High-throughput prediction of protein–protein interactions uncovers hidden molecular networks in biosynthetic gene clusters

Yoshitaka Moriwaki[1, 2,]*, Taro Shiraishi[3], Yohei Katsuyama[2,4], Kenichi Matsuda[5], Toyoyuki Ose[6], Atsushi Minami[7], Hideaki Oikawa[8], Tomohisa Kuzuyama[2,4], Ryuichiro Ishitani[1], Tohru Terada[2,4]

[1] Department of Computational Drug Discovery and Design, Medical Research Laboratory, Institute of Integrated Research, Institute of Science Tokyo, 1-5-45 Yushima, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8510, Japan.

[2] Department of Biotechnology, Graduate School of Agricultural and Life Sciences, The University of Tokyo, 1-1-1 Yayoi, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8657, Japan.

[3] Department of Chemistry, Graduate School of Science, Kyoto University, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto, 606-8502, Japan.

[4] Collaborative Research Institute for Innovative Microbiology, The University of Tokyo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8657, Japan

[5] Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Hokkaido University, kita-ku, Sapporo, 060-0812, Japan.

[6] Faculty of Advanced Life Science, Hokkaido University, kita-ku, Sapporo, 060-0810, Japan.

[7] Department of Chemistry, Institute of Science Tokyo, 2-12-1 O-okayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8551, Japan.

[8] Division of Chemistry, Faculty of Science, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, 060-0810, Japan.

Abstract

Biosynthetic gene clusters (BGCs) are contiguous genomic regions that encode diverse proteins responsible for natural product biosynthesis. These proteins collectively produce various secondary metabolites with complex chemical structure, including antibiotics and mycotoxins, yet the complete biosynthetic pathways have been experimentally resolved for only a limited number of compounds. Protein–protein interactions within BGCs have recently been recognized as key determinants of intermediate transfer, enzymatic regulation, and structural stability. However, many BGCs still contain proteins of unknown function that cannot be predicted by conventional sequence-based bioinformatics tools, hindering a comprehensive understanding of their biosynthetic pathways. To address this challenge, we built a high-throughput complex prediction pipeline by replacing AlphaFold3's multiple sequence alignment generation with a faster MMSeqs2. We systematically screened 487,828 protein pairs derived from 2,437 BGCs registered in the Minimum Information about a Biosynthetic Gene cluster (MIBiG) database and predicted 15,438 heteromeric interactions with an ipTM $\geq$ 0.6. Among them, 1,390 protein pairs exhibited structural homology with an RMSD $\leq$ 2.0 Å. These predictions highlight interesting molecular mechanisms involving proteins previously annotated as "uncharacterized" or "potentially dysfunctional". Our analysis further showed that the ipSAE metric can distinguish correct heterocomplex pairs when multiple functionally homologous proteins are present within a BGC. Overall, our computational analysis revealed molecular interaction networks among proteins encoded by each BGC and identified enzyme complexes that are likely functional only when assembled. These predicted complexes may represent previously unrecognized links in their biosynthetic pathways. The complete results are available in a reusable format at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17451667 to support future experimental validation.

Introduction

Secondary metabolites are natural products produced by organisms that are not directly involved in their growth, development, or reproduction. Unlike primary metabolites, such as amino acids, nucleotides, and carbohydrates, secondary metabolites often play specialized roles in ecological

interactions—such as defense against predators[1], competition with other organisms[2], or symbiotic

relationships[3]. These compounds are typically produced by biosynthetic gene clusters (BGCs), which

are co-located sets of genes that collectively encode enzymes required to produce a specific

metabolite and auxiliary proteins such as transporter and regulatory proteins[4, 5]. Secondary metabolites

contain a wide variety of chemical structures and classes, including non-ribosomal peptides (NRPs),

polyketides (PKs), ribosomally synthesized and post-translationally modified peptides (RiPPs),

terpenes, and saccharides, which have attracted significant interest from both enzymology and organic

chemistry. Since the 2000s, progress in sequencing technologies, such as next-generation sequencing

and metagenomic analysis, along with the development of bioinformatics tools and the expansion of

genomic databases, has significantly advanced research on secondary metabolites derived from

uncultivable microorganisms. For example, antiSMASH[6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] is a widely used

bioinformatics tool for the identification, annotation, and analysis of BGCs in microbial genomes. It

also classifies clusters into known types by comparing them to curated reference datasets, including

the Minimum Information about a Biosynthetic Gene cluster (MIBiG) database[14]. DeepBGC[15]

incorporates deep learning and natural language processing strategies to capture genomic positional

dependencies and order information that are not considered in hidden Markov model (HMM)-based

tools such as ClusterFinder[16] and antiSMASH. This improved the identification of BGCs in bacterial

genomes and contributed to the discovery of novel BGCs encoding natural products that could not be

detected by experimental methods.

Proteins can expand their functional capabilities by forming complexes with other proteins or

ligands. As in other types of gene clusters, the formation of protein complexes plays a crucial role in

BGCs. Notably, protein–protein interactions observed in carrier proteins[17], *trans*-type acyltransferase

(AT) polyketide synthase (PKS)[18], *cis*-type AT PKS[19], type I/II PKS, and fatty acid synthase[20, 21] have

been extensively studied and discussed. These interactions are key components of the biosynthetic

machinery. In homomultimer complexes, residues that are distant in the primary and tertiary

structures assemble at the multimer interface to form a single binding pocket[22]. Additionally, some

heteromeric complexes influence the stability, specificity, and catalytic activity[23, 24]. Because these

interactions underlie the remarkable structural and chemical diversity of the products, many enzymes

in these systems have been structurally characterized to clarify their molecular basis to date.

Nevertheless, most BGCs still harbor numerous proteins of unknown function, often annotated simply

as "hypothetical protein" in MIBiG. Sequence-based bioinformatics tools generally cannot predict the

function of these proteins unless homologous proteins with known functions have already been

characterized. This limitation represents a major challenge for the comprehensive understanding of

their biosynthetic pathways.

Highly accurate prediction of protein tertiary structures, as exemplified by AlphaFold2

(AF2)[25], has significantly advanced structural bioinformatics. Structures predicted with high

confidence are often sufficiently accurate to be used as search models of molecular replacement

method of for X-ray crystallography[26, 27], as well as initial structures for molecular dynamics (MD)

simulations and quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics (QM/MM) calculations[28]. Furthermore,

AlphaFold provides valuable predictions about protein–protein[29] interactions that are difficult to

obtain from sequence-based bioinformatics tools alone. Notably, AlphaFold predicts inter-residue

distances based on co-evolutionary signals concealed in the multiple sequence alignments (MSA) for

the query sequence(s). When more than roughly 30–100 effective homologous sequences are

available in sequence database, this strategy enables accurate prediction without relying on

experimentally determined homologous structures or prior knowledge of protein–protein interactions.

One application of protein complex prediction is the discovery and experimental validation of the

protein Tmem81, which is conserved across vertebrates during fertilization of sperm and egg but

whose function could not be inferred prior to the study[30].

Here, we report a comprehensive search of all pairwise complex predictions among proteins

encoded within each BGC using AlphaFold3 (AF3)[31]. These computational analyses enabled highly

sensitive detection of potential homo- and heteromultimer formation that were previously difficult to

predict using conventional sequence-based bioinformatics tools. This approach led to the

identification of novel pairs of proteins that are likely to act cooperatively. Furthermore, our results

suggest that numerous structurally homologous heterocomplexes exist in BGCs and that many of

them involve proteins previously annotated as having unknown functions. Finally, we visualized the

protein–protein interaction network maps to provide a comprehensive overview in the BGCs. Taken

together, these findings offer novel and significant insights into previously uncharacterized proteins in

BGCs, thereby providing valuable contributions to both experimental and computational researcher

communities engaged in the investigation of secondary metabolites.

Results

High-throughput complex prediction pipeline

We developed a computational pipeline for the systematic prediction of protein–protein

complexes encoded within BGCs (**Fig. 1**). The pipeline takes as input the GenBank (.gbk) files

associated with BGC accession IDs registered in MIBiG. Users may also provide a GenBank files

generated by antiSMASH or FASTA-formatted protein sequence files for unregistered BGCs. Here,

we focused on 2437 BGCs that are labeled as "active" in MIBiG and targeted proteins with up to

1,950 amino acid residues. For each BGC, complexes were predicted for all possible protein

combinations, including self-pairs. Specifically, for a BGC containing N qualifying proteins, we

performed $N(N-1)/2$ predictions for heteromeric pairs and N additional predictions for homomeric

pairs, resulting in a total of $N(N+1)/2$ predictions per BGC.

Fig. 1: computational workflow for protein complex prediction. 1. Input amino acid sequences. List all pairs
of self or other protein sequences encoded in each BGC accession ID, excluding those with a length more than
1950 residues. 2.   Generate paired and unpaired MSAs for all the protein pairs using MMseqs2 and
colabfold_search. 3. Predict the dimeric complex using AlphaFold3. The input JSON files were created with
alphafold3_tools. 4. Visualize a protein-protein interaction (PPI) map for each BGC accession ID. Output JSON
files containing ipTM and ipSAE metrics were also generated.

Highly accurate structure prediction using AF3 requires the generation of multiple sequence

alignments (MSAs) for the input sequences. However, comprehensive prediction using the AF3 Web

server is not feasible due to its usage limits (currently 30 runs per day). Moreover, the official AF3

inference code available on GitHub is also impractical for the high-throughput workflows, mainly

because the MSA generation process using HMMER 3[32] is slow and cannot be efficiently parallelized.

To address these issues, we used *colabfold_search* from LocalColabFold[33] in conjunction with

MMseqs2[34] to rapidly generate MSAs. The resultant MSAs included both unpaired MSAs for

individual proteins and paired MSAs generated by concatenating sequences from the same organism.

These were assigned to the "unpairedMsa" and "pairedMsa" keys, respectively, in the AF3 input

JSON file. This conversion was performed using the *msatojson* command, which is part of our

alphafold3_tools toolkit. Using this pipeline, we generated MSAs in 1–2 minutes per complex on a

server with 768 GB of RAM or more and efficiently distributed the structure inference tasks for a total

of 487,828 protein pairs across multiple GPU-equipped computers.

Validation of the predicted complexes

We subsequently compared the predicted complexes with the experimentally determined

protein complexes deposited in Protein Data Bank (PDB) to evaluate the validity. As of November 30,

2024, a total of 555 homomeric and 30 heteromeric protein entries were found in PDB to exhibit over

95% sequence identity with proteins registered in MIBiG ver. 4.0. Among the 555 homomeric

proteins, 408 were annotated as homodimers, and 135 as homotrimers or higher-order assemblies that

could be modeled on our GPUs. The remaining 12 entries could not be predicted due to their

extremely large complex sizes. A high sequence similarity threshold of 95% was applied to minimize

the effects of amino acid differences, insertions, or deletions that could alter the composition of

residues at the multimerization interface and thereby lead to inaccurate measurements.

For the protein structures registered in PDB as homodimers, our predicted dimeric models

showed ipTM ≥ 0.8 for 294/408 (72.1%) and ipTM ≥ 0.6 for 358/408 (87.7%) (**Fig. 2a**). The ipSAE

metric, which represents a corrected ipTM calculated using only interchain residue pairs with reliable

PAE scores, correlated well with ipTM above the 0.6 threshold, but approached zero below this

cutoff. We next examined the 135 proteins annotated as forming higher-order homomeric complexes.

When predicted as dimers, these proteins frequently yielded ipTM values around 0.6. However, when

re-predicted with their stoichiometries of biological assemblies registered in PDB, the ipTM values

substantially improved, exceeding 0.8 in most cases (**Fig. 2b**). A representative example is CutA1

from *Oryza sativa* (PDB ID: 2ZOM). In the dimeric prediction, the substructure was nearly identical

to the crystal structure but exhibited low confidence scores (ipTM = 0.38; ipSAE = 0.001). In

contrast, the trimeric prediction, corresponding to the biological assembly, closely reproduced the

experimental structure, with improved ipTM and ipSAE values of 0.64 and 0.84, respectively (**Fig.**

2c). These results highlight the limitations of using ipTM or ipSAE thresholds for dimer prediction,

especially when the inter-subunit interface is small. Additionally, the ipTM and ipSAE metrics were

further improved to 0.93 and 0.86, respectively, when its N-terminal long transit peptide region

(residues 1–64) was not included in the prediction. This finding also indicated that the long-disordered

region lowered ipTM (**Supplementary Fig. 1**). Despite this, ipSAE remained high, underscoring its

reliability as an evaluation metric in such cases.

Fig. 2: Validation of the predicted complexes. a Scatter plot of chain-level ipTM and ipSAE values for predicted homodimers ($n = 408$). Marginal histograms for each axis are displayed above and to the right. **b** Differences in ipTM and ipSAE between the predicted homodimer (blue) and the biological assembly (red). Only biological assemblies forming homomeric complexes larger than dimers and computable on our GPUs are included ($n = 135$). **c** Superimposition of the predicted *Os*CutA1 trimer (GenBank ID: BAT10611.1; blue, yellow, and green) and dimer (purple) with the crystal structure (PDB ID: 2ZOM). **d** Predicted MupZ homotetramer (colored) and its crystal structure (white). The artificial N-terminal peptide (orange) is shown in stick representation. **e** Scatter plot of ipTM and ipSAE values for predicted heterodimers. **f** Predicted HitB (GenBank ID: BAR73008.1)–HitD (BAR73010.1) and its crystal structure (white and gray). The cross-linking probe in the crystal structure is shown in brown stick representation. **g** Superimposition of the predicted PbtA (AGY49587.1; blue)–PbtF (AGY49592.1; yellow) complex with the crystal structure (PDB ID: 8T19; white and gray). Residues of PbtA at the interface are shown in stick representation.

Nevertheless, some of the predicted complexes did not exhibit high ipTM/ipSAE values even when using the stoichiometries of biological assemblies. Closer inspection revealed that several of these cases represented artifacts, either due to misassignments of stoichiometry inferred from the crystal packing using PDBePISA[35], or the inclusion of artificial sequence tags that induced unnatural oligomerization. The former example is MxaA in *Stigmatella aurantiaca* (GenBank ID: AAK57184.1; PDB ID: 4U7W), which is experimentally validated as a monomer[36]. The latter example is MupZ from *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (**Fig. 2d**; GenBank ID: AFD33556.1; PDB ID: 6FXD), which is registered as a homo-tetramer due to C-terminal His$_6$-tag–induced tetramerization, although the native protein forms a dimer.[37] We summarized the proteins exhibiting low ipSAE and ipTM values in **Supplementary Table 1**. These observations highlight the challenges of constructing fully reliable datasets of multimeric assemblies from PDB. Nonetheless, our findings suggest that an ipTM threshold of 0.6 is effective for screening proteins for the potential of homooligomerization.

Validation of the predicted heteromeric complexes

For the 30 heteromeric complexes, we observed similar ipTM and ipSAE correlations to those in the homomeric complexes. Among these, 6M01[38], 7YN3[39], 8K4R[40], 8T19 (DOI: 10.2210/pdb8T19/pdb), and 4TX3[41] showed ipTM < 0.6 (**Fig. 2e**). We further investigated the cause of these low ipTM values. First, in PDB entries of 7YN3, 8K4R (VinM-VinL), and 6M01 (**Fig. 2f**), a

chemical reagent to induce covalent cross-linking between the two proteins was used to obtain the

crystal structure of the heterodimeric complexes. Biologically, one of the proteins in these two PDB

entries is an acyl carrier protein (ACP), which is known to form a transient complex with the other

protein. Thus, it is speculated that the ipTM does not yield high values for such complexes.

PDB ID 8T19 represents the complex structure of PbtA, a RiPP precursor peptide, and its

modifying enzyme PbtF from the GE2270 BGC (BGC0001155). The ipTM and ipSAE values were

0.39 and 0.1, respectively. Interestingly, AF3 predicted that the peptide binds to the β-strand region of

PbtF; however, the predicted binding position was shifted by two residues compared with the crystal

structure (**Fig. 2g**). We further investigated NisB from *Lactococcus lactis subsp. lactis* and StrB from

Streptococcus thermophilus LMD-9 (BGC0001209)[42] to gain insights into proteins that bind RiPP

precursor peptides. The crystal structure of NisB in complex with its precursor peptide NisA was not

included in the validation dataset because these proteins were fused within the same chain (PDB ID:

4WD9)[43] or the peptide is chemically modified (PDB ID: 6M7Y)[44]. StrB shares 94.98% sequence

identity with its homologous protein SuiB from *Streptococcus suis* (PDB ID: 5V1T)[45]. The predicted

complex structures for both matched well with their corresponding crystal structures, showing no

residue shift and high ipTM and ipSAE values (**Supplementary Fig. 2**). However, because of the

extremely limited number of available structures or experimental data on formation of RiPP precursor

peptide–enzyme complexes, a statistical evaluation for them remains difficult.

Taken together, these results indicate that AF3 successfully predicted complex formation

(ipTM ≥ 0.6) in 26 out of the 30 heteromeric cases. However, there are limitations in its predictive

capabilities, particularly for transient complexes or those with small binding interfaces, such as those

formed by ACPs or precursor peptides.

Novel heterocomplexes

Among 487,828 predicted protein pairs, 15,438 heterodimers exhibited ipTM ≥ 0.6, and 3,754

showed ipTM ≥ 0.8. These include complexes formed by previously uncharacterized proteins. Here,

we can hypothesize the functions of these proteins based on the predicted models. For example, a

heterodimer of cae45685.1 and cae45686.1 (**Fig. 3a–c**) found in borrelidin BGC from *Streptomyces*

parvulus (MIBiG accession ID: BGC0000031)[46, 47, 48] is annotated as "hypothetical protein" in

MIBiG, and to our knowledge, no studies have been reported for these proteins. BLASTp[49] search

predicted both proteins have partial sequence similarity with GCN5-related *N*-acetyltransferase

(GNAT). Structure-based searches against PDB100 database using the Foldseek webserver[50] indicated

that the predicted complex structure resembles the single subunit Naa30 of the heterotrimeric NatC

complex (PDB ID: 6YGD, chain A)[51], which catalyzes N-terminal acetylation (Nt-acetylation) of

numerous eukaryotic proteins. Superimposition of the complex model on the Naa30 structure revealed

that a binding pocket for the cofactor acetyl-CoA is formed between the cae45685.1–cae45686.1

interface, with the acetyl group of acetyl-CoA being exposed to the peptide-binding site of Naa30

(**Fig. 3d**). This suggests that this heterocomplex may also catalyze Nt-acetylation of its substrate.

Recently, *Streptomyces mutabilis sp*. MII, which is thought to possess a BGC similar to

BGC0000031, has been reported to produce *N*-acetylborrelidin B in addition to borrelidin

(**Supplementary Fig. 3a**)[52]. Given that borrelidin B, a known precursor of borrelidin, has an

aminomethyl group at C12 carbon, it is plausible that the heterocomplex binds borrelidin B at a

peptide-binding site analogous to that of Naa30 and catalyzes its acetylation to yield *N*-

acetylborrelidin B (**Supplementary Fig. 3b and 3c**).

Fig. 3: Examples of predicted complex models. a cae45685.1 (green)–cae45686.1 (purple)–Acetyl-CoA

(brown) trimeric complex model. **b** The predicted complex colored by pLDDT (orange, 0–50; yellow, 50–70;

cyan, 70–90; and blue, 90–100). **c** The predicted aligned error (PAE) matrix with chain coloring of Panel **a** on the side bars. The dashed black lines indicate the chain boundaries. **d** Superimposition of the Naa30 crystal structure (white) on the predicted model shown in Panel **a**. The N-terminal region of major capsid protein as a substrate peptide (Uniprot ID: P32503) is shown as cyan stick. **e** PGA1_262p00820 (green)–PGA1_262p00830 (purple) complex model found in BGC0000932. **f** pLDDT-colored predicted PGA1_262p00820–PGA1_262p00830 complex. The PAE matrix with chain coloring of Panel **f** is shown on right panel. **g** Predicted PGA1_262p00820 monomer structure colored by pLDDT. The right panel shows the PAE matrix. These data were obtained from the AlphaFold Protein Structure Database[53] (UniProt ID: I7E6A3).

We also identified several Domain Unknown Function (DUF) proteins whose function appears to arise only upon complex formation. For example, PGA1_262p00820 (Genbank ID: AFO93364.1) in tropodithietic acid BGC from *Phaeobacter inhibens* DSM 17395 (MIBiG accession ID: BGC0000932)[54] was annotated as a DUF4399 domain–containing protein, a family for which functional characterization remains scarce. Our analysis predicted that this protein forms a complex with PGA1_262p00830 (AFO93365.1), a DoxX-family protein, with an ipTM of 0.82 and an ipSAE of 0.64 (**Fig. 3e**). Notably, the N-terminal region of PGA1_262p00820 was predicted to be disordered as a monomer; however, in the heterodimer, this region adopted an α-helical conformation with high pLDDT and formed an interaction interface with a helix of PGA1_262p00830 (**Fig. 3f and g**). Given that DoxX-family proteins are localized to the cell membrane, PGA1_262p00820 is expected to be embedded with PGA1_262p00830 in the cell membrane. Thus, the two proteins may act cooperatively as membrane-bound enzymes or transporters.

Structurally homologous heterocomplexes

By examining the predicted heterodimers, we identified 952 pairs (4.9%) in which the structural RMSD between constituent proteins was ≤1.0 Å, and 1390 pairs (7.1%) with RMSD ≤ 2.0 Å (**Fig. 4a**). The median ipTM and ipSAE values for the protein pairs with RMSD ≤2.0 Å were 0.82 and 0.71, respectively, indicating that these predictions were made with high confidence. This observation suggests that structurally homologous heterodimers are present across BGCs and contribute to the biosynthesis. A well-characterized and popular example is a ketosynthase (KS)–chain length factor (CLF) complex, which constitutes the central catalytic machinery in Type II PKSs.

In this complex, the KS subunit catalyzes the decarboxylation of the malonyl unit tethered to a

phosphopantetheinyl arm of an ACP, and the condensation of the resulting enolate anion with a

growing polyketide chain attached to its catalytic cysteine. The CLF subunit is a KS homolog lacking

catalytic residues, but the internal tunnel formed by the complex plays a critical role in determining

the polyketide chain length. The actinorhodin polyketide beta-ketoacyl synthase alpha (GenBank ID:

CAC44200.1) and beta (CAC44201.1) subunits of BGC0000194 have been identified as KS and CLF,

respectively, and their heterocomplex structure was determined (PDB ID: 1TQY)[55]. The protein pair

was predicted to form a complex with high ipTM and ipSAE values of 0.96 and 0.93, respectively,

and closely matched the crystal structure (**Fig. 4b**). Interestingly, despite the KS and CLF subunits

sharing the same fold with an RMSD of 1.02 Å, the homodimeric prediction for KS yielded relatively

low scores (ipTM = 0.65, ipSAE = 0.38), and CLF showed almost no signal (ipTM = 0.20, ipSAE =

0.0). These findings indicate that AF3 is capable of correctly identifying heterocomplex formation

independent of overall structural similarity between monomers.

Fig. 4: Predicted structurally homologous complexes. a Histogram of structural RMSD values between

monomeric units of predicted heterodimer pairs. An inset shows a magnified view of the 0–10 Å range. **b**

Superimposition of the predicted complex structure of actinorhodin polyketide β-ketoacyl synthase alpha

(KS) and beta (CLF) subunits (blue and red) on the crystal structure (PDB ID: 1TQY; green and yellow).

KS is shown in blue and green, and CLF in red and yellow. **c** *mbg* cluster. Only the genes encoding KS and

CLF are depicted. **d** Computed ipTM and ipSAE values for each complex prediction of the four KS

(horizontal) and four CLF (vertical) subunits in *mbg* cluster. **e** Superimposition of the predicted MonBI

(blue)–MonBII (yellow) heterodimer on the crystal structure of the MonBI homodimer (PDB ID: 3WMD;

cyan). The computed ipTM values for each homo- and hetero-dimer are shown below. **f** Predicted Ams8

(blue)–Ams9 (yellow) complex. **g** Close-up view of the FAD binding site in the predicted structures of

Ams8 (blue) and Ams9 (yellow). The pltA crystal structure (PDB ID: 5DBJ) is shown in gray. Residues

presumed to be important for chlorination activity are shown in stick representation. **h** Proposed

trichlorination mechanism in the armeniaspirol BGC (bottom). Formation of the dichloropyrrole moiety

catalyzed by PltA during pyoluteorin biosynthesis is shown on the top for comparison.

Subsequently, we examined whether ipTM and ipSAE could identify correct KS–CLF pairs

within a BGC cluster encoding multiple KS and CLF proteins. In our previous work, we

experimentally validated the correct pairing in *mbg* cluster (BGC0002441; **Fig. 4c**) as Mbg7–Mbg3,

Mbg6–Mbg5, Mbg16–Mbg15, and Mbg21–Mbg22 [56]. Our all-by-all complex predictions for the 4 × 4

combinations showed that both ipTM and ipSAE values reached their maximum values for the

experimentally validated pairs (**Fig. 4d**). Notably, ipSAE yielded lower values for incorrect pairings

than ipTM, indicating greater discriminatory power. A similar trend was observed in the Ysf cluster

(BGC0002547)[57], which encodes three KSs and three CLFs, where the highest values again

corresponded to the experimentally confirmed pairings (**Supplementary Fig. 4**). Collectively, these

results demonstrate that the ipTM and ipSAE metrics provide reliable indicators for identifying true

KS–CLF pairs and predicting their released polyketide intermediates, even when the corresponding

genes are not located adjacent within the BGC.

Our comprehensive predictions further identified 381 protein pairs that are likely to form both

homodimers and heterodimers, meeting the criteria of ipTM ≥ 0.6 and ipSAE ≥ 0.6. A representative

example is the pair MonBI and MonBII from the monensin BGC (BGC0000100). Although the

crystal structure of the MonBI homodimer has been determined in our previous work (PDB ID:

3WMD)[58], biological assays have shown that MonBI also forms a heterodimer with MonBII, and this

complex displays enzymatic activity. AF3 predictions indicated that MonBI and MonBII form

homodimers with ipTM values of 0.87 and 0.84, respectively, while they form a heterodimer with a

higher ipTM value of 0.93 (**Fig. 4e**). The predicted MonBI–MonBII heterodimer structure closely

matched the MonBI homodimer crystal structure, with an RMSD of 1.0 Å. This result suggests that

dimer formation between these two proteins is competitive, and that the heterodimer is preferentially

formed.

Proteins predicted to form both homo- and hetero-dimers were also observed among other

functional proteins. We highlight three flavin-dependent halogenase-like proteins—Ams8, Ams9, and

Ams22—from the armeniaspirol BGC (BGC0002022)[59] as an example. Within the BGC, Ams21 and

Ams22 share sequence similarities of 43% and 65% with PltL and PltA, respectively, from the

characterized pyoluteorin BGC (BGC0000127), suggesting that Ams21 functions as an ACP and

Ams22 as a flavin-dependent halogenase. Moreover, the structure of the active site of Ams22 is

highly similar to that of PltA (PDB ID: 5DBJ)[60], which catalyzes the 4,5-dichlorination of the pyrrolyl

moiety covalently attached to the phosphopantetheinyl arm of PltL, strongly suggesting that Ams22

catalyzes the same reaction (**Supplementary Fig. 5**). However, unlike in the pyoluteorin BGC, the

armeniaspirol BGC was reported to produce a 3,4,5-trichlorinated pyrollyl intermediate during the

biosynthetic process[59]. Thus, the remaining halogenase-like enzymes, Ams8 and Ams9, are

hypothesized to catalyze chlorination at the 3-position of the pyrrolyl moiety, although the mechanism

remains unclear[59].

Our structure prediction pipeline showed that Ams8 and Ams9 may form homodimers with

ipTM values of 0.77 and 0.73, respectively, whereas their heterodimer displayed a higher ipTM value

of 0.86 (**Fig. 4f**). Intriguingly, the predicted structure of Ams8 revealed that E337 is positioned at a

site that would inhibit the binding of flavin adenine dinucleotide (FAD), an essential cofactor for

halogenation. In addition, the conserved lysine residue required to mediate the reaction between the

substrate and hypochlorous acid[61, 62, 63] generated from FAD, molecular oxygen, and chloride ions—is

replaced by N90 in Ams8. (**Fig. 4g**). These unusual residue substitutions strongly suggest that Ams8

lacks halogenase activity. By contrast, Ams9 and Ams22 retain these conserved residues. However,

gene deletion of *ams8* completely abolished the biosynthetic process of armeniaspirol, whereas

deletion of either *ams9* or *ams22* reduced its production by 100-fold but did not lead to complete

loss[59]. This indicates that Ams8 is more essential for the biosynthetic pathway. Overall, these findings

suggest that Ams9 functions as the enzyme catalyzing trichlorination of 4,5-dichloropyrrolyl–*S*-

Ams22, while Ams8 acts as an auxiliary protein that supports the activity of Ams9 through complex

formation (**Fig. 4h**).

Visualization of the protein–protein interaction network map

To facilitate the use of our computational results by a broad range of researchers, we created a

web site that visualizes protein–protein network diagrams for the 2437 BGCs (http://vivace.bi.a.u-

tokyo.ac.jp/network_in_bgc/publish.html). On this site, users can filter the data by MIBiG accession

ID, taxonomy, class, or compound names, and view both the network diagrams and representative

chemical structures of the products (**Fig. 5a**). Proteins are represented as nodes, and pairs of proteins

predicted to form homodimers or heterodimers are connected by edges when they exceed a certain

threshold (**Fig. 5b**). The JSON files and Python scripts used to generate these network diagrams are

available in the supplementary files, allowing users to perform their own analyses.

Fig. 5: Visualization of the protein–protein interaction (PPI) network map. a The interface on the website. **b**
The PPI network map in the monensin BGC (BGC0000100). The nodes represent proteins encoded within the
BGC. Edges indicate predicted interactions, with labels showing the corresponding ipTM values. Blue edges
denote structurally homologous interactions. Only nodes connected by edges above the ipTM threshold are
displayed (ipTM > 0.55 was applied on the website).

<u>Discussion</u>

One of the core challenges in the field of secondary metabolism and biosynthesis research is to

elucidate the origins and biosynthetic mechanisms of the vast repertoire of natural products. In this

study, we established a high-throughput complex prediction pipeline based on AF3 and demonstrated

that it enables comprehensive detection of protein–protein interactions within BGCs. We further

showed that BGCs contain a considerable proportion of protein homo- or hetero- complexes whose

function emerges only upon complex formation, as well as structurally homologous heterocomplexes.

Although our pipeline and network maps provide valuable insights into the interactome in

BGCs, they have three limitations. First, AF2 (including AlphaFold-Multimer) and AF3 often fail to

accurately predict weak or transient protein complexes. This limitation arises because their algorithms

infer three-dimensional protein structures primarily from coevolutionary signals in the MSA derived

from individual amino acid sequence(s), and inter-chain interactions were not considered during their

training processes[31]. Carrier proteins, such as ACPs in PKSs and peptidyl carrier proteins (PCPs) in

NRPSs, exemplify this limitation. These proteins tether biosynthetic intermediates via a thioester

bond to the thiol group of a phosphopantetheinyl arm attached to a conserved serine residue. They

then interact with multiple catalytic domains in a specific yet transient manner to promote stepwise

transformations of the substrate. Although identifying their partner enzymes is crucial for studying

biosynthetic pathways, improving their prediction accuracy remains an important technical challenge.

Similarly, predicting the binding position of precursor peptides in RiPPs is also difficult for the same

reason.

Second, our computational pipeline did not perform complex predictions for proteins larger

than 1,950 residues due to computational limitations. Such large proteins are typically found in type I

PKS or NRPS systems, where multiple catalytic domains are linked within a single polypeptide to

form the core scaffold of the product. While these modular proteins mainly assemble the product

through their intramolecular domain–domain interactions, some tailoring enzymes within the same

BGC can modify intermediates tethered to the modular proteins, thereby expanding the chemical

diversity of the final products.[64, 65] Prior prediction of these interactions could help identify novel

tailoring enzymes responsible for introducing unusual functional groups; however, such predictions

were not fully performed in this study.

Third, our method may fail to correctly predict the complex formation of proteins with

potentially conformational changes. Although talaromyolides *tlx* BGC from *Talaromyces*

purpureogenus has not been registered in the current MIBiG dataset yet, the TlxJ–TlxI heterodimer

crystal structure (PDB ID: 7VBQ)[66] is notable case to discuss the issue (**Supplementary Fig. 6a**).

While sequence analysis suggests that both TlxJ (GenBank ID: BDC03472.1) and TlxI (BDC03471.1)

were nonheme iron oxygenases and the RMSD between the two proteins was 1.6 Å, TlxI is suggested

to be enzymatically dysfunctional as oxidases due to the lack of an arginine residue for α-

ketoglutarate (α-KG) binding and serve as an auxiliary protein to assist in TlxJ expression enhancing

its catalytic activity[66]. The gel filtration analysis and the X-ray crystallography indicated that TlxI is

monomeric (PDB ID: 7VBR).[66] However, while TlxJ–TlxI was correctly predicted as a

heterocomplex with an ipTM of 0.91 (**Supplementary Fig. 6b**), TlxI was predicted to form a

homodimer with an ipTM of 0.85 (**Supplementary Fig. 6c**). Interestingly, the crystal structures

revealed that TlxI undergoes a large conformational change when forming a heterocomplex with TlxJ.

Yet the predicted TlxI structure was close to the conformation observed in the heterocomplex crystal

structure in both monomeric and homomeric forms (**Supplementary Fig. 6c and d**). This observation

is consistent with the caveat that AF3 does not adequately predict proteins that undergo

conformational changes[31]. By contrast, AF3 successfully predicted the homodimer of MonBI with an

ipTM of 0.87 and the heterodimer with MonBII with a higher ipTM of 0.93 (**Fig. 4e**). These results

suggest that MonBI does not undergo significant conformational changes upon dimerization. To our

knowledge, MSA subsampling with AF2 or ColabFold[67] is one of the best strategies for predicting

such conformational changes in advance. However, we did not apply this approach in this study

because of its high computational cost.

Although several technical challenges remain in accurately predicting protein complexes, our

comprehensive approach uncovered numerous plausible complexes hidden within BGCs. Notably, the

structurally homologous heterodimers identified in this study may serve as intriguing targets for future

research, particularly in the context of microbial evolution. According to the genome streamlining

theory, natural selection in prokaryotes tends to eliminate genetic redundancy and nonessential

sequences, leading to the evolution of highly compact and efficient genomes[68, 69]. Thus, the

structurally homologous complexes are unlikely to be mere products of gene duplication but are

instead expected to possess distinct functional roles such as regulation or assistance in protein

expression. Examples of the former function have been reported in both homo-[70, 71] and hetero-

complexes[66], and their characterization is relatively straightforward. In contrast, the latter function can

only be uncovered through co-expression of a specific protein combination, and its underlying

molecular mechanisms remain largely unexplored. Among the reported cases, MonBI–MonBII[58] and

LstA–LstB[72] become functional only when co-expressed. Co-expression of LxmK and LxmY has

been shown not only to improve stability but also to increase yield.[73] Interestingly, TalA from

Talaromyces pinophilus LD-7[74] and Lsd19 from *Streptomyces lasaliensis*[75, 76, 77, 78] have been

identified as naturally occurring chimeric enzymes, in which two structurally homologous protein

domains are fused into a single polypeptide chain. Such protein (or domain) pairs may exist to expand

the range of catalytic functions that can be achieved by a single enzyme alone.

Currently, sequence-based prediction tools such as DeepBGC and ClusterFinder are widely

used to identify BGCs that produce novel natural products. In contrast, structure-based approaches

have the potential to elucidate the molecular mechanisms underlying these products based on the

relationship between protein function and tertiary structure. The development of prediction tools for

protein structures and their interaction networks is a key step toward unraveling enzymatic

mechanisms and entire metabolic pathways, even in uncultivable microorganisms. Our results provide

a comprehensive overview of the constituent proteins within BGCs and highlight intriguing protein

complexes for future investigation. These bottom-up approaches will accelerate identification of

protein pairs that should be co-expressed or co-analyzed and deepen our biochemical understanding,

ultimately providing insights essential for the rational engineering of enzymes.

Methods

Structure Prediction Workflow

Input amino acid sequences

We selected the proteins derived from BGCs for comprehensive protein-protein complex

prediction based on the following criteria. First, we focused on 2,437 "active" BGC accession IDs

deposited in MIBiG version 4.0 (2024-11-15) that are currently maintained and updated. IDs marked

as "retired" or "pending" were excluded from analysis. Second, among the proteins encoded in these

BGCs, those with more than 1,950 amino acids, which are commonly found in PKS- or NRPS-

modular type proteins, were excluded from the prediction, as they can exceed the computational limits

of modeling using AF3. The amino acid sequences were obtained from the GBK format files provided

by MIBiG. Using the amino acid sequences that meet the criteria, we performed exhaustive

predictions of homo- and heterodimeric complexes for each BGC.

MSA generation and structure prediction

Despite recent advances, protein structure prediction with AF3 still relies on sufficient number

of multiple sequence alignments (MSAs) for the query sequences. To achieve both high accuracy and

high-throughput prediction, we replaced the default MSA generation pipeline using HMMER 3[32]

implemented in AF3 with a faster alternative: the *colabfold_search* command in LocalColabFold[33].

MMseqs2 version 15-6f452[34] was used to build two sequence databases, Uniref30_2302 and

colabfold_envdb_202108 (released on July 31, 2023), which can be downloaded from

https://colabfold.mmseqs.com/ and generate MSAs for the query sequences. The obtained MSAs have

been shown to be sufficient for producing highly accurate predicted models with AF2 or ColabFold in

most cases.[33] In addition to unpaired MSAs, we also obtained paired MSAs to further improve the

accuracy of complex modeling. The protein template search against PDB100 database was not

performed, as it is known to improve monomeric but not complex prediction accuracy. The MSA

generation was performed on the SuperComputer Flow Type III subsystem at Nagoya University.

This system comprises 16 Intel Xeon Platinum 8280M processors (2.7 GHz, 28 cores each) and 24

TiB of RAM per node. Each query took approximately 1–2 minutes on the calculation node. The

obtained a3m-formatted MSA files were added to the "pairedMsa" and "unpairedMsa" keys of the

AF3 input JSON file using the *msatojson* command of the alphafold3_tools software that we

developed and made available on our GitHub repository: https://github.com/cddlab/alphafold3_tools/.

The "modelSeeds" value in the AF3 input JSON file was set to 1 and five models were generated for

each prediction. For dimer with a total number of residues below 1500, the complex structure

prediction was performed using the SuperComputer Flow Type II subsystem with NVIDIA GPU

V100; for those with 1500 to 2000 residues, our in-house NVIDIA GPU RTX4090; and for those with

2000–3900 residues, NVIDIA GPU H100 (VRAM 94GB). The Predicted Aligned Error (PAE) of the

predicted structures was visualized using the *paeplot* command of alphafold3_tools.

Validation of the predicted complex structures

Metrics

To identify biologically plausible protein–protein interactions in the AF3-predicted

complexes, we employed two metrics: the interface predicted TM-score (ipTM) and the interaction

prediction score from aligned errors (ipSAE)[79]. The ipTM measures the accuracy of the predicted

relative arrangement of subunits. Values ≥ 0.8 indicate confident and high-quality predictions, < 0.6

suggest failure, and 0.6–0.8 represent an uncertain range.[29, 31] The ipTM values are provided in the

AF3 output JSON files. The ipSAE is a modified scoring function that evaluates the quality of

predicted interactions by focusing on residue pairs likely to participate in the interface, rather than the

entire sequence. This metric can be computed by applying the ipSAE script[79] to the AF3 output JSON

file with both the PAE cutoff (pae_cutoff) and Cα-Cα distance cutoff (dist_cutoff) set to 10. We did

not use other metrics such as pDock[80], pDockQ2[81], or LIS[82] in this analysis, although they serve

similar purposes in evaluating protein–protein interactions.

Validation datasets and complex analysis

We evaluated both ipTM and ipSAE metrics for the predicted homo- and heterodimeric

structures by validating them against experimentally determined complexes. For proteins encoded in

the BGCs listed in MIBiG version 4.0 and also registered in the Protein Data Bank (PDB), we

retrieved their biologically relevant complex structures (also referred as "biological assemblies") and

stoichiometry information were retrieved from Protein Data Bank (PDB) as of November 30, 2024.

To minimize the impact of amino acid substitutions on protein oligomerization, the sequence identity

threshold was set to 95%. Additionally, for complexes whose biological assemblies contained more

than two chains and did not exceed 3,900 amino acid residues in total, we performed further structure

predictions with the stoichiometries to obtain the corresponding ipTM and ipSAE metrics.

For the obtained heterodimeric structures, the RMSD of the backbone heavy atoms (N, Cα, C,

and O) between the two subunits was calculated using Gemmi version 0.7.3

(https://github.com/project-gemmi/gemmi) [83], with the maximum number of outlier rejection cycles

set to 5. To prevent calculation errors caused by very short sequences (e.g., precursor peptides),

RMSD values were not computed for proteins with fewer than 20 residues.

Network visualization

The protein–protein networks obtained for the 2437 BGCs were drawn using NetworkX

version 3.5. Each protein was represented as a node, and edges were drawn between heterodimers that

showed ipTM > 0.55 in the AF3 structural prediction. Proteins that formed homodimers at the same

threshold were represented with self-loop edges. Then, the network maps were output in SVG image

format and made available on a web server. Additionally, the JSON files and Python codes used for

generating these network maps will be published as supplementary files, allowing users to regenerate

them in their own environments using arbitrary thresholds.

<u>Data availability</u>

The predicted protein–protein interaction network and JSON files underlying this article are

available in Zenodo at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17451667. The data used for the plots in **Fig. 2**

are provided as a Supplementary Excel file.

<u>Code availability</u>

The python scripts used for the preprocessing, evaluation, and visualization are publicly

available at https://github.com/cddlab/bgccomplexbuilder. The *msatojson*, *paeplot*, and other utility

commands to process the input and output files of AlphaFold3 can be downloaded as

alphafold3_tools (https://github.com/cddlab/alphafold3_tools).

References

1.   Zhang, S., Mukherji, R., Chowdhury, S., Reimer, L. & Stallforth, P. Lipopeptide-mediated bacterial interaction enables cooperative predator defense. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **118**, e2013759118 (2021).

2.   Chevrette, M. et al. Microbiome composition modulates secondary metabolism in a multispecies bacterial community. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **119**, e2212930119 (2022).

3.   Modolon, F., Barno, A., Villela, H. & Peixoto, R. Ecological and biotechnological importance of secondary metabolites produced by coral-associated bacteria. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **129**, 1441–1457 (2020).

4.   Malpartida, F. & Hopwood, D. A. Physical and genetic characterisation of the gene cluster for the antibiotic actinorhodin in *Streptomyces coelicolor* A3(2). *Mol. Genet. Genomics* **205**, 66–73 (1986).

5.   Stanzak, R., Matsushima, P., Baltz, R. & Rao, R. Cloning and Expression in *Streptomyces lividans* of Clustered Erythromycin Biosynthesis Genes from *Streptomyces erythreus*. *Bio/Technology* **4**, 229–232 (1986).

6.   Medema, M. et al. antiSMASH: rapid identification, annotation and analysis of secondary metabolite biosynthesis gene clusters in bacterial and fungal genome sequences. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **39**, W339–W346 (2011).

7.   Blin, K. et al. antiSMASH 2.0—a versatile platform for genome mining of secondary metabolite producers. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **41**, W204–W212 (2013).

8.   Weber, T. et al. antiSMASH 3.0-a comprehensive resource for the genome mining of biosynthetic gene clusters. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **43**, W237–W243 (2015).

9.   Blin, K. et al. antiSMASH 4.0-improvements in chemistry prediction and gene cluster boundary identification. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **45**, W36–W41 (2017).

10. Blin, K. et al. antiSMASH 5.0: updates to the secondary metabolite genome mining pipeline.

Nucleic Acids Res. **47**, W81–W87 (2019).

11. Blin, K. et al. antiSMASH 6.0: improving cluster detection and comparison capabilities.

Nucleic Acids Res. **49**, W29–W35 (2021).

12. Blin, K. et al. antiSMASH 7.0: new and improved predictions for detection, regulation,

chemical structures and visualisation. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **51**, W46–W50 (2023).

13. Blin, K. et al. antiSMASH 8.0: extended gene cluster detection capabilities and analyses of

chemistry, enzymology, and regulation. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **53**, W32–W38 (2025).

14. Zdouc, M. et al. MIBiG 4.0: advancing biosynthetic gene cluster curation through global

collaboration. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **53**, D678–D690 (2025).

15. Hannigan, G. et al. A deep learning genome-mining strategy for biosynthetic gene cluster

prediction. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **47**, (2019).

16. Cimermancic, P. et al. Insights into Secondary Metabolism from a Global Analysis of

Prokaryotic Biosynthetic Gene Clusters. *Cell* **158**, 412–421 (2014).

17. Gulick, A. & Aldrich, C. Trapping interactions between catalytic domains and carrier proteins

of modular biosynthetic enzymes with chemical probes. *Nat. Prod. Rep.* **35**, 1156–1184

(2018).

18. Kosol, S., Jenner, M., Lewandowski, J. & Challis, G. Protein–protein interactions in *trans*-AT

polyketide synthases. *Nat. Prod. Rep.* **35**, 1097–1109 (2018).

19. Dodge, G., Maloney, F. & Smith, J. Protein–protein interactions in "*cis*-AT" polyketide

synthases. *Nat. Prod. Rep.* **35**, 1082–1096 (2018).

20. Herbst, D., Townsend, C. & Maier, T. The architectures of iterative type I PKS and FAS. *Nat.

Prod. Rep.* **35**, 1046–1069 (2018).

21. Chen, A., Re, R. & Burkart, M. Type II fatty acid and polyketide synthases: deciphering

protein–protein and protein–substrate interactions. *Nat. Prod. Rep.* **35**, 1029–1045 (2018).

22. Mori, T. et al. Molecular basis for the diversification of lincosamide biosynthesis by

pyridoxal phosphate-dependent enzymes. *Nat. Chem.* **17**, 256–264 (2025).

23.   Sikandar, A. & Koehnke, J. The role of protein-protein interactions in the biosynthesis of

579   ribosomally synthesized and post-translationally modified peptides. *Nat. Prod. Rep.* **36**,

580   1576–1588 (2019).

581   24.   Rattray, D. & Foster, L. Dynamics of protein complex components. *Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol.*

582   **48**, 81–85 (2019).

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

584   583–589 (2021).

585   26.   McCoy, A., Sammito, M. & Read, R. Implications of *AlphaFold2* for crystallographic

586   phasing by molecular replacement. *Acta Crystallographica Section D: Structural Biology* **78**,

587   1–13 (2022).

588   27.   Akdel, M. et al. A structural biology community assessment of AlphaFold2 applications. *Nat.*

589   *Struct. Mol. Biol.* **29**, 1056–1067 (2022).

590   28.   Homma, M. et al. Insights into stereoselective ring formation in canonical strigolactone:

591   Discovery of a dirigent domain-containing enzyme catalyzing orobanchol synthesis. *Proc.*

592   *Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **121**, e2313683121 (2024).

593   29.   Evans, R. et al. Protein complex prediction with AlphaFold-Multimer. *bioRxiv*,

594   2021.2010.2004.463034 (2022).

595   30.   Deneke, V. et al. A conserved fertilization complex bridges sperm and egg in vertebrates. *Cell*

596   **187**, 7066–7078.e7022 (2024).

597   31.   Abramson, J. et al. Accurate structure prediction of biomolecular interactions with AlphaFold

598   3. *Nature* **630**, 493–500 (2024).

599   32.   Eddy, S. R. Accelerated Profile HMM Searches. *PLoS Comp. Biol.* **7**, e1002195 (2011).

600   33.   Mirdita, M. et al. ColabFold: making protein folding accessible to all. *Nat. Methods* **19**, 679–

601   682 (2022).

602   34.   Steinegger, M. & Söding, J. MMseqs2 enables sensitive protein sequence searching for the

603   analysis of massive data sets. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **35**, 1026–1028 (2017).

604   35.   Krissinel, E. & Henrick, K. Inference of macromolecular assemblies from crystalline state. *J.*

605   *Mol. Biol.* **372**, 774–797 (2007).

36. Barajas, J. et al. Comprehensive Structural and Biochemical Analysis of the Terminal

Myxalamid Reductase Domain for the Engineered Production of Primary Alcohols. *Chem.*

Biol. **22**, 1018–1029 (2015).

37. Wang, L. et al. A Rieske oxygenase/epoxide hydrolase-catalysed reaction cascade creates

oxygen heterocycles in mupirocin biosynthesis. *Nat. Catal.* **1**, 968–976 (2018).

38. Miyanaga, A., Kurihara, S., Chisuga, T., Kudo, F. & Eguchi, T. Structural Characterization of

Complex of Adenylation Domain and Carrier Protein by Using Pantetheine Cross-Linking

Probe. *ACS Chem. Biol.* **15**, 1808–1812 (2020).

39. Mori, T. et al. Molecular basis for carrier protein-dependent amide bond formation in the

biosynthesis of lincosamide antibiotics. *Nat. Catal.* **6**, 531–542 (2023).

40. Miyanaga, A. et al. Structural Basis of Amide-Forming Adenylation Enzyme VinM in

Vicenistatin Biosynthesis. *ACS Chem. Biol.* **18**, 2343–2348 (2023).

41. Haslinger, K., Peschke, M., Brieke, C., Maximowitsch, E. & Cryle, M. X-domain of peptide

synthetases recruits oxygenases crucial for glycopeptide biosynthesis. *Nature* **521**, 105–109

(2015).

42. Schramma, K. R., Bushin, L. B. & Seyedsayamdost, M. R. Structure and biosynthesis of a

macrocyclic peptide containing an unprecedented lysine-to-tryptophan crosslink. *Nat. Chem.*

7, 431–437 (2015).

43. Ortega, M. A. et al. Structure and mechanism of the tRNA-dependent lantibiotic dehydratase

NisB. *Nature* **517**, 509–512 (2015).

44. Bothwell, I. R. et al. Characterization of glutamyl-tRNA-dependent dehydratases using

nonreactive substrate mimics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **116**, 17245–17250 (2019).

45. Davis, K. M. et al. Structures of the peptide-modifying radical SAM enzyme SuiB elucidate

the basis of substrate recognition. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, 10420–10425 (2017).

46. Olano, C. et al. Evidence from engineered gene fusions for the repeated use of a module in a

modular polyketide synthase. *Chem. Commun.*, 2780–2782 (2003).

47. Olano, C. et al. Biosynthesis of the angiogenesis inhibitor borrelidin by *Streptomyces*

parvulus Tü4055: insights into nitrile formation. *Mol. Microbiol.* **52**, 1745–1756 (2004).

48. Olano, C. et al. Biosynthesis of the angiogenesis inhibitor borrelidin by *Streptomyces*

parvulus Tü4055: Cluster analysis and assignment of functions. *Chem. Biol.* **11**, 87–97

(2004).

49. Camacho, C. et al. BLAST+ : architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics* **10**, 421

(2009).

50. van Kempen, M. et al. Fast and accurate protein structure search with Foldseek. *Nat.*

Biotechnol. **42**, 243–246 (2024).

51. Grunwald, S. et al. Divergent architecture of the heterotrimeric NatC complex explains N-

terminal acetylation of cognate substrates. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 5506 (2020).

52. Hamed, A. et al. *N*-Acetylborrelidin B: a new bioactive metabolite from *Streptomyces*

mutabilis sp MII. *Z. Naturforsch., C: Biosci.* **73**, 49–57 (2018).

53. Varadi, M. et al. AlphaFold Protein Structure Database: massively expanding the structural

coverage of protein-sequence space with high-accuracy models. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **50**,

D439–D444 (2022).

54. Brock, N., Nikolay, A. & Dickschat, J. Biosynthesis of the antibiotic tropodithietic acid by the

marine bacterium *Phaeobacter inhibens*. *Chem. Commun.* **50**, 5487–5489 (2014).

55. Keatinge-Clay, A., Maltby, D., Medzihradszky, K., Khosla, C. & Stroud, R. An antibiotic

factory caught in action. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **11**, 888–893 (2004).

56. Zhang, J. et al. Reconstitution of a Highly Reducing Type II PKS System Reveals 6π-

Electrocyclization Is Required for *o*-Dialkylbenzene Biosynthesis. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **143**,

2962–2969 (2021).

57. Deng, Z. et al. An Unusual Type II Polyketide Synthase System Involved in Cinnamoyl Lipid

Biosynthesis. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **60**, 153–158 (2021).

58. Minami, A. et al. Allosteric Regulation of Epoxide Opening Cascades by a Pair of Epoxide

Hydrolases in Monensin Biosynthesis. *ACS Chem. Biol.* **9**, 562–569 (2014).

59. Fu, C. et al. Armeniaspirol Antibiotic Biosynthesis: Chlorination and Oxidative

Dechlorination Steps Affording Spiro[4.4]non-8-ene. *ChemBioChem* **20**, 764–769 (2019).

60. Pang, A., Garneau-Tsodikova, S. & Tsodikov, O. Crystal structure of halogenase PltA from

the pyoluteorin biosynthetic pathway. *J. Struct. Chem.* **192**, 349–357 (2015).

61. Barker, R. D., Yu, Y., De Maria, L., Johannissen, L. O. & Scrutton, N. S. Mechanism of

Action of Flavin-Dependent Halogenases. *ACS Catal.* **12**, 15352–15360 (2022).

62. Yeh, E., Blasiak, L. C., Koglin, A., Drennan, C. L. & Walsh, C. T. Chlorination by a long-

lived intermediate in the mechanism of flavin-dependent halogenases. *Biochemistry* **46**,

1284–1292 (2007).

63. Flecks, S. et al. New insights into the mechanism of enzymatic chlorination of tryptophan.

Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. **47**, 9533–9536 (2008).

64. Ames, B. et al. Crystal structure and biochemical studies of the trans-acting polyketide enoyl

reductase LovC from lovastatin biosynthesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 11144–11149

(2012).

65. Matthews, M. et al. Substrate-Triggered Formation and Remarkable Stability of the C-H

Bond-Cleaving Chloroferryl Intermediate in the Aliphatic Halogenase, SyrB2. *Biochemistry*

48, 4331–4343 (2009).

66. Li, X. et al. Heterodimeric Non-heme Iron Enzymes in Fungal Meroterpenoid Biosynthesis. *J.*

Am. Chem. Soc. **143**, 21425–21432 (2021).

67. del Alamo, D., Sala, D., McHaourab, H. S. & Meiler, J. Sampling alternative conformational

states of transporters and receptors with AlphaFold2. *eLife* **11**, (2022).

68. Giovannoni, S. et al. Genome streamlining in a cosmopolitan oceanic bacterium. *Science* **309**,

1242–1245 (2005).

69. Giovannoni, S., Thrash, J. & Temperton, B. Implications of streamlining theory for microbial

ecology. *ISME J.* **8**, 1553–1565 (2014).

70. Kotaka, M., Ren, J., Lockyer, M., Hawkins, A. & Stammers, D. Structures of R- and T-state

Escherichia coli aspartokinase III: Mechanisms of the allosteric transition and inhibition by

lysine. *J. Biol. Chem.* **281**, 31544–31552 (2006).

71. Mattevi, A. et al. Crystal structure of *Escherichia coli* pyruvate kinase type I: molecular basis

of the allosteric transition. *Structure* **3**, 729–741 (1995).

72.   Zhang, D., Zhang, F. & Liu, W. A KAS-III Heterodimer in Lipstatin Biosynthesis

Nondecarboxylatively Condenses C_8 and C_{14} Fatty Acyl-CoA Substrates by a Variable

Mechanism during the Establishment of a C_{22} Aliphatic Skeleton. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **141**,

3993–4001 (2019).

73.   Randall, G. et al. A Stable Dehydratase Complex Catalyzes the Formation of Dehydrated

Amino Acids in a Class V Lanthipeptide. *ACS Chem. Biol.* **19**, 2548–2556 (2024).

74.   Ren, M. et al. Antiviral Chlorinated Drimane Meroterpenoids from the Fungus *Talaromyces*

pinophilus LD-7 and Their Biosynthetic Pathway. *J. Nat. Prod.* **87**, 2034–2044 (2024).

75.   Hotta, K. et al. Enzymatic catalysis of anti-Baldwin ring closure in polyether biosynthesis.

Nature **483**, 355–358 (2012).

76.   Minami, A., Oguri, H., Watanabe, K. & Oikawa, H. Biosynthetic machinery of ionophore

polyether lasalocid: enzymatic construction of polyether skeleton. *Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol.*

17, 555–561 (2013).

77.   Migita, A. et al. Identification of a Gene Cluster of Polyether Antibiotic Lasalocid from

Streptomyces lasaliensis. *Biosci. Biotechnol. Biochem.* **73**, 169–176 (2009).

78.   Wong, F. et al. Epoxide Hydrolase-Lasalocid A Structure Provides Mechanistic Insight into

Polyether Natural Product Biosynthesis. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **137**, 86–89 (2015).

79.   Dunbrack, R. L. *Rēs ipSAE loquunt*: What's wrong with AlphaFold's ipTM score and how to

fix it. *bioRxiv*, 2025.2002.2010.637595 (2025).

80.   Bryant, P., Pozzati, G. & Elofsson, A. Improved prediction of protein-protein interactions

using AlphaFold2. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 1265 (2022).

81.   Zhu, W., Shenoy, A., Kundrotas, P. & Elofsson, A. Evaluation of AlphaFold-Multimer

prediction on multi-chain protein complexes. *Bioinformatics* **39**, btad424 (2023).

82.   Kim, A.-R. et al. Enhanced Protein-Protein Interaction Discovery via AlphaFold-Multimer.

bioRxiv, 2024.2002.2019.580970 (2024).

83.   Wojdyr, M. GEMMI: A library for structural biology. *J. Open Source Softw.* **7**, 4200 (2022).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and

Technology, Japan [Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas, 22H05126 to Y.M. and T.T.,

22H05120 to T.K. and T.S., 22H05130 to Y.K., 22H05128 to K.M., 25H01575 to A.M., and

25H02250 to R.I.; Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (JSPS KAKENHI), 25K01890 to Y.M. and

19H04634 to T.O.]. Additional support was provided by the Medical Research Center Initiative for

High Depth Omics at the Institute of Science Tokyo, Nanken-Kyoten at the Institute of Science Tokyo

2025, and the Multilayered Stress Diseases project (JPMXP1323015483) at the Institute of Science

Tokyo. This work utilized computational resources from the supercomputer "Flow" provided by the

Information Technology Center at Nagoya University through the HPCI System Research Project

(Project IDs: jh240001 and jh250002) and the TSUBAME 4.0 supercomputer at the Institute of

Science Tokyo.

We thank Dr Naruki Yoshikawa for a fruitful discussion.

Author information

Contributions

Yoshitaka Moriwaki: Conceptualization [lead], Data curation [lead], Formal analysis [lead],

Funding acquisition [equal], Investigation [lead], Methodology[lead], Resources [equal], Software

[lead], Validation [lead], Visualization [lead], Writing—original draft [lead], Writing—review &

editing [equal]), Taro Shiraishi: Conceptualization [equal], Investigation [support-ing], Resources

[equal], Validation [equal], Writing—review & editing [equal], Yohei Katsuyama: Conceptualization

[equal], Investigation [supporting], Validation [equal], Writing—review & editing [equal], Kenichi

Matsuda: Conceptualization [equal], Investigation [supporting], Writing—review & editing [equal],

Toyoyuki Ose: Writing—review & editing [supporting], Atsushi Minami: Writing—review & editing

[supporting], Hideaki Oikawa: Writing—review & editing [supporting], Tomohisa Kuzuyama:

Funding acquisition [lead], Project administration [lead], Writing—review & editing [equal],

Ryuichiro Ishitani: Funding acquisition [equal], Resources [equal], Supervision [equal], Writing—

review & editing [equal], Tohru Terada: Funding acquisition [equal], Project administration [lead],

Resources [equal], Supervision [equal], Writing—review & editing [equal]

Corresponding authors

Correspondence to Yoshitaka Moriwaki.

Ethics declarations

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.