

# ProteinGPT: Multimodal LLM for Protein Property Prediction and Structure Understanding

Yijia Xiao<sup>1</sup>, Edward Sun<sup>1</sup>, Yiqiao Jin<sup>2</sup>, Qifan Wang<sup>3</sup>, Wei Wang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of California, Los Angeles,

<sup>2</sup>Georgia Institute of Technology,

<sup>3</sup>Meta AI

{yijia.xiao,wei.wang}@cs.ucla.edu, edwardsun12895@g.ucla.edu,  
yjin328@gatech.edu, wqfcr@fb.com

## Abstract

Understanding biological processes, drug development, and biotechnological advancements requires detailed analysis of protein structures and sequences, a task in protein research that is inherently complex and time-consuming when performed manually. To streamline this process, we introduce ProteinGPT, a state-of-the-art multi-modal protein chat system, that allows users to upload protein sequences and/or structures for comprehensive protein analysis and responsive inquiries. ProteinGPT seamlessly integrates protein sequence and structure encoders with linear projection layers for precise representation adaptation, coupled with a large language model (LLM) to generate accurate and contextually relevant responses. To train ProteinGPT, we construct a large-scale dataset of 132,092 proteins with annotations, and optimize the instruction-tuning process using GPT-4o. This innovative system ensures accurate alignment between the user-uploaded data and prompts, simplifying protein analysis. Experiments show that ProteinGPT can produce promising responses to proteins and their corresponding questions.

## 1 Introduction

Proteins are fundamental molecular building blocks of life, playing critical roles in biological processes [1]. Understanding their structure, functions, and interactions is vital for advancements in drug discovery [2], healthcare [3], and biological/medical engineering [4]. Recent breakthroughs in machine-learning-based protein structure and function prediction [5] have significantly accelerated biological research by reducing the reliance on traditional labor-intensive laboratory experiments and literature searches.

**Challenges.** As proteins can be represented by strings of characters, each corresponding to an amino acid from an alphabet of 20 letters, recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) have naturally extended to protein research.

Studies like ProtST [6], ProteinChat [7], and ProtChatGPT [8] align protein sequence or structure data with textual descriptions to create LLMs for proteins.

However, most of these studies rely on a single modality, potentially overlooking insights from the fusion of multiple modalities. For instance, protein sequences can reveal evolutionary information, functional sites, and sequence-structure relationships, while protein structures provide critical insights into spatial arrangement, structural dynamics, binding sites, and stability.

Applying multimodal LLMs to protein modeling is non-trivial due to the challenge in aligning diverse modalities, such as textual descriptions, protein sequences, and protein structures. Meanwhile, direct end-to-end retraining for protein LLMs is usually impractical due to extensive requirements for annotated data.

**This Work.** We propose ProteinGPT, a chat system that allows researchers to upload protein sequences and/or structures (via fasta or PDB files) and ask natural language questions. ProteinGPT consists of four major blocks: a protein sequence encoder, a protein structure encoder, a projection layer, and an LLM.

The *protein sequence encoder* is based on the `esm2_t36_3B_UR50D` model from ESM-2 (Evolutionary Scale Modeling 2) [5], which features 36 transformer layers and 3 billion parameters. The model is pretrained on UniRef50/D, a comprehensive protein database that strategically samples UniRef100 sequences from UniRef50 clusters to maximize sequence diversity, thereby enriching the informativeness of the encoding. The *protein structure encoder*, `esm_if1_gvp4_t16_142M_UR50`, is an inverse folding model that incorporates a geometric input processing layer paired with a seq2seq transformer. Trained on 12 million structures predicted by AlphaFold2 [9], the model is highly effectively at capturing the structural information of proteins.

This design enables information extraction from not only the protein structural and sequential information but also prior knowledge within ESM. The projection layer aligns both embeddings with LLM embeddings.

To effectively train the system for modality alignment, we introduce ProteinQA, a large-scale dataset of over 132,092 protein sequences, structures, and annotations.

Unlike previous works that use entire protein annotations as the prediction target for instruction tuning, we propose a GPT-4 [10] guided approach that decomposes proteins’ abstract summary into question-answer (QA) pairs, effectively enhancing the model’s ability to understand user queries and generate concise, relevant answers.

**Contributions.** Our contributions are as follows:

- **Novel Framework.** We introduce ProteinGPT, an innovative chat system that fuses protein sequence and structural information to enable interactive protein-focused conversations, significantly enhancing the understanding and design of proteins;
- **Large-scale Dataset.** We propose ProteinQA, a large-scale dataset based on the RCSB-PDB Protein Description Dataset [7]. ProteinQA encompasses 132,092 protein samples, each annotated with a detailed descriptive abstract, 20-30 property tags, and 5-10 QA pairs. The depth and variety of these annotations position ProteinQA as a high-quality instruction tuning corpus;
- **Comprehensive Experiments.** We conducted extensive experiments on mainstream open-source and proprietary LLM backbones under different scenarios. Our empirical analysis provides guidance for the future design of protein LLMs.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Model Architecture

ProteinGPT consists of two frozen pre-trained encoders (Figure 1 and 2): an inverse folding model (`esm_if1_gvp4_t16_142M_UR50`) for structure encoding and a protein language model for sequence encoding (`esm2_t36_3B_UR50D`). The embeddings generated by these models are fed into a linear projection layer to produce soft prompts for the LLM. The model training comprises two stages: 1) *Sequential and Structural Alignment* and 2) *Instruction Tuning*.

#### 2.1.1 Sequence and Structure Alignment

In the alignment stage, protein structures are first fed into the pre-trained structure encoder, which explicitly captures the detailed 3D structures and models spatial interactions between amino acid residues. We take `esm_if1_gvp4_t16_142M_UR50` as the structure encoder. Then, sequences are encoded using the sequence encoder `esm2_t36_3B_UR50D` featuring 36 transformer layers and 3 billion parameters, trained on the Protein UniRef50/D database to enhance sequence diversity. This module integrates structural information with implicit structural contact, evolutionary, and biochemical information that the structure





Figure 1:  ProteinGPT Modality Fusion & Alignment Stage: we freeze the encoder blocks and train the linear project layer to learn how to align protein structure and protein sequence representations with text. In the alignment stage, the input to the training is only the projected protein representation. No text prompts are incorporated in this stage.

alone does not capture. For efficient training, both of these modules are frozen. We utilize a specialized token prompt for protein-text modality alignment:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{Q}: & \langle \textit{Protein} \rangle \langle \textit{Struct} \rangle \langle \textit{Seq} \rangle \\
 & \langle \textit{/Protein} \rangle \langle \textit{QuestionPrompts} \rangle \\
 \mathbf{A}: & \langle \textit>Description} \rangle
 \end{aligned}$$

The structural and sequential information is encoded into the soft prompts and prepended to the question prompt. In stage 1 training, the question prompt  $\mathbf{Q}$  is left empty to prioritize learning the abstract description from the protein representation. The description tag is then replaced with the full annotation from RCSB-PDB [7] to train the projection layer in aligning a protein with its annotation description.

## 2.1.2 Instruction Tuning

In stage 2, the model undergoes instruction tuning using our curated QA dataset. Unlike previous works that utilize full annotations, we focus on specific QA examples to facilitate instruction tuning. We augment the abstract dataset from stage 1 using GPT-4o to generate explicit QA pairs for this stage. The prompts from stage 1 are adapted to the LLaMA style (“###Human : . . .” and “###Assistant : . . .”), with  $\mathbf{Q}$  replaced by explicit questions from the QA dataset, such as “how many assemblies does this protein have.” The model then generates descriptive yet concise answers from the given protein as  $\mathbf{A}$ .

## 2.2 Datasets

For modality alignment, we construct a large-scale dataset from the RCSB-PDB database [11] consisting of 132,092 protein structures, sequences, and abstract descriptions. The raw dataset of 204,826 proteins is filtered to retain only those with an abstract description, chain A, and sequences without non-encodable characters. Each entry in the final dataset includes the 3D protein structure represented by backbone atomic coordinates, the sequence string, and a rich protein annotation, as shown in Figure 2. The detailed statistics of our dataset are presented in Table 1, highlighting the extensive annotations and comprehensive content available for each protein.

Table 1: Statistics for ProteinQA

Per Protein	Min	Max	Mean
# Abstracts tokens	89	728	205.45
# Answer tokens	32	550	98.56
# Open-Ended QA Pair samples	10	26	17.39
# Closed-Ended QA Pair samples	24	29	25.94

### 2.3 Data Augmentation

Previous works often use the entire protein annotation for instruction tuning [6–8], which may result in the model producing overly detailed responses with extraneous information not directly relevant to the user prompt. Therefore, our ProteinGPT decomposes the rich protein annotations into more specific QA-pairs for instruction tuning so that user instructions can be concisely answered. We do this by generating short concise answers along with long-form responses to include our dataset. Concretely, we prompt GPT-4o to generate both open-ended and close-ended QA pairs with the context of the abstract to decompose the abstract into atom-level QA pairs. As seen in Table 1, on average, each protein has around 40 total QA pairs generated from this process.

## 3 Experiments

### 3.1 Training

Our training process is divided into two phases: modality alignment (MA) and instruction tuning (IT). This approach allows the model to preserve previously acquired knowledge while effectively handling specific instructions, such as protein-related queries.

**Stage 1: Modality Fusion/Alignment (MA).** In this stage, we focus exclusively on training the projection adapter by freezing both sequence and structure encoders. We set the maximum text length of abstracts to 384 characters to accommodate the annotation lengths within the RCSB-PDB dataset. The projection layer is trained over 10 epochs with a batch size of 1, weight decay of 0.05, and 2048 warm-up steps. The dataset is divided into a training set (70%) of 105,673 proteins and a testing set (30%) of 26,419 proteins. We utilize the AdamW optimizer with  $\beta_1 = 0.9$ ,  $\beta_2 = 0.98$  [12], and employ a learning rate scheduler with a linear warm-up followed by cosine annealing. We set the initial learning rate to  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ , the minimum learning rate to  $8 \times 10^{-5}$ , and the warm-up learning rate to  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ . Automatic mixed precision (AMP) [13] was used to improve training efficiency.

**Stage 2: Instruction Tuning (IT).** In this stage, the model is fine-tuned on a protein question-answering task. Training is conducted for 10 epochs with a batch size of 1, weight decay of 0.05, and 200 warm-up steps. The QA dataset used in this phase comprises approximately 3.7 million samples, with around 35 questions per protein. We apply similar settings for the AdamW optimizer and AMP, but with a lower initial learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-5}$ , a minimum rate of  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ , and a warm-up rate of  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ .

### 3.2 Computational Cost

We conduct our training using two NVIDIA H100 PCIe GPUs (80GB) and two NVIDIA A100 PCIe GPUs (40GB). Stage 1 requires approximately one week, while stage 2 demands around 60 hours.

## 4 Results

We trained ProteinGPT on 4 base LLM architectures: Vicuna [14], LLaMA-2 [15], LLaMA-3 [16], and Mistral [17]. We conducted a series of experiments to assess ProteinGPT’s effectiveness both quantitatively and qualitatively. Additionally, we carried out ablation studies to ascertain the importance





Figure 2:  ProteinGPT Instruction Tuning Stage: we utilize the QA pairs and property tags in ProteinQA to tune the LLM to follow instructions and give concise responses. For instruction alignment, explicit prompts (*Questions* on the protein) are included at the beginning of the prompt.

of various modules at different stages. These included the original model (LLM with protein sequence as text input), the modality-aligned model, and the instruction-tuned model (i.e. ProteinGPT).

Moreover, we also benchmark the capabilities of state-of-the-art large language models on protein-related tasks using OpenAI’s APIs as a baseline. Instances of empty model outputs are substituted with “N/A” for data consistency.

## 4.1 Qualitative Evaluation

Figure. 6-8 shows example conversations between human users and ProteinGPT. To ensure unbiased evaluation and avoid data leakage, all testing was performed on a separate set of proteins isolated from training. ProteinGPT effectively interpret the semantics of queries and produces accurate, logically consistent responses. These responses include details about protein *functions*, such as catalyzing the reduction of dinitrogen to ammonia, and *structures*, such as the structural dependencies on the substrate azide and the product ammonia. This demonstrates ProteinGPT’s capabilities on protein sequence, structure, and function understanding tasks and its potential for enabling rapid exploration of proteins.

## 4.2 Quantitative Evaluation

### 4.2.1 Instruction Tuning Observations

We randomly select 3,508 question-answer-protein pairs from our curated dataset, covering 160 proteins from the test split. Each protein is associated with 28~30 questions that ProteinGPT has not seen during training. Similarly, for baseline comparison with vanilla LLM (without modality alignment or instruction tuning) and GPT, we sample 1,025 questions (35 proteins with 28~30 questions per protein), considering the computational costs. For fairness of comparison, all evaluations are performed on this same set of question-answer-protein pairs. We employ standard metrics for semantic similarity, including BERTScore [18], PubMedBERT-Score [19], and GPT Score [20], as well as lexical metrics (ROUGE-1/2/L [21]), to compare model predictions with the ground truth. Note: for the GPT Score, we simply replaced the encoder used in the BERTScore with OpenAI’s text-embedding-3-large embedding model.

Table 2 and Table 4 highlight the performance of the full modality aligned and instruction tuned ProteinGPT. As seen, it has very high overall semantic scores, however has very low lexical scores. This can be explained by looking closer at the output of ProteinGPT. While our annotations often contained

concise responses such as "10", ProteinGPT would often output complete sentences such as "the protein has 10 assemblies". Since the ROUGE score, BLEU score, METEOR score, and other similar lexical metrics reward for overlaps and penalize for misses, these lexical differences make our scores very low [21–23]. However, in this case, the semantic meaning outweighs the exact format in which the answer is produced, we conclude that the semantic metrics serve as a better benchmark for the performance of ProteinGPT.

#### 4.2.2 Foundational LLMs Comparison

From the 4 models that we selected, the versions of ProteinGPT that are based on Mistral and LLaMA-3 appear to perform the best. This can be observed in Figure 7. This is likely due to the already stellar performance of these foundational LLMs, especially with LLaMA-3 being Meta’s newest and most powerful model and Mistral similarly being the SOTA released by Mistral AI.

#### 4.2.3 Baseline Comparisons to ProteinGPT

We also compare ProteinGPT to two baselines to demonstrate our contributions in creating multimodal LLMs that are more capable than general-purpose LLMs in communicating about proteins. The first baseline is the vanilla LLMs that we trained our models on, such as Vicuna, Mistral, LLaMA-3, and LLaMA-2. The second baseline is GPT-4 and GPT-3.5. For evaluation, we simply pretended the FASTA sequence of the protein in front of the prompt to give the LLM context of the protein.

**Vanilla LLM:** The semantic and lexical scores for prompting a vanilla LLM with a prompt prepended with a protein sequence are included in Tables 2 and 4. Note: These are the same results as the stage in the ablation study in which no training is done.

**OpenAI GPT-4/GPT-3.5:** Similarly, the scores for using GPT-4 and GPT-3.5 as the LLM are presented in Table 3 and Table 5. We utilized GPT-3.5-turbo, GPT-4o, and GPT-4-turbo in our evaluation.

The overall comparison can be seen in Figure 3, which shows that ProteinGPT outperforms both baselines consistently. This demonstrates that our model outperforms knowledge embedded within LLMs and effectively utilizes sequence and structure information to answer questions.

Table 2: Lexical Performance of LLM with Protein Sequence as Text Input (Left), Modality Alignment only (Middle), and ProteinGPT (Right). R-1, R-2, R-L, and R-Lsum stand for ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, ROUGE-L, and ROUGE-Lsum, respectively.

Base Model	(a) Protein Sequence				(b) Modality Fusion				(c) ProteinGPT			
	R-1	R-2	R-L	R-Lsum	R-1	R-2	R-L	R-Lsum	R-1	R-2	R-L	R-Lsum
<b>Vicuna</b>	0.026	0.034	0.025	0.025	0.104	0.003	0.105	0.104	0.345	0.007	0.350	0.348
<b>Llama-2</b>	0.010	0.001	0.010	0.010	0.063	0.004	0.064	0.064	0.348	0.014	0.347	0.349
<b>Llama-3</b>	0.005	0.000	0.005	0.005	0.090	0.005	0.090	0.090	0.366	0.021	0.368	0.367
<b>Mistral</b>	0.007	0.001	0.007	0.007	0.008	0.002	0.008	0.008	0.461	0.048	0.460	0.457

Table 3: Lexical Performance with ProteinGPT and OpenAI GPT models using protein sequence as text input.

Model	R-1	R-2	R-L	R-Lsum
<b>GPT-3.5-turbo</b>	0.137	0.010	0.140	0.140
<b>GPT-4-turbo</b>	0.049	0.001	0.049	0.048
<b>GPT-4o</b>	0.068	0.000	0.067	0.068
<b>ProteinGPT<sub>Vicuna</sub></b>	0.345	0.007	0.350	0.348
<b>ProteinGPT<sub>Llama-2</sub></b>	0.348	0.014	0.347	0.349
<b>ProteinGPT<sub>Llama-3</sub></b>	0.366	0.021	0.368	0.367
<b>ProteinGPT<sub>Mistral</sub></b>	0.461	0.048	0.460	0.457

Comparison of Protein Text LLM and ProteinGPT




Figure 3: Protein Text LLM takes protein primary sequence as part of the prompt to the model. GPT models are more powerful than open-source LLMs like LLaMA and Mistral. Given the same protein sequence as input, ProteinGPT utilizes the information from sequence and structure encoders and yields more accurate responses.

#### 4.2.4 Baseline Comparisons to ProteinGPT

We also compare ProteinGPT to two baselines to demonstrate our contributions in creating multimodal LLMs that are more capable than general-purpose LLMs in communicating about proteins. The first baseline is the vanilla LLMs that we trained our models on, such as Vicuna, Mistral, LLaMA-3, and LLaMA-2. The second baseline is GPT-4 and GPT-3.5. For evaluation, we simply pretended the FASTA sequence of the protein in front of the prompt to give the LLM context of the protein.

#### 4.2.5 Close-Ended Accuracy Experiment

Although semantic-based evaluations may be useful in gauging the feasibility of our outputs, to ensure our model is outputting factually correct information regarding a given protein, we also conduct a close-ended answer format evaluation on ProteinGPT with samples from our test subset of proteins. We selected 160 proteins for evaluation but only used QA-pairs that had a factual single-word ground truth and excluded questions that had open-ended answers (e.g. "describe this protein"). Examples of such closed-ended questions are "yes"/"no" questions or information on the number of assemblies or polymers in a protein. We then use GPT-4o to directly judge the outputs of ProteinGPT to the ground truth in our dataset. The results can be seen in Figure 4. Llama-3 and Mistral are the best-performing backbone models,




Figure 4: ProteinGPT Instruction Tuned performance on fact-based, closed-ended questions (e.g. number of polymer entities that exist in this protein)

achieving around 80% accuracy in answering fact-based closed-ended questions. Even the weaker models like Llama-2 and Vicuna achieve reasonable accuracy above 70%. Therefore, ProteinGPT not only demonstrates strong capabilities in generating feasible answers as demonstrated by our semantic evaluations, but ProteinGPT also provides factually accurate answers as demonstrated by this accuracy evaluation.




Figure 5: Performance improves progressively from the vanilla LLM model with protein as text to the modality-aligned version, and finally to the instruction-tuned variants of ProteinGPT. Each stage of ProteinGPT’s training results in substantial enhancements in both lexical and semantic performance, showcasing the efficiency of our framework.

### 4.3 Ablation Study

Lastly, to better understand our contributions and ensure the model is learning at each step in the architecture, we perform an ablation study to demonstrate that the module after each stage is indeed improving the performance of ProteinGPT. ProteinGPT is broken down into three modules: vanilla LLM, modality-aligned LLM, and instruction-tuned LLM.

**Vanilla LLM:** Table 4 (a) and Table 2 (a) display the semantic and lexical scoring using similar metrics for the vanilla LLM of choice (Vicuna, LLaMA, etc.). This is evaluated on the same set of 160 proteins and 3508 questions that we used to evaluate the final model. Also note that at this stage, no training has been done, the model is the same as the out-of-the-box LLM.

**Modality Aligned (MA) LLM:** Following this, Table 4 (b) and Table 2 (b) show that of the LLM after modality alignment. Evaluated on the same set of proteins, at this stage, the linear layer has been trained to learn to align and fuse the structure and sequence modalities to the LLM.

**Instruction Tuned (IT) LLM:** Lastly, as mentioned previously, Tables 4 (c) and 2 (c) are for the fully aligned and instruction-tuned model. At this stage, the model is complete and has been tuned on our GPT-4o curated dataset to follow instructions concisely.

Figure 5 highlights the performance differences between each of these stages. We can observe that, the instruction-tuned and modality-aligned final model consistently outperforms the modality-only model and vanilla LLMs. This falls in line with our hypothesis and demonstrates that our 3 stages of training are



indeed improving the model’s multi-modal understanding of proteins. More specifically, the observation that modality alignment always performs better than a vanilla LLM demonstrates that through this stage, the MLLM understands how to digest multi-modal information. Similarly, the observation that the instruction-tuned and modality-aligned ProteinGPT performs better than all other stages demonstrates that this stage indeed teaches the model how to properly answer questions related to these structures and sequences it learned from the previous stage.

Table 4: Semantic Performance of LLM with Protein Sequence as Text Input (left), with only Modality Alignment (middle), and with ProteinGPT (right).  $S_{\text{BERT}}$ ,  $S_{\text{Pub}}$ , and  $S_{\text{GPT}}$  stand for BERTScore [18], PubMedBERT-Score [19], and GPT-4o [10] score, respectively.

Metric	Base Model	(a) Protein Sequence			(b) Modality Fusion			(c) ProteinGPT		
		$S_{\text{BERT}}$	$S_{\text{Pub}}$	$S_{\text{GPT}}$	$S_{\text{BERT}}$	$S_{\text{Pub}}$	$S_{\text{GPT}}$	$S_{\text{BERT}}$	$S_{\text{Pub}}$	$S_{\text{GPT}}$
<b>Precision</b>	Vicuna	0.572	0.464	0.396	0.582	0.515	0.446	0.730	0.626	0.605
	Llama-2	0.513	0.372	0.362	0.589	0.446	0.414	0.739	0.644	0.606
	Llama-3	0.490	0.442	0.369	0.593	0.487	0.446	0.779	0.706	0.698
	Mistral	0.525	0.405	0.362	0.513	0.479	0.400	0.821	0.758	0.717
<b>Recall</b>	Vicuna	0.653	0.473	0.310	0.691	0.540	0.334	0.788	0.751	0.661
	Llama-2	0.680	0.324	0.214	0.679	0.477	0.308	0.796	0.773	0.689
	Llama-3	0.657	0.332	0.210	0.695	0.456	0.309	0.803	0.776	0.713
	Mistral	0.624	0.287	0.192	0.623	0.359	0.211	0.839	0.816	0.752
<b>F1</b>	Vicuna	0.608	0.468	0.347	0.629	0.524	0.381	0.756	0.682	0.630
	Llama-2	0.582	0.345	0.269	0.628	0.459	0.351	0.764	0.701	0.644
	Llama-3	0.560	0.378	0.268	0.638	0.470	0.363	0.790	0.739	0.705
	Mistral	0.569	0.335	0.250	0.561	0.409	0.276	0.829	0.784	0.733

Table 5: Semantic Performance on OpenAI GPT Protein Text LLM and our ProteinGPT {Vicuna, Llama-2, Llama-3, Mistral} models.  $S_{\text{BERT}}$ ,  $S_{\text{PubMedBERT}}$ , and  $S_{\text{GPT}}$  stand for BERTScore [18], PubMedBERT Score [19], and GPT-4o Score [10], respectively.

Scoring Model	Metrics	GPT-3.5-turbo	GPT-4-turbo	GPT-4o	Vicuna	Llama-2	Llama-3	Mistral
$S_{\text{BERT}}$	Pre	0.641	0.578	0.596	0.730	0.739	0.779	0.821
	Rec	0.701	0.675	0.668	0.788	0.796	0.803	0.839
	F1	0.667	0.621	0.628	0.756	0.764	0.790	0.829
$S_{\text{PubMedBERT}}$	Pre	0.513	0.434	0.440	0.626	0.644	0.706	0.758
	Rec	0.667	0.406	0.580	0.751	0.773	0.776	0.816
	F1	0.579	0.418	0.499	0.682	0.701	0.739	0.784
$S_{\text{GPT}}$	Pre	0.470	0.391	0.391	0.605	0.606	0.698	0.717
	Rec	0.466	0.266	0.363	0.661	0.689	0.713	0.752
	F1	0.467	0.316	0.376	0.630	0.644	0.705	0.733

## 5 Related Works

**Protein Representation Learning.** Studies in protein representation mainly focus on the four hierarchical structural levels of proteins, which are critical for their biological roles. Some research [24, 25] treat protein sequences as a biological language and utilize the Transformer architecture [26] to model amino acid interactions and predict sequences using large sequence databases. Other approaches [5, 27–33] employ Masked Language Modeling (MLM) to develop attention mechanisms reflecting protein spatial interaction maps. Structure-oriented methods [34–36] encapsulate the functional attributes and spatial

data of proteins for tasks like molecule binding [37, 38], protein interface studies [39, 40], and property predictions [41]. However, most works rely on single-modal data, which overlooks the cross-modality interactions among text and protein sequence & structure information.

**Large Language Models.** Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) such as GPT-4 [20], LLaMA [42], Mistral Large 2 [17], and Gemini [43] have established new benchmarks in natural language processing (NLP), offering enhanced language comprehension and reasoning [44–48]. Multimodal LLMs (MLLMs) have further extended these capabilities beyond text, enabling the processing of natural language task performance on multimodal data [49–51].

**Fusing Protein with LLMs.** The integration of large language models (LLMs) into protein research has yielded innovative methods for understanding protein structures and functions. Given that proteins can be represented as character strings, models like ProteinChat [7] and ProtChatGPT [8] have been developed to facilitate the analysis of protein sequences. ProteinChat focuses on providing ChatGPT-like capabilities for interpreting 3D protein structures, while ProtChatGPT leverages a Protein-Language Pertaining Transformer (PLP-former) to align protein embeddings with natural language queries, enhancing the accessibility of protein data. ProteinCLIP [52] introduces a contrastive learning approach to refine protein sequence embeddings by aligning them with functional text descriptions, improving tasks like protein-protein interaction prediction. InstructProtein [53] further bridges human and protein languages by enabling bidirectional generation, facilitating text-based protein function prediction and sequence design. ProtST [6] presents a framework that strengthens protein language models by integrating protein sequences with textual descriptions of their properties, utilizing tasks such as unimodal mask prediction, multimodal representation alignment, and multimodal mask prediction to enhance the understanding of protein functions at various levels of detail. ProtLLM [54] introduces a dynamic protein mounting mechanism and a protein-as-word language modeling approach, enabling the model to handle interleaved protein and text inputs, and to predict both natural language and protein sequences, with pre-training on the InterPT dataset that combines structured and unstructured biological data. Collectively, these models demonstrate the potential of LLMs to advance protein research.

## 6 Conclusions

We introduce ProteinGPT, a protein LLM designed to enhance question-answering capabilities and significantly expedite the process of protein understanding by providing concise responses to queries. ProteinGPT fuses structure and sequence modalities to align them to any base LLM, allowing protein researchers to harvest any off-the-shelf model to build a protein model off of. By integrating sequence and structural data, ProteinGPT also builds upon existing methodologies in protein-centric large language models and expands upon them by introducing GPT-4o to enrich protein data with detailed annotations, thereby optimizing instruction tuning. Our experimental results indicate that ProteinGPT not only shows promise for practical applications in protein understanding and design but also highlights the potential of interactive protein models as a dynamic research tool. This research serves as an incremental step towards more sophisticated interactive protein models, and we anticipate that ProteinGPT will contribute to and inspire further innovations in protein research, fostering more rapid advancements in this critical field.

## Limitations

Our work has the following limitations. 1) *Hallucination* ProteinGPT leverages the capabilities of LLMs for protein conversations, thus inheriting their potential for hallucination. This may imply safety concerns in the field of biology as it can provide faulty information with significant consequences. 2) *Verifiability*, ProteinGPT provides all answers without citations, making it hard to verify and trace the information back to the sources. 3) *Dependency on Training Data Quality*. The effectiveness of the model heavily relies on the quality of the training data. As demonstrated with alignment using GPT-4, different strategies may yield vastly different results.

To address these issues, future research can focus on more rigorous data processing and selection strategies to ensure model validity and reliability. Additionally, researchers can explore various strategies such as retrieval augmented generation (RAG) to incorporate cited sources into responses for better trustworthiness and reliability of Protein LLMs. Continuous refinements with expert inputs and feedback from the biology community could make ProteinGPT integral to protein researchers in the near future.

## References

- [1] Norio Kitadai and Shigenori Maruyama. Origins of building blocks of life: A review. *Geoscience Frontiers*, 9(4):1117–1153, 2018.
- [2] Simon J. Teague. Implications of protein flexibility for drug discovery. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 2(7):527–541, July 2003.
- [3] World Health Organization and United Nations University. *Protein and amino acid requirements in human nutrition*, volume 935. World Health Organization, 2007.
- [4] Serge Kobsa and W Mark Saltzman. Bioengineering approaches to controlled protein delivery.
- [5] Zeming Lin, Halil Akin, Roshan Rao, Brian Hie, Zhongkai Zhu, Wenting Lu, Nikita Smetanin, Robert Verkuil, Ori Kabeli, Yaniv Shmueli, et al. Evolutionary-scale prediction of atomic-level protein structure with a language model. *Science*, 379(6637):1123–1130, 2023.
- [6] Minghao Xu, Xinyu Yuan, Santiago Miret, and Jian Tang. Protst: Multi-modality learning of protein sequences and biomedical texts, 2023.
- [7] Han Guo, Mingjia Huo, and Pengtao Xie. Proteinchat: Towards enabling chatgpt-like capabilities on protein 3d structures. 2023.
- [8] Chao Wang, Hehe Fan, Ruijie Quan, and Yi Yang. Protchatgpt: Towards understanding proteins with large language models, 2024.
- [9] John Jumper, Richard Evans, Alexander Pritzel, Tim Green, Michael Figurnov, Olaf Ronneberger, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Russ Bates, Augustin Žídek, Anna Potapenko, Alex Bridgland, Clemens Meyer, Simon A. A. Kohl, Andrew J. Ballard, Andrew Cowie, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Stanislav Nikolov, Rishub Jain, Jonas Adler, Trevor Back, Stig Petersen, David Reiman, Ellen Clancy, Michal Zielinski, Martin Steinegger, Michalina Pacholska, Tamas Berghammer, Sebastian Bodenstern, David Silver, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew W. Senior, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Pushmeet Kohli, and Demis Hassabis. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *Nature*, 2021.
- [10] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee,

Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.

- [11] H. M. Berman. The protein data bank. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 28(1):235–242, January 2000.
- [12] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization, 2019.
- [13] Paulius Micikevicius, Sharan Narang, Jonah Alben, Gregory Diamos, Erich Elsen, David Garcia, Boris Ginsburg, Michael Houston, Oleksii Kuchaiev, Ganesh Venkatesh, and Hao Wu. Mixed precision training, 2018.
- [14] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%\* chatgpt quality, March 2023.
- [15] Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Han, Aojun Zhou, Xiangfei Hu, Shilin Yan, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, Peng Gao, and Yu Qiao. Llama-adapter: Efficient fine-tuning of language models with zero-init attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16199*, 2023.
- [16] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [17] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [18] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [19] Yu Gu, Robert Tinn, Hao Cheng, Michael Lucas, Naoto Usuyama, Xiaodong Liu, Tristan Naumann, Jianfeng Gao, and Hoifung Poon. Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical

- natural language processing. *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare*, 3(1):1–23, October 2021.
- [20] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *Arxiv Preprint*, arXiv:2303.08774, 2023.
- [21] Kavita Ganesan. Rouge 2.0: Updated and improved measures for evaluation of summarization tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01937*, 2018.
- [22] Alon Lavie and Abhaya Agarwal. Meteor: an automatic metric for mt evaluation with high levels of correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, StatMT '07, page 228–231, USA, 2007. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [23] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics*, ACL '02, page 311–318, USA, 2002. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [24] Ali Madani, Ben Krause, Eric R Greene, Subu Subramanian, Benjamin P Mohr, James M Holton, Jose Luis Olmos Jr, Caiming Xiong, Zachary Z Sun, Richard Socher, et al. Large language models generate functional protein sequences across diverse families. *Nature Biotechnology*, pages 1–8, 2023.
- [25] Pascal Notin, Mafalda Dias, Jonathan Frazer, Javier Marchena Hurtado, Aidan N Gomez, Debora Marks, and Yarin Gal. Tranception: protein fitness prediction with autoregressive transformers and inference-time retrieval. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 16990–17017, 2022.
- [26] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [27] Joshua Meier, Roshan Rao, Robert Verkuil, Jason Liu, Tom Sercu, and Alex Rives. Language models enable zero-shot prediction of the effects of mutations on protein function. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:29287–29303, 2021.
- [28] Alexander Rives, Joshua Meier, Tom Sercu, Siddharth Goyal, Zeming Lin, Jason Liu, Demi Guo, Myle Ott, C Lawrence Zitnick, Jerry Ma, et al. Biological structure and function emerge from scaling unsupervised learning to 250 million protein sequences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(15):e2016239118, 2021.
- [29] Roshan Rao, Joshua Meier, Tom Sercu, Sergey Ovchinnikov, and Alexander Rives. Transformer protein language models are unsupervised structure learners. *Biorxiv*, pages 2020–12, 2020.
- [30] Jesse Vig, Ali Madani, Lav R Varshney, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Nazneen Fatema Rajani. Bertology meets biology: Interpreting attention in protein language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.15222*, 2020.
- [31] Yijia Xiao, Jiezhong Qiu, Ziang Li, Chang-Yu Hsieh, and Jie Tang. Modeling protein using large-scale pretrain language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07435*, 2021.
- [32] Ahmed Elnaggar, Michael Heinzinger, Christian Dallago, Ghalia Rehawi, Yu Wang, Llion Jones, Tom Gibbs, Tamas Feher, Christoph Angerer, Martin Steinegger, et al. Prottrans: Toward understanding the language of life through self-supervised learning. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 44(10):7112–7127, 2021.

- [33] Bo Chen, Xingyi Cheng, Pan Li, Yangli-ao Geng, Jing Gong, Shen Li, Zhilei Bei, Xu Tan, Boyan Wang, Xin Zeng, et al. xtrimopglm: unified 100b-scale pre-trained transformer for deciphering the language of protein. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06199*, 2024.
- [34] Vladimir Gligorijevic, P Douglas Renfrew, Tomasz Kosciolk, Julia Koehler Leman, Daniel Berenberg, Tommi Vatanen, Chris Chandler, Bryn C Taylor, Ian M Fisk, Hera Vlamakis, et al. Structure-based protein function prediction using graph convolutional networks. *Nature communications*, 12(1):3168, 2021.
- [35] Bowen Jing, Stephan Eismann, Patricia Suriana, Raphael JL Townshend, and Ron Dror. Learning from protein structure with geometric vector perceptrons. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.01411*, 2020.
- [36] Zuobai Zhang, Minghao Xu, Arian Jamasb, Vijil Chenthamarakshan, Aurelie Lozano, Payel Das, and Jian Tang. Protein representation learning by geometric structure pretraining. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [37] Wengong Jin, Jeremy Wohlwend, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. Iterative refinement graph neural network for antibody sequence-structure co-design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04624*, 2021.
- [38] Xiangzhe Kong, Wenbing Huang, and Yang Liu. Conditional antibody design as 3d equivariant graph translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.06073*, 2022.
- [39] Sazan Mahbub and Md Shamsuzzoha Bayzid. Egret: edge aggregated graph attention networks and transfer learning improve protein-protein interaction site prediction. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 23(2):bbab578, 2022.
- [40] Manon R' eau, Nicolas Renaud, Li C Xue, and Alexandre MJJ Bonvin. Deeprank-gnn: a graph neural network framework to learn patterns in protein-protein interfaces. *Bioinformatics*, 39(1):btac759, 2023.
- [41] Ningyu Zhang, Zhen Bi, Xiaozhuan Liang, Siyuan Cheng, Haosen Hong, Shumin Deng, Jiazhang Lian, Qiang Zhang, and Huajun Chen. Ontoprotein: Protein pretraining with gene ontology embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11147*, 2022.
- [42] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023.
- [43] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- [44] Changyu Chen, Xiting Wang, Yiqiao Jin, Victor Ye Dong, Li Dong, Jie Cao, Yi Liu, and Rui Yan. Semi-offline reinforcement learning for optimized text generation. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [45] Binwei Yao, Ming Jiang, Diyi Yang, and Junjie Hu. Benchmarking llm-based machine translation on cultural awareness, 2024.
- [46] Tianyi Zhang, Faisal Ladhak, Esin Durmus, Percy Liang, Kathleen McKeown, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. Benchmarking large language models for news summarization, 2023.
- [47] Qinlin Zhao, Jindong Wang, Yixuan Zhang, Yiqiao Jin, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, and Xing Xie. Competeai: Understanding the competition behaviors in large language model-based agents. In *ICML*, 2024.

- [48] Yiqiao Jin, Qinlin Zhao, Yiyang Wang, Hao Chen, Kaijie Zhu, Yijia Xiao, and Jindong Wang. Agentreview: Exploring peer review dynamics with llm agents. *arXiv:2406.12708*, 2024.
- [49] Fangxun Shu, Lei Zhang, Hao Jiang, and Cihang Xie. Audio-visual llm for video understanding, 2023.
- [50] Weihao Yu, Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Zicheng Liu, Xinchao Wang, and Lijuan Wang. Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities, 2023.
- [51] Munan Ning, Bin Zhu, Yujia Xie, Bin Lin, Jiayi Cui, Lu Yuan, Dongdong Chen, and Li Yuan. Video-bench: A comprehensive benchmark and toolkit for evaluating video-based large language models, 2023.
- [52] Kevin E Wu, Howard Chang, and James Zou. Proteinclip: enhancing protein language models with natural language. *bioRxiv*, pages 2024–05, 2024.
- [53] Zeyuan Wang, Qiang Zhang, Keyan Ding, Ming Qin, Xiang Zhuang, Xiaotong Li, and Huajun Chen. Instructprotein: Aligning human and protein language via knowledge instruction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03269*, 2023.
- [54] Le Zhuo, Zewen Chi, Minghao Xu, Heyan Huang, Heqi Zheng, Conghui He, Xian-Ling Mao, and Wentao Zhang. Protllm: An interleaved protein-language llm with protein-as-word pre-training, 2024.

## A Case Studies

To avoid data leakage, we reserved 30% of our QA and abstract dataset for testing, which is around 26,419 proteins. This ensures that the tests reflect real-world scenarios as ProteinGPT has never seen these proteins before during training. We provide ProteinGPT’s Q and A on Protein 7RUV in Figure 8.


## B Comparative Plots

Figures 7 and 9 highlight the performance comparison across different models, including various versions of ProteinGPT, OpenAI’s GPT models, and Mistral models, using multiple evaluation metrics.

Figure 9 shows the performance of ProteinGPT variants alongside OpenAI’s GPT and MA models. The key observations from this figure are:

- **ROUGE-1 and ROUGE-L:** The ProteinGPT\_Mistral model significantly outperforms the other models with scores of 0.451 and 0.460, respectively. ProteinGPT\_LLaMA-3 and the other GPT variants (GPT-3.5-turbo, GPT-4-turbo, GPT-4o) have much lower scores, indicating that the Mistral-based variant is superior in these metrics.
- **ROUGE-LSum:** Similar to ROUGE-1 and ROUGE-L, the ProteinGPT\_Mistral variant leads with a score of 0.457, followed closely by ProteinGPT\_LLaMA-3 at 0.387. Other models show significantly lower scores, emphasizing the effectiveness of the Mistral variant.
- **BERT Score:** The ProteinGPT\_Mistral model also performs best with a score of 0.821, with ProteinGPT\_LLaMA-3 following at 0.779. The GPT models lag behind, demonstrating that the ProteinGPT variants are more aligned with human evaluations.
- **PubMedBert Score:** Again, ProteinGPT\_Mistral achieves the highest score of 0.758, outperforming ProteinGPT\_LLaMA-3 slightly. The GPT models perform lower in this biomedical domain-specific metric.







**### Human:**  
Please provide a detailed description of the protein.


**# Protein Sequence** (to be encode by ESM2)  
`MTGMSREEVESLIQEVLEVYPEKARKDRNKLAV  
NDPAVTQSKKCIISNKKSQPLMTIRGCAYAGSKGV  
... ..  
DYSGPYHGFDCFAIFARDMDMTLNNPCWKKLQAP  
WEASEGAEKVAASA`

**# Protein Structure**  
Structures are encoded by ESM2's inverse folding [GVP-GNN model]


Structures come from:  
(a) RCSB database if found  
(b) Predicted by AlphaFold


**### ProteinGPT:**  
The MoFe protein is a 2.5 MDa protein complex that catalyzes the reduction of dinitrogen to ammonia. The protein is composed of two identical 60-subunit MoFe proteins, each containing a central cavity that houses the active site. The active site is composed of a P-cluster, an FeMo-cofactor, and a bridging sulfur atom. The P-cluster is a 4Fe-4S cluster that is the site of electron transfer from the nitrogenase reductase.




**### ProteinGPT (continued):**  
The FeMo-cofactor is a 7Fe-9S cluster that is the site of nitrogen reduction. The bridging sulfur atom is a ligand to the FeMo-cofactor and is the site of nitrogen binding.




**### Human:**  
Does this protein contain branched entities?



**### ProteinGPT:**  
Yes, the protein contains branched entities. The FeMo-cofactor is a 7Fe-9S cluster that is the site of nitrogen reduction. The FeMo-cofactor is composed of a central 4Fe-4S cluster, a 3Fe-3S cluster, and a 2Fe-2S cluster. The 3Fe-3S cluster is connected to the 4Fe-4S cluster by a bridging sulfur atom. The 2Fe-2S cluster is connected to the 3Fe-3S cluster by a bridging sulfur atom.



**### Human:**  
What experimental methods were used to determine the structure of this protein? Please choose from EM, Multiple methods, NMR, Neutron, X-ray and other



**### ProteinGPT:**  
The structure of the MoFe protein was determined by X-ray crystallography. The structure was determined in the presence of the substrate azide and the product ammonia. The structure was determined at 2.5 Å resolution.

Figure 6: Conversations between humans and ProteinGPT on Protein 6O7Q, where ProteinGPT provides detailed insights into both sequence (e.g., “60-subunit MoFe proteins”) and structural information (e.g., “substrate azide and product ammonia”).

- **GPT-4o Score:** The trend continues with ProteinGPT\_Mistral leading at 0.717, while ProteinGPT\_LLaMA-3 scores 0.706, suggesting a close performance in this category.

In Figure 7, the performance of ProteinGPT with different base large language models (LLMs) is evaluated. The following findings are noteworthy:

- **ROUGE-1 and ROUGE-L:** The Mistral variant of ProteinGPT outperforms other base models (Vicuna, LLaMA-2, and LLaMA-3) in both ROUGE-1 (0.461) and ROUGE-L (0.460) scores. LLaMA-3 follows, but with slightly lower performance, while Vicuna and LLaMA-2 have the lowest scores.
- **ROUGE-LSum:** The Mistral base again outperforms others with a score of 0.457, while the LLaMA-3 variant is close behind at 0.367.
- **BERT Score:** Mistral shows the best performance (0.821), with other bases following in descending order: LLaMA-3 (0.779), LLaMA-2 (0.730), and Vicuna (0.739).
- **PubMedBert Score:** Mistral continues to outperform other base models with a score of 0.758, while LLaMA-3 follows at 0.706.
- **GPT-4o Score:** The Mistral base model scores highest at 0.717, followed by LLaMA-3 at 0.698.

Overall, the findings suggest that the ProteinGPT\_Mistral variant consistently outperforms other models across all metrics. The Mistral base model proves to be the most effective for ProteinGPT, indicating that the combination of Mistral with ProteinGPT architecture is particularly powerful. In contrast, other base models such as LLaMA-2 and Vicuna, and the GPT variants, show comparatively lower performance, especially in metrics like ROUGE-1, ROUGE-L, and the PubMedBert Score, which are crucial for natural language processing tasks in specialized domains such as biomedical text analysis.




Figure 7: ProteinGPT's Performance with Different Base LLMs.

**### Human:**  
Please describe the structure of the protein

**# Protein Sequence** (to be encode by ESM2)  
*SGFRKMAFPSPGKVEGCMVQVTCGTTLNGLWLDL*  
*VVYCPRHVICTSEDMLNPNYEDLLIRKSNHNFLVQ*  
 ... ..  
*QDHVDILGPLSAQTGIAVLDMCASLKELLQNGMNG*  
*RTLIGSALLEDEFTPFDDVVRQCSGVTFQ*

**# Protein Structure**  
Structures are encoded by ESM2's inverse folding [GVP-GNN model]

Structures come from:  
(a) RCSB database if found  
(b) Predicted by AlphaFold

**### ProteinGPT:**  
The protein is a viral main protease (Mpro) of SARS-CoV-2. The protein is a homodimer with each monomer consisting of two domains: the N-terminal domain (NTD) and the C-terminal domain (CTD). The NTD is composed of a central beta-sheet flanked by two alpha-helices, while the CTD is composed of a central alpha-helix flanked by two beta-sheets. The active site is located at the interface of the two domains.

**### Human:**  
Please describe the functionality of the protein.

**### ProteinGPT:**  
The protein is a viral main protease (Mpro) of SARS-CoV-2. The protein is essential for viral replication and is a key target for antiviral drug development.

**### Human:**  
What structural fold does the protein adopt?

**### ProteinGPT:**  
The protein adopts a chymotrypsin-like fold.

**### Human:**  
Please give a summary about the protein.

**### ProteinGPT:**  
The protein is a viral main protease (Mpro) of SARS-CoV-2. The protein is a homodimer with each monomer consisting of two domains: the N-terminal domain (NTD) and the C-terminal domain (CTD). The NTD is composed of a central beta-sheet flanked by two alpha-helices, while the CTD is composed of a central alpha-helix flanked by two beta-sheets. The active site is located at the interface of the two domains. The protein has 2 intermolecular metallic bonds. The protein adopts a chymotrypsin-like fold.

Figure 8: ProteinGPT's conversation on Protein 7RUV.




Figure 9: Comparison of ProteinGPT, OpenAI’s GPT and MA models.