLH1 and MSH2 variants using bioinformatic prediction, splicing assays, segregation, and tumor characteristics. Hum Mutat 2009;30:757–70. https://doi.org/10.1002/HUMU.20936,.

[4] Sattar S, Kenis C, Haase K, Burhenn P, Stolz-Baskett P, Milisen K, et al. Falls in older patients with cancer: Nursing and Allied Health Group of International Society of Geriatric Oncology review paper. J Geriatr Oncol 2020;11:1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgo.2019.03.020.

[5] Findlay GM, Daza RM, Martin B, Zhang MD, Leith AP, Gasperini M, et al. Accurate classification of BRCA1 variants with saturation genome editing. Nature 2018;562:217–22. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41586-018-0461-Z,.

[6] Drozda JP, Roach J, Forsyth T, Helmering P, Dummitt B, Tcheng JE. Constructing the informatics and information technology foundations of a medical device evaluation system: A report from the FDA unique device identifier demonstration. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association 2018;25:111–20. https://doi.org/10.1093/JAMIA/OCX041,.

[7] Hecht M, Bromberg Y, Rost B. Better prediction of functional effects for sequence variants. BMC Genomics 2015;16. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-16-S8-S1,.

[8] Ioannidis NM, Rothstein JH, Pejaver V, Middha S, McDonnell SK, Baheti S, et al. REVEL: An Ensemble Method for Predicting the Pathogenicity of Rare Missense Variants. Am J Hum Genet 2016;99:877–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2016.08.016.

[9] Cheng J, Novati G, Pan J, Bycroft C, Žemgulyte A, Applebaum T, et al. Accurate proteome-wide missense variant effect prediction with AlphaMissense. Science (1979) 2023;381. https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIENCE.ADG7492,.

[10] Marquet C, Heinzinger M, Olenyi T, Dallago C, Erckert K, Bernhofer M, et al. Embeddings from protein language models predict conservation and variant effects. Hum Genet 2022;141:1629–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/S00439-021-02411-Y,.

[11] Yan Z, Ge F, Liu Y, Zhang Y, Li F, Song J, et al. TransEFVP: A Two-Stage Approach for the Prediction of Human Pathogenic Variants Based on Protein

Sequence Embedding Fusion. J Chem Inf Model 2024;64:1407–18. https://doi.org/10.1021/ACS.JCIM.3C02019,.

[12] Brandes N, Goldman G, Wang CH, Ye CJ, Ntranos V. Genome-wide prediction of disease variant effects with a deep protein language model. Nat Genet 2023;55:1512–22. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41588-023-01465-0,.

[13] Elnaggar A, Heinzinger M, Dallago C, Rehawi G, Wang Y, Jones L, et al. ProtTrans: Toward Understanding the Language of Life Through Self-Supervised Learning. IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell 2022;44:7112–27. https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2021.3095381,.

[14] Elnaggar A, Essam H, Salah-Eldin W, Moustafa W, Elkerdawy M, Rochereau C, et al. Ankh ♀: Optimized Protein Language Model Unlocks General-Purpose Modelling. BioRxiv 2023:2023.01.16.524265. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.16.524265.

[15] Heinzinger M, Rost B. Teaching AI to speak protein. Curr Opin Struct Biol 2025;91. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SBI.2025.102986,.

[16] Wang D, Pourmirzaei M, Abbas UL, Zeng S, Manshour N, Esmaili F, et al. S-PLM: Structure-Aware Protein Language Model via Contrastive Learning Between Sequence and Structure. Adv Sci (Weinh) 2025;12. https://doi.org/10.1002/ADVS.202404212.

[17] Kawabata T, Ota M, Nishikawa K. The protein mutant database. Nucleic Acids Res 1999;27:355–7. https://doi.org/10.1093/NAR/27.1.355,.

[18] Altschul SF, Madden TL, Schäffer AA, Zhang J, Zhang Z, Miller W, et al. Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: A new generation of protein database search programs. Nucleic Acids Res 1997;25:3389–402. https://doi.org/10.1093/NAR/25.17.3389,.

[19] Tordai H, Torres O, Csepi M, Padányi R, Lukács GL, Hegedűs T. Analysis of AlphaMissense data in different protein groups and structural context. Sci Data 2024;11. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41597-024-03327-8,.

[20] Notin P, Dias M, Frazer J, Marchena-Hurtado J, Gomez A, Marks DS, et al. Tranception: Protein Fitness Prediction with Autoregressive Transformers and Inference-time Retrieval n.d.

[21] Paszke Adam, Gross Sam, Massa Francisco, Lerer Adam, Bradbury James, Chanan Gregory, et al. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019 2019:8024–35.

[22] Adzhubei IA, Schmidt S, Peshkin L, Ramensky VE, Gerasimova A, Bork P, et al. A method and server for predicting damaging missense mutations. Nat Methods 2010;7:248–9. https://doi.org/10.1038/NMETH0410-248,.

[23] Ng PC, Henikoff S. SIFT: Predicting amino acid changes that affect protein function. Nucleic Acids Res 2003;31:3812–4. https://doi.org/10.1093/NAR/GKG509,.

[24] Rives A, Meier J, Sercu T, Goyal S, Lin Z, Liu J, et al. Biological structure and function emerge from scaling unsupervised learning to 250 million protein sequences. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2021;118. https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.2016239118/-/DCSUPPLEMENTAL.