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Abstract
It has long been suspected that analysis of correlated amino acid substitutions should uncover pairs or clusters of sites that are spatially proximal in mature protein structures. Accordingly, methods based on different mathematical principles such as information theory, correlation coefficients and maximum likelihood have been developed to identify co-evolving amino acids from multiple sequence alignments. Sets of pairs of sites whose behaviour is identified by these methods as correlated are often significantly enriched in pairs of spatially proximal residues. However, relatively high levels of false-positive predictions typically render such methods, in isolation, of little use in the ab initio prediction of protein structure. Misleading signal (or problems with the estimation of significance levels) can be caused by phylogenetic correlations between homologous sequences and from correlation due to factors other than spatial proximity (for example, correlation of sites which are not spatially close but which are involved in common functional properties of the protein). In recent years, several workers have suggested that information from correlated substitutions should be combined with other sources of information (secondary structure, solvent accessibility, evolutionary rates) in an attempt to reduce the proportion of false-positive predictions. We review methods for the detection of correlated amino acid substitutions, compare their relative performance in contact prediction and predict future directions in the field.
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INTRODUCTION
Models of molecular evolution used in bioinformatics and phylogenetic studies of both nucleotide and protein sequences have become increasingly sophisticated in recent years. Modern nucleotide substitution models allow different frequencies of bases and substitution types (reviewed in [1]) and permit the estimation and incorporation of site-specific substitution rates (reviewed in [2]). However, such stochastic substitution models assume that each site in a molecular sequence evolves independently of all other sites. While this assumption greatly facilitates probabilistic calculations such as the scoring of alignments or the construction of phylogenetic trees, it is naïve for a number of reasons. For example, in coding sequences where strong evolutionary pressures are likely to act on the protein sequence encoded, the nature of the genetic code ensures that multiple substitutions within a given codon are unlikely to be accepted in an independent manner. Furthermore, selective constraints requiring the maintenance of secondary structure elements in non-coding RNAs or elements involved in post-transcriptional regulation of gene expression (often found in untranslated regions of...
mRNAs) would be expected to violate the assumption of independence between sites.

The evolutionary behaviour of codons has been modelled with codon level substitution matrices [3]. Covariance models combined with sequence-based heuristics can also be used to efficiently detect known secondary structure elements in genome sequences [4] and coordinated substitutions have been used in comparative sequence analysis to predict secondary structure [5].

In the case of amino acid sequences, empirically derived probabilistic substitution models specific to diverse taxonomic groups and sub-cellular localisations are commonly used for sequence alignment and phylogenetic analyses (reviewed in [1]). Such models typically allow the incorporation of dataset-specific amino acid frequencies [6] and variability in site substitution rates. Such models capture only the average tendencies of amino acids to undergo interconversions and do not necessarily describe perfectly the context-specific evolutionary tendencies of individual sites. Analogously to the situation in RNA sequences, physical and functional interactions between sites in protein sequences might lead to non-independence of their evolutionary behaviour. Such behaviour is an explicit prediction of the COVARION hypothesis [7] and forms the basis of heterotachy [8] and evolutionary trace [9] analyses. Recently, Lin et al. [10] introduced contact-mutation matrices derived from structural information. It has been shown that substitution scores reflecting contact information can also improve alignment accuracy [11]. However, failure to accommodate non-independence of substitutions is also likely to compromise phylogenetic analyses, ancestral sequence reconstruction and molecular dating strategies. The detection of pairs or groups of sites undergoing correlated evolution should also allow the prediction of structurally or functionally interacting amino acids [12–14].

Reliable prediction of pairs of amino acids that are physically proximal in protein tertiary structures would be of immense value in the ab initio prediction of protein structure through the provision of a priori structural constraints. A priori knowledge of relatively few contacts can allow discrimination between structure models or between solutions suggested by threading [15]. However, correlations between sites that are physically distant in protein structures might also be attributable to networks of sites, which influence protein domain architecture, substrate specificity or folding [16].

Correlations between amino acid sites do not follow simple rules analogous to those in RNA sequences and different physico-chemical considerations may tend to be more important in different secondary structure contexts and at different evolutionary distances [17]. Other considerations, such as the phylogenetic trees describing relationships between homologous sequences also complicate the identification of meaningfully correlated pairs or groups of sites [18].

Here, we provide an overview of different approaches that have been considered for the detection of correlated mutations from multiple sequence alignments and where possible, we try to compare the relative performance of these approaches. We briefly consider machine learning and other methods that incorporate correlated substitutions and other types of information in the prediction of amino acid contacts. Finally, we speculate on future directions in the analysis of correlated amino acid substitutions.

**SOURCES OF APPARENT CORRELATION BETWEEN AMINO ACID SITES**

Atchley et al. [18] formalized a simple linear model to explain correlation (C) between two sites in a sequence alignment.

\[
C = C_{\text{structure}} + C_{\text{function}} + C_{\text{phylogeny}} + C_{\text{interaction}} + C_{\text{stochastic}}
\]

Where, \( C_{\text{phylogeny}} \) is correlation due to phylogenetic relationships between homologous sequences that are related by a tree-like evolutionary structure and therefore cannot be considered to be statistically independent observations. Thus, we expect that the outcome of compensatory substitutions that occurred in a sequence ancestral to a group of sequences under consideration will be manifest in the descendent sequences—and that simple pairwise comparisons between sequences will not be sufficient to provide an accurate account of evolutionary events. \( C_{\text{structure}} \) and \( C_{\text{function}} \) signify correlation due to structural and functional constraints, effectively the signal that correlated substitution analyses attempt to uncover. However, these sources of correlation may not be independent from one another or indeed from phylogenetic correlation. \( C_{\text{interaction}} \) describes
interactions between the aforementioned sources of correlation. Finally, random effects from uneven or incomplete sequence sampling, casual co-variation and other stochastic factors are represented by $\sigma_{\text{stochastic}}$.

In practice, most bioinformatics approaches to correlated mutation analysis do not discriminate between structural and functional correlations, attempting to filter only stochastic and potentially phylogenetic noise. This may be no simple task as an elegantly designed recent study provides compelling evidence that the strength of correlations due to phylogenetic factors are, at least in many sequence alignments, of at least the same order of magnitude as those due to structure and function [19]. These authors used a method known to find relatively well-characterized correlations due to secondary structure and showed that distributions of levels of apparent correlation between pairs of sites within proteins were similar to those between pairs of sites from sequence matched non-interacting protein alignments.

For convenience, the majority of published correlated mutation analysis (CMA) algorithms can be grouped into various categories: methods using the Pearson correlation coefficient, methods employing information theory, methods based on observed and expected patterns of data distribution, methods based on alignment perturbation, methods based on maximum likelihood, methods using empirically derived contact probabilities and machine learning approaches. We will discuss each of these categories of methods independently and will describe elements common to different implementations. Representative software and server implementations of these methods are described in Table 1.

### Methods based on correlation coefficients

The simplest correlation coefficient-based methods do not consider substitutions but correlations between physicochemical properties of amino acids found in pairs of sites in individual sequences. In particular, the program CRASP [20–21] calculates correlation coefficients based on an array of amino acid physicochemical indices, weighting the contribution of individual sequences according to their degree of evolutionary relatedness with other homologs under consideration.

Substitutions can be weighted equally (a binary classification) or differently, using a metric of substitution probabilities or differences in biochemical properties between pairs of amino acids (charge, volume, etc). The best known implementation of this method [12] used all pairwise comparisons between sequences and a binary scheme for scoring substitutions (perfectly conserved sequence positions and positions with >10% gaps are excluded from the analysis). The component of the correlation coefficient derived from each pairwise comparison was also weighted according to the degree of overall identity between the pair of sequences considered. Workers from the same research group subsequently proposed the use of the McLachlan amino acid similarity matrix [22] to provide a general measure of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software/Reference</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2P [36]</td>
<td>ignintest.cbb.pitt.edu/cgi-bin/p2p/p2p0.cgi</td>
<td>Webserver, P2P matrix methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI with z-score [23, 24]</td>
<td><a href="http://www.biochem.uwo.ca/cgi-bin/CDD/index.cgi">www.biochem.uwo.ca/cgi-bin/CDD/index.cgi</a></td>
<td>Software for MI method with z-scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various [29, 39]</td>
<td><a href="http://www.afodor.net/">www.afodor.net/</a></td>
<td>Java code for various methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the severity of amino acid substitutions [23]. Other related implementations have been proposed by Neher [13], Taylor and Hatrick [14] and Vicatos et al. [24]. These differ from the method of Olmea and Valencia [23], principally in the choice of substitution weight measures, the choice of which site pairs are evaluated and the treatment of negative correlations (for a comprehensive summary see [25]).

One limitation of the methods described above is that they take no explicit account of the phylogenetic tree linking the sequences under study. In tree-based correlation coefficient methods, hypothetical ancestral sequences corresponding to nodes on a phylogenetic tree are reconstructed and only changes observed along single branches are used in the calculation of correlation coefficients. Fukami-Kobayashi et al. [26] used maximum parsimony to reconstruct ancestral sequences on a neighbour joining tree and considered only charge reversing substitutions scored in a binary manner, while Fleishman et al. [27] reconstructed trees and ancestral sequences with probabilistic methods and considered all substitutions—using weights derived from the Miyata amino acid replacement matrix. We have also implemented a method similar to that of Fleishman, but using the McLachlan matrix and a different measure of significance (see Discussion section). Such tree-based methods may better account for phylogenetic correlations, but inevitably use less comparisons than pairwise methods as the number of internal branches in a bifurcating tree is smaller than the number of possible pairwise comparisons between sequences.

**Methods using information theory**

Mutual information (MI) [Equation (3)] is a measure of the mutual dependence of two variables, in the case of two positions $i$ and $j$ in a sequence alignment it can be considered a measure of how much information about site $j$ in a given sequence is given by knowledge of site $i$.

$$\text{MI}(i, j) = \sum_{x=1}^{n} \sum_{y=1}^{m} P_{xy} \log_2 \frac{P_{xy}}{P_x P_y}$$

Where MI($i$, $j$) is the mutual information between sites $i$ and $j$, the indices refer to the 20 possible amino acid states and $P_{xy}$ reflects the probability of observing amino acid $x$ at site $i$ and amino acid $y$ at site $j$, $P_x$ and $P_y$ are the respective independent probabilities of these events.

Unlike the correlation coefficient-based methods described earlier, mutual information-based approaches do not consider substitutions, but rather the relative frequencies of different amino acids and combinations of amino acids observed at two positions in the MSA. As for basic correlation coefficient methods, mutual information used in isolation might be expected to be sensitive to correlation derived from phylogeny and various methods have been proposed to account for this signal.

Wollenberg and Atchley [18, 28] suggested a parametric bootstrap approach, whereby a phylogenetic tree was used to repeatedly generate simulated sequences under a standard amino acid substitution matrix. Datasets generated in this way would be expected to show correlation only due to phylogeny and stochastic considerations—and allow the estimation of levels of phylogenetic correlation that would be expected to result from the tree linking the sequences.

Tillier and Lui [29] reasoned that the majority of sites in an alignment would follow the general phylogenetic trend, while pairs of sites which were undergoing correlated evolution for structural or functional reasons would share high mutual information between each other, but low mutual information with other sites in the alignment. They used the measure of multiple inter-dependency, effectively, the ratio of the mutual information between a pair of sites and the sum of the mutual information of each of these sites with all other sites.

Others have found that normalizing the mutual information score by pair entropy reduces the impact of phylogenetic correlations [30–31]. Pair entropy is a measure of the relative frequency with which a given combination of character states is observed at a pair of sites. Reasoning that all sites in the distribution follow the same phylogenetic history and related correlation trends, these authors use the distribution of pair normalized mutual information scores to convert individual pair scores into $z$-scores.

**Methods based on observed and expected patterns of data distribution**

Several groups have considered the observed patterns of amino acid occurrence at two positions and compared them to the frequencies of data expected under an independent sites model, generating a
chi-squared observed minus expected squared (OMES) statistic according to Equation (4):

\[ \chi^2(i, j) = \sum_n \frac{(N_{n,OBS} - N_{n,EX})^2}{N_{n,EX}} \]  

(4)

Where, \( n \) runs over all possible combinations of amino acid pairs at positions \( i \) and \( j \), \( N_{n,EX} \) is the expected number of occurrences of \( n \) if positions \( i \) and \( j \) are independent and \( N_{n,OBS} \) is the observed number of pairs of \( n \). Initial work following this approach assumed that the test statistic indeed followed the chi-squared distribution [32–33], while a later modification introduced reshuffling of data columns to estimate the distribution of the test statistic. One proposed implementation of the reshuffling uses evolutionary distances to alter the probabilities that sites from particular sequences will be reshuffled to simulate tree-like evolution during the estimation of significance intervals [19].

**Methods based on alignment perturbation**

Alignment perturbation methods compare the relative composition of columns of the entire alignment with that of a sub-alignment, whose sequence content is defined by the occurrence of a pre-specified amino acid at a given site. In statistical coupling analysis (SCA) [16, 34] a sub-alignment containing all sequences with a pre-defined amino acid at a given site is created. For the second site, the sum of the squares of the ratio of probabilities of observing each amino acid in the perturbed and complete alignments is calculated.

A second perturbation-based method, explicit likelihood of subset co-variation (ELSC) [35], selects sub-alignments in the same way as SCA, but calculates the probability of the observed partition of character states at a given site by chance given the entire alignment. This value is normalized to give a probability of the observed data relative to the most probable random partition of the data.

**Probabilistic methods**

A true tree-based maximum likelihood method to uncover pairs of coevolving sites was proposed by Pollock et al. [36]. In this method, the probability of the observed data given a pre-calculated phylogenetic tree is calculated under independent and non-independent models, and a likelihood ratio test performed to evaluate the significance of the difference of likelihoods. However, in order both to remain computationally tractable and to allow adequate parameterisation of the substitution models from individual datasets, the method uses a simple two-state evolutionary model allowing, for example, discrimination only between positively and negatively charged amino acids or large and small amino acids. The method performed extremely well with simulated data, but has received limited testing with real data.

Bayesian mutational mapping to analyse distributions of substitutions over phylogenetic trees has been used with coding sequence data under codon substitution models [37]. Dimmic et al. implemented a variety of tests to identify correlations between codons. However, analogously to the maximum likelihood method, parametric tests implemented in this study were based on simple models of favourable or non-favourable interaction states between pairs of amino acids. With simulated data this method detected between 60 and 99% of pairs evolving in a correlated manner (depending on the strength of correlation imposed in the simulation) and only around 3% of other pairs of sites were recovered as significantly correlated. In limited testing on real data, 13% of contact pairs and 3% of non-contact pairs were recovered as significantly correlated (meaning that 40% of predictions made were true contacts—given the numbers of contact and non-contact pairs considered). However, these numbers are difficult to compare with other methodologies given the restricted size of the dataset (one protein) and the fact that the authors did not consider pairs of sites with inter-amino acid distances between 8 and 16 Å.

**Empirical matrix-based methods**

Singer et al. [38] developed a log-odds matrix describing the relative probability that a given pair of amino acids should be involved in inter-residue contacts or not taking a normalized sum of log-odds scores for pairs of sites observed to change simultaneously through pairwise comparisons of sequences. Significance levels were established through a data randomization test.

Lin et al. [10] developed a series of contact-based substitution matrices. The Markov model underlying the contact accepted mutations takes into account the ‘interchanging of structurally defined side-chain contacts’ and was built from 6912 pairs of domains of the CATH database [39]. While this matrix was not aimed at the detection of contacts, Eyal et al. [40]
used pairwise comparisons of sequences from Blocks protein alignments [41] that were associated with protein crystal structures to infer the frequencies of all possible pair substitutions for contacting and non-contacting pairs. They then created a log-odds matrix of $400 \times 400$ entries depicting the relative probabilities of all pair substitutions in contact and non-contacting pairs. Analogously to the approach of Singer et al., the probability that a pair of sites constitute a structural contact can then be estimated simply by summing the matrix entries for pair substitutions inferred from pairwise comparisons in a sequence alignment [42].

**Machine learning approaches**

Machine learning approaches incorporate many different sources of information—often including but not restricted to correlated substitution data—to generate predictions of amino acid contacts. Such methods use large training sets to identify patterns of observations that tend to be associated with contacts.

Fariselli et al. used multiple sequence alignments associated with known protein structures to train a neural network which used, for each pair of sites, the McLachlan correlation score, information concerning site conservation, secondary structure context of each of the sites in question, the separation of the sites in the primary sequence and the frequencies of different amino acid pairs observed in the alignment (as well as frequencies of neighbouring amino acids in the primary sequence) [43]. More recently, Cheng and Baldi [44] implemented a support vector machine called SVMcon that used several measures of correlated substitutions between sites among other features including secondary structure data, site composition probabilities for a nine residue windows centred around the sites of interest and other measures of contact potential to predict amino acid contacts.

Another neural network approach that is perhaps more explicitly dependent of correlated substitutions reasons that correlations should not be restricted to sites making contacts, but should also be manifest between nearby sites in the primary sequence [45]. Pairwise correlations are thus calculated between all pairs of sites in two windows of length five amino acids, centred on the two positions of interest in the alignment. Other information used as input to the neural network includes the biophysical character of the amino acids on which the window was centred (non-polar, polar, acidic or basic), the secondary structure types in which the sites of interest were predicted to participate, the mean empirical frequency with which amino acids observed at the tested sites in the alignment were seen to constitute contacts in a training set, the length of the sequence alignment and the separation between tested sites in the alignment. The neural network of Hamilton et al. [45] outperformed that of Fariselli et al. [43] in direct comparisons [45].

**RELATIVE PERFORMANCE OF DIFFERENT METHODS**

Evaluation of the performance of different correlated substitution algorithms is complicated by a series of factors. Using real data, it is almost impossible to know which pairs indeed undergo non-independent substitutions. Nevertheless, it is possible, given a crystal structure, to identify true positive contact predictions, and on occasion functional correlations not depending on spatial proximity can be confirmed through reference to the literature. However, false-positive prediction rates are hard to ascertain as it is difficult to be sure that an inferred correlation between two sites is functionally spurious.

Several authors [31, 36] have used simulated data to evaluate the behaviour of various CMA algorithms. The usual approach here is to allow the majority of sites to evolve in the usual, mutually independent, manner and to specify a subset of sites as ‘drivers’ which, when they undergo substitutions increase the probability of substitution at defined ‘acceptor’ sites. Such experiments can be informative, although it is important to recognize that the mechanism of correlation imposed is unlikely to be representative of biological evolution and indeed may more closely reflect the expectations of the methods used to identify correlated evolution.

Accordingly, most algorithms have been evaluated by their capacity to predict known contacts (analysing alignments of proteins for which at least one sequence has a known 3D structure). By informal convention, structural contacts are almost always defined as pairs of amino acids with $\beta$-carbon to $\beta$-carbon distances of $<8 \text{Å}$ ($\alpha$-carbon distances in the case of glycine residues). Constant sites and site with multiple gaps in sequence alignments are routinely excluded from all calculations as are potential interactions between sites closer than around 10 positions in the primary sequence (interactions due to secondary structure or...
primary sequence proximity being of little interest). The sensitivity (percentage of true contacts that are detected) of CMA algorithms is not typically considered, while accuracy (the percentage of predictions that are correct) is considered as a key performance indicator. Even when powerful methods of estimating significance of results have been implemented, it is not uncommon for the most significant (or highest scoring) \(L/2, L/5\) or \(L/10\) predictions (where \(L\) is the length of a given protein) to be used and many researchers express their results in terms of improvement over random prediction as the accuracy of methods can be greatly dependent on the length of proteins considered. This is easy to appreciate as the number of contacts in a protein structure tends to increase approximately linearly with the length of the protein, while the number of possible interactions between sites increases quadratically with the length of the protein.

Relatively few studies have evaluated different correlated substitution methods on identical datasets and considering similar numbers of predictions. Fodor and Aldrich [46] performed a thorough analysis of the influence of site conservation on the behaviour of the McLachlan pairwise correlation, OMES, SCA and MI algorithms using 224 datasets derived from PFAM [47] entries with corresponding crystal structures. They concluded that the McLachlan correlation and OMES methods significantly outperformed SCA and MI and that the performance of these methods is not entirely due to their tendency to ascribe high scores to highly conserved pairs of sites, which also tend to be clustered in protein structures. It has also been shown that ELSC outperforms SCA in the prediction of contacts in the analysis of alignments corresponding to 143 PFAM entries [35].

Eyal et al. [40] compared the performance of their pair-to-pair substitution matrix with the contact propensity matrix method of Singer [38] and the pairwise correlation method [12]. They concluded that in the prediction of contacts in protein cores (where both residues have low solvent accessibility) their matrix outperforms other methods in terms of accuracy (up to 24% when few predictions are made), while the correlation method tends to outperform the pair-to-pair matrix method when solvent accessible regions were considered.

Halperin and coworkers [48] recently compared the performance of several algorithms to predict pairs of residues that participate in intermolecular interactions between domains of Cohesin and Dockerin proteins and in interactions between domains of fusion proteins. While this problem is distinct from the prediction of intramolecular contacts, it is of interest to note that these authors also concluded that Pearson correlation methods (such as the correlated McLachlan substitution weights) and OMES methods outperformed MI, SCA and ELSC.

We have compared the 8 Å contact prediction accuracy of four methods using a set 25 manually curated alignments of randomly selected, non-redundant, protein families whose high resolution crystal structures are available (with a mean length of 182 amino acids and an average of 93 sequences per alignment). Where possible, as in many other studies, the best \(L/2\) predictions are considered. The first method considered was that of [12], using the McLachlan amino acid similarity matrix and with other details as described in [23]. We have also implemented a mutual information parametric bootstrap analysis, similar to the one described in [28], where site substitution rate variability and root sequence reconstruction were incorporated in the parametric bootstrap. We also used the program \textit{Dependency} [29], which implements the multiple interdependency algorithm of Tillier and Lui, and generated on average less than half the number of predictions of methods using the \(L/2\) predictions per dataset rule.

Finally, we implemented a tree-based correlation (\textit{TreeCor}) measure similar to that of Fleshman et al. [27]. \textit{TreeCor} calculates Pearson correlation coefficients from McLachlan matrix scores from branch-specific comparisons between extant and reconstructed ancestral sequences. A z-score measure of significance is derived from reshuffling of substitutions on branches of the phylogenetic tree 1000 times. Maximum likelihood trees were estimated using Phylm [49] with the JTT substitution matrix [50] and allowing for site rate variation. Ancestral sequences were inferred using the maximum likelihood method [51] and the \(L/2\) scores with the highest z-scores were selected.

Our data are consistent with other studies in suggesting that pairwise correlation methods outperform MI (Table 2). Although \textit{Dependency} has an accuracy comparable to the correlation methods, considerably fewer predictions were considered. The tree-based correlation measure marginally outperformed the pairwise correlation measure suggesting...
that explicit consideration of the phylogenetic structure inherent in the data might help to increase accuracy. In agreement with other authors [46], we find that accuracy is strongly linked to the number of predictions made by both the pairwise and tree-based correlation methods. Considering \( L/10 \) predictions, both the tree-based and pairwise methods yielded accuracies close to 0.18.

Many methods for contact prediction have also been assessed in the CASP (critical assessment of structure prediction) experiments [52–53]. Some of these—such as SVMcon [44]—explicitly use correlated substitution data while others, for example PROFcon [54], benefit implicitly from information contained in correlated substitutions through the way that input data are encoded. A common thread linking the best performing methods is the use of many different types of data in the generation of predictions (see section on Machine learning) and it is difficult to estimate the relative contribution of correlated substitution information to their performance. The criteria used to evaluate prediction accuracy in the recent CASP7 experiment are somewhat different to those that have classically been employed in correlated substitution analyses (predictions between sites at least 24 amino acids apart in the primary sequence) [53]. However, as suggested by the relative performance of machine learning approaches that incorporate correlated substitutions and other sources of information (Table 2), the best performing contact prediction pipelines appear to consistently outperform methods based exclusively on correlated substitutions. However, it is encouraging that methods such PROFcon [54] and SVMcon [44] that use correlated substitution information—either implicitly or explicitly—have produced highly competitive contact predictions [52–53].

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

To date, no single method has proved itself vastly superior to others in the prediction of intramolecular contacts from correlated substitution analysis. While Pearson correlation measures and OMES seem to outperform MI, SCA and ELSC, it must be recognized that even their performance is inconsistent, particularly when more than \( L/2 \) predictions are made. For all methods it is difficult to know a priori whether conclusions are likely to be reliable. Additional estimates of significance that take phylogenetic correlation into account and more widespread testing of probabilistic methods are also needed.

The strong performance of the P2P matrix in direct comparison to correlation methods is striking and suggests that with additional consideration of phylogenetic issues inherent in the pairwise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Ref Hamilton</th>
<th>Pearson-pairwise</th>
<th>Tree-correlation</th>
<th>OMES</th>
<th>SCA</th>
<th>ELSC</th>
<th>Dependency</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>P2P</th>
<th>Singer</th>
<th>Fariselli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This article (^a)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>−0.11</td>
<td>−0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[39] (^b)</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>−0.11</td>
<td>−0.05</td>
<td>−0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>−0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[29] (^c)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[34] (^d)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17] (^e)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[32] (^f)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[37] (^g)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[38] (^h)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) For experimental conditions see discussion.

\(^b\) 224 PFAM alignments, each method considers best 75 predictions.

\(^c\) 138 PFAM alignments, each method considers best 75 predictions.

\(^d\) 59 PFAM alignments, best \( L/2 \) predictions.

\(^e\) 127 PFAM alignments, cutoff chosen for maximum accuracy in each case, range of mean accuracies for different SCOP fold categories is shown.

\(^f\) 118 hssp alignments, best \( L/10 \) predictions.

\(^g\) 173 alignments of at least 15 sequences, best \( L/2 \) predictions.

\(^h\) 29 alignments of at least 15 sequences, best \( L/2 \) predictions.
compelling evidence for functional long distance correlations in individual proteins [27, 30, 32, 36, 59]. Therefore, it is likely that many ‘false positive’ contact predictions are likely to constitute real functional correlations.

Finally, from an evolutionary and bioinformatics perspective, continuing study of correlated substitutions is of great importance. Many bioinformatics and molecular phylogenetic approaches rely on parametric bootstraps and data simulations. Failure to adequately account for significant evolutionary processes in simulations and phylogenetic analyses will inevitably lead to reconstruction of erroneous phylogenies, divergence time estimates and ancestral sequence estimations.

**Key Points**

- Correlated amino acid substitutions are expected to reflect physical interactions between sites and networks of sites sharing functional constraints.
- Phylogenetic structure underlying alignments of homologous protein sequences introduces strong apparent correlations into the data.
- Various conceptually distinct methods allow significant enrichment of contact sites with correlated mutation analysis, but discrimination of functional and structural correlations remains an unsolved problem.
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