SUPERPOSITION OF MOLECULAR STRUCTURES USING QUATERNIONS
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An algorithm is developed that finds the optimal orientation of a rigid molecular structure, represented by \( N \) reference sites, with respect to the same number of sites in an observed structure. The optimal orientation is found by minimizing the weighted sum of squared deviations of the rotated reference site positions from the observed site positions. The rotation is parametrized by a quaternion whose components, written as a column vector, are shown to be an eigenvector of a characteristic matrix which is defined in terms of the coordinate sets to be superimposed.

The presented algorithm is particularly useful with respect to the calculation of orientational correlations of molecular structures.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The simulation or analysis of molecular systems often requires the rotational fit of a given molecular reference structure, defined by a set of atomic coordinates, to a corresponding observed structure. Good examples are the investigation of rigid-body motions in proteins by the analysis of molecular dynamics (MD) simulations, the comparison of protein structures [1,2], and the removal of unwanted protein rotations in MD simulations or their analysis. The algorithm described in the following to solve such problems is an efficient general purpose algorithm that has a particular advantage for the study of orientational correlations: Given the observed site positions \( \{ r^\alpha \} \), \( \alpha = 1...N \), and the corresponding positions \( \{ r^\alpha_0 \} \) of the reference structure, both coordinate sets related to a suitable chosen rotation center, we define for each site an 'error'

\[
\tilde{\varepsilon}_\alpha(q) = D(q) \tilde{r}^{\alpha}_0 - r^\alpha.
\]

The rotation to be optimized is described by an orthogonal matrix \( D(q) \) which is parametrized in terms of four quaternion parameters \( (q_0, q_1, q_2, q_3) \), written in compact notation as \( q^T = (q_0, q^T) \) [3]:

\[
D(q) = \begin{pmatrix}
q_0^2 + q_1^2 - q_2^2 - q_3^2 & 2(-q_0 q_3 + q_1 q_2) & 2(q_0 q_2 + q_1 q_3) \\
2(q_0 q_3 + q_1 q_2) & q_0^2 + q_2^2 - q_1^2 - q_3^2 & 2(-q_0 q_1 + q_2 q_3) \\
2(-q_0 q_2 + q_1 q_3) & 2(q_0 q_1 + q_2 q_3) & q_0^2 + q_3^2 - q_1^2 - q_2^2
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

For the notation of vectors we keep the following convention throughout this paper:
Arrows label three-dimensional column vectors, underscores label four-dimensional column vectors, and an upper 'T' stands for the transposition of a matrix or a vector. The quaternion parameters have to satisfy the normalization constraint

\[ q_0^2 + q_1^2 + q_2^2 + q_3^2 = q \cdot q = 1. \]  

(3)

To find the optimal superposition of the coordinate sets \( \{ \tilde{r}_s \} \) and \( \{ r_s^{(0)} \} \) in a least-squares sense the following function has to be minimized with the constraint (3):

\[ m(q) = \sum_x w_x |\tilde{r}_x(q)|^2. \]  

(4)

The \( w_x \) are positive weights for each site. If needed, the choice of the rotation centers can easily be included into the above minimization problem since the corresponding fit is decoupled from the rotational fit: With \( \sum_x w_x = 1 \) and the coordinate sets \( \{ \tilde{x}_s \} \) and \( \{ x_s^{(0)} \} \), \( x = 1...N \), representing the observed structure and the reference structure, the optimal rotation centers are found to be

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{x}_c &= \sum_x w_x \tilde{x}_x, \\
x_c^{(0)} &= \sum_x w_x x_x^{(0)}
\end{align*}
\]  

(5)

The coordinate sets for the following rotational fit are then given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{r}_s &= \tilde{x}_x - \tilde{x}_c, \\
r_s^{(0)} &= x_x^{(0)} - x_c^{(0)}
\end{align*}
\]  

(6)

It is convenient to use quaternion parameters for the rotational minimization problem not only because their usage leads to an algorithm that is numerically easy to handle and efficient, as we will see, but also because they allow to express easily relative orientations between molecules or parts of them. The second property is particularly useful if one wants to study orientational correlations \([4,5]\). A comprehensive treatise on quaternions can be found in \([3]\) and \([6]\).

The quaternion parameters are related in the following way to the familiar Euler angles:

\[
\begin{align*}
q_0(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) &= \cos \left( \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \cos \left( \frac{\gamma + \alpha}{2} \right) \\
q_1(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) &= \sin \left( \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \sin \left( \frac{\gamma - \alpha}{2} \right) \\
q_2(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) &= \sin \left( \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \cos \left( \frac{\gamma - \alpha}{2} \right) \\
q_3(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) &= \cos \left( \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \sin \left( \frac{\gamma + \alpha}{2} \right)
\end{align*}
\]  

(7)

The convention for the Euler-angles used here is the 'y-convention' where the rotation is defined by successive rotations about the \( z, y', z'' \)-axis with angles \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \). The quaternion parameters can be as well expressed in terms of the rotation axis \( \hat{n} \) and the
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rotation angle $\Phi$ of a rotation:

$$
\begin{align*}
q_0(n, \Phi) &= \cos (\Phi/2), \\
q_1(n, \Phi) &= \sin (\Phi/2)n_x, \\
q_2(n, \Phi) &= \sin (\Phi/2)n_y, \\
q_3(n, \Phi) &= \sin (\Phi/2)n_z.
\end{align*}
$$

(8)

2 FITTING THE QUATERNION PARAMETERS

2.1 Preliminary Definitions

The algorithm to find the quaternion parameters that minimize $m(q)$ defined in (4), subject to the constraint $q \cdot q = 1$, is most conveniently derived in the framework of quaternion algebra. An arbitrary quaternion $A$ is determined by four real parameters $(a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3)$ and is written as:

$$
A = a_0 I + a_1 J + a_2 K + a_3 I.
$$

(9)

$I^2 = J^2 = K^2 = -1$. 

(10)

$IJ = K$, cycl. 

(11)

A possible matrix representation of $A$ is [6]:

$$
A = \begin{pmatrix}
    a_0 - a_1 - a_2 - a_3 \\
    a_1 & a_0 - a_3 & a_2 \\
    a_2 & a_3 & a_0 - a_1 \\
    a_3 - a_2 & a_1 & a_0
\end{pmatrix}.
$$

(12)

From (12) we derive the following multiplication rule for the product $C = AB$ of two quaternions:

$$
\begin{align*}
c_0 &= a_0 b_0 - \tilde{a} \cdot \tilde{b}, \\
\tilde{c} &= a_0 \tilde{b}^* + b_0 \tilde{a} + \tilde{a} \wedge \tilde{b}.
\end{align*}
$$

(13)

The symbol ' $\wedge$ ' denotes the vector-product. An immediate consequence from (12) and (13) is the following formula for the scalar product $a \cdot b$:

$$
a \cdot b = a_0 b_0 + \tilde{a} \cdot \tilde{b} = \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}\{A^*B\}.
$$

(14)

With $\text{tr}\{\ldots\}$ the trace is denoted. The most important feature of normalized quaternions is that they represent rotations: Introducing the quaternions $X \Leftrightarrow x \equiv (0, x)^T$ and $Q \Leftrightarrow q \equiv (q_0 q)^T$, with $q \cdot q = 1$, we have for the components of

$$
X' = QXQ^T
$$

(15)
the following relations:

\[
\begin{align*}
&x'_0 = 0, \\
&\hat{\mathbf{x}} = D(q)\hat{\mathbf{x}},
\end{align*}
\]

(16)

where \(D(q)\) is given by (2).

2.2 The Algorithm

Using eqs. (14), (15), and (16) of the last subsection we can write the sum of squared deviations \(m(q)\) as

\[
m(q) = \frac{1}{4} \sum \omega_{z} tr\{E_{a}^{T}(q)E_{a}(q)\},
\]

(17)

where \(E_{a}(q)\) is the quaternion representation of \(\hat{e}_{a}(q)\) defined in (1):

\[
E_{a}(q) = QX_{a}^{0}Q^{T} - X_{a}.
\]

(18)

Instead of minimizing \(m(q)\), with respect to \(q\) it is, more convenient to minimize the function \(\hat{m}(q)\), defined by

\[
\hat{m}(q) = \frac{1}{4} \sum \omega_{z} tr\{\hat{E}_{a}(q)\hat{E}_{a}(q)\},
\]

(19)

\[
\hat{E}_{a}(q) = QX_{a}^{0} - X_{a}Q.
\]

(20)

From equation (20) and the invariance of the trace under cyclic permutation of the arguments it follows immediately that

\[
\hat{m}(q) = m(q) \quad \text{if} \quad q \cdot q = 1.
\]

(21)

The advantage of using \(\hat{m}(q)\) instead of \(m(q)\) is due to the fact that the quaternions \(\hat{E}_{a}(q)\) are linear in \(q\), i.e. its component vectors \(\hat{e}_{a}\) can be related to the component vector \(q\) of the quaternion \(Q\) by a matrix \(K_{a}\) whose explicit form will be derived later:

\[
\hat{e}_{a} = K_{a}q.
\]

(22)

Consequently \(\hat{m}(q)\) can be written as a quadratic form in \(q\), regardless if \(q\) is normalized or not:

\[
\hat{m}(q) = q \cdot Mq,
\]

(23)

\[
M = \sum \omega_{z} K_{a}^{T}K_{a}.
\]

(24)

The general form of \(M\) given in (24) follows from eqs. (22), (19), and (14). Taking into account the side-constraint \(q \cdot q = 1\) by the method of Lagrange multipliers we have to minimize the following extended function:

\[
\hat{m}'(q,\lambda) = \hat{m}(q) - \lambda(q \cdot q - 1).
\]

(25)

The necessary condition for a minimum of \(\hat{m}'(q,\lambda)\) with respect to \(q\) and \(\lambda\) leads
immediately to the following eigenvector equation for $q$:

$$Mq = \lambda q,$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

$$q^*q = 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

According to (24) $M$ is a symmetric and positive semidefinite matrix and therefore all its eigenvalues are real and greater than or equal to zero. Since $m(q)$ is equal to $\bar{m}(q)$ if $q^*q = 1$, we have for all normalized solutions $q_i$, $i = 0\ldots3$, of (26):

$$m(q_i) = \lambda_i.$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

Therefore the normalized eigenvector corresponding to the smallest eigenvalue of $M$ is the solution we are looking for.

It remains to find the explicit form of the matrix $M$. To do this we start from eq. (24) which expresses $M$ in terms of the matrices $K_s$ which are themselves defined by the relation (22). The explicit form of the matrices $K_s$ can be easily found from the definition of $E_s(q)$ given in (20) and the multiplication rules for quaternions listed in (13). Introducing the vectors $d_s$ and $s_s$, defined by

$$d_s = r_s - r_s^{(0)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)

$$s_s = r_s + r_s^{(0)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)

and the antisymmetric matrix $W_s$,

$$W_s = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -s_{yz} & s_{zx} \\ s_{yz} & 0 & -s_{xy} \\ -s_{zx} & s_{xy} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)

$K_s$ can be written as

$$K_s = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d_s \\ -d_s & W_s \end{pmatrix}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

The explicit form of $M$ can now be obtained from straight-forward insertion of the above expression for $K_s$ into eq. (24). Defining the quantities

$$u_s = r_s \wedge r_s^{(0)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

$$P_s = r_s \otimes r_s^{(0)} + r_s^{(0)} \otimes r_s,$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

where the symbol $\otimes$ stands for the dyadic product, we arrive at the following expression for $M$:

$$M = \sum_a w_a M_a,$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)

$$M_a = \begin{pmatrix} |d_a|^2 & 2u_a^2 \\ 2u_a & |s_a|^2 - 1 - 2P_a \end{pmatrix}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

Here $1$ denotes the three by three unit matrix.

If the number of sites $N$ in the minimization problem is equal to one the matrix $M \equiv M_1$ has two twofold degenerate eigenvalues:

$$\lambda_{1,2} = |\bar{r}|^2 + |r^{(0)}|^2 \mp 2|\bar{r}| |r^{(0)}|.$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)
The eigenvalue $\lambda_1$ is equal to the minimum of $m(q)$, which is achieved when the rotated reference vector $r^{(0)}$ is parallel to $r$, and $\lambda_2$ is equal to the maximum $m(q)$, when the rotated reference vector $r^{(0)}$ and $r$ are antiparallel. The degeneracy of the eigenvalues is due to the fact that the rotations which lead to the minimum or maximum in $m(q)$ are evidently not unique: If we choose a coordinate system in which $r^{(0)}$ is parallel to the $z$-axis and express the active rotation of $r^{(0)}$ by the Euler-angles $\alpha$, $\beta$, and $\gamma$, the rotation is entirely determined by $\alpha$ and $\beta$, which are the azimuthal and polar angle of the vector $r$. The third angle $-\gamma$ is redundant since the axis for the third rotation is (anti)parallel to $\bar{r}$. Correspondingly any linear combination

$$q = c_1 q^{(1,2)} + c_2 q^{(1,2)}, \quad \text{with } c_1^2 + c_2^2 = 1,$$

where $q^{(1,2)}$ and $q^{(1,2)}$ are orthonormal basis-vectors which span the two-dimensional eigenspaces belonging to $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ respectively, leads to the same $m(q)$. In this case the solution of our minimization problem is given by an arbitrary normalized linear combination of the eigenvectors $q^{(1)}$ and $q^{(2)}$ which are the basis of the eigenspace belonging to $\lambda_1$.

The above case can be immediately generalized for the fit of linear structures with a number of sites, $N > 1$: For linear structures the optimal rotation for each single site in the reference structure, and therefore for the whole reference structure, is the same. Consequently the two twofold degenerate eigenvalues read:

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \sum w_x |\bar{r}_x - r_x^{(0)}|^2 = 2 \sum |\bar{r}_x| |r_x^{(0)}|.$$ 

(39)

3 CONCLUSION AND NUMERICAL CONSIDERATIONS

As was shown above the optimal rotational superposition of two molecular structures – regardless of the arrangement of the atoms – can be found by the calculation of the normalized eigenvector belonging to the smallest eigenvalue of the real and symmetric $4 \times 4$-matrix $M = \sum w_x M_x$, defined in eqs. (35,36). The components of this eigenvector represent the quaternion parameters describing the optimal orientation of the reference structure with respect to the target structure. For the numerical solution of the eigenvalue problem the single components of the matrices $M_x$ are given below. Since the $M_x$ are symmetric matrices, it suffices to list – and to calculate – only the upper triangle $M_x_{i,j}$, $i \leq j$ with $\bar{r}_x \equiv (x_x,y_x,z_x)^T$ and $r_x^{(0)} \equiv (x_{0x},y_{0x},z_{0x})^T$ we have:

$$M_{x,11} = x_x^2 + y_x^2 + z_x^2 + x_{0x}^2 + y_{0x}^2 + z_{0x}^2 - 2x_x x_{0x} - 2y_x y_{0x} - 2z_x z_{0x}$$

$$M_{x,12} = 2(y_x z_{0x} - z_x y_{0x})$$

$$M_{x,13} = 2(-x_x z_{0x} + z_x x_{0x})$$

$$M_{x,14} = 2(x_x y_{0x} - y_x x_{0x})$$

$$M_{x,22} = x_x^2 + y_x^2 + z_x^2 + x_{0x}^2 + y_{0x}^2 + z_{0x}^2 - 2x_x x_{0x} + 2y_x y_{0x} + 2z_x z_{0x}$$

$$M_{x,23} = -2(x_x y_{0x} + y_x x_{0x})$$

$$M_{x,24} = -2(x_x z_{0x} + z_x x_{0x})$$

$$M_{x,33} = x_x^2 + y_x^2 + z_x^2 + x_{0x}^2 + y_{0x}^2 + z_{0x}^2 + 2x_x x_{0x} - 2y_x y_{0x} + 2z_x z_{0x}$$

$$M_{x,34} = -2(y_x z_{0x} + z_x y_{0x})$$

$$M_{x,44} = x_x^2 + y_x^2 + z_x^2 + x_{0x}^2 + y_{0x}^2 + z_{0x}^2 + 2x_x x_{0x} + 2y_x y_{0x} - 2z_x z_{0x}$$

(40)
The complete matrix $M$ is obtained by a loop over all sites $x = 1...N$, accumulating the matrices $M_x$, multiplied by the weights $w_x$. Because of its structure this loop vectorizes well on vector machines if the number of sites is sufficiently large.

To solve the eigenvector problem for $M$ one could in principle use a routine that calculates by inverse iteration [7] only its smallest eigenvalue and the corresponding eigenvector. However, for a $4 \times 4$-matrix no gain in speed can be expected [7] since it is only an advantage to use inverse iteration if less than approximately 25% of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors are needed. Tests with the routes DSPEV (full solution) and DSPSV (inverse iteration) from the IBM ESSL-library [8] confirm this.

The superposition of two peptide conformations, each described by 310 atom positions, takes $2.1 \text{ ms}$ on an IBM 3090/600 G computer in vector mode, and $15.0 \text{ ms}$ in scalar mode. Approximately $0.4 \text{ ms}$ of the above CPU-times are used to diagonalize the matrix $M$.
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