Acta Cryst. (1993). D49, 100-106

# Programs for **Phasing by Entropy Maximization as Implemented in** *Xtal3.2:*  **a Crystallographic Software System**

BY JAMES M. STEWART

*University of Maryland, College Park, MD* 20742, *USA* 

DOUGLAS M. COLLINS

*The Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, USA* 

KEITH D. WATENPAUGH

*The Upjohn Co., Kalamazoo, MI, USA* 

EDWARD PRINCE

*National Institutes for Science and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, USA* 

AND SYDNEY R. HALL

*University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia* 

*(Received* 30 *June* 1992; *accepted* 18 *August* 1992)

### **Abstract**

*Xtal3.2,* a crystallographic software package, is an international development project involving about 40 researchers over a full spectrum of crystallographic interests. This development has been supported by many national and international agencies and commercial institutions since the first version in 1983. The 1992 release, *Xtal3.2,* contains software for 95 different calculations. These range from the processing of raw diffraction data to interactive molecular graphics, atomic charge estimation, electronic publication preparation, and the structure solution and refinement of small and large molecules. Tests of the *Xtal*  programs for phase determination and phase refinement by the application of 'maximum entropy' are presented.

#### **1. Introduction**

*Xtal3.2* (Hall & Stewart 1992) is a collection of programs designed to perform the calculations necessary to solve, refine, interpret and publish structures determined by diffraction techniques. It consists of a 'nucleus' of programs which manage program invocation, input/output of data and results, formation, maintenance and manipulation of data files, and monitoring of perceived errors. The library of crystallographic and 'housekeeping' programs runs under the control of the nucleus programs. Each program is modular and works against defined data files, both binary and ASCII. The structure of these files is defined in such a way that each calculation may extract the information needed and insert the results which are computed into update files for use by any other program in the system. The preparation of the ASCII input files which invoke the

programs is documented in book form (Hall & Stewart, 1992). The ASCII data files which result from a structure analysis are in the CIF format described by Hall, Allen & Brown (1991). The CIF format files are suitable for communication to and from other systems, to some journals, and as archive files.

All the programs are written in FORTRAN; however, the symbolic representation is stored in a form which is first treated by a preprocessor, *RFPP* (Hall, 1985), a FOR-TRAN77 variant of *RATMAC* (Munn, Stewart, Norden & Pagoaga, 1980), which is itself a FORTRAN program. The macro feature of the preprocessor is a convenient way to deal automatically with the differences in machines, FORTRAN compilers and operating system characteristics. In addition to the preprocessor there are other 'software tools' for preparing, applying, and distributing updates and enhancements to the crystallographic programs. Between major releases updates are handled by means of an automatic e-mail reply facility 'sendme' from the University of Western Australia.

Detailed *Xtal* documentation is published as two manuals. These give details of the file structure, system control commands, terminology used and descriptions of each of the crystallographic calculations. Some examples of input are also included. The programs are supplied with some 'decks' of test input and output. The documentation includes information on implementation of the programs and use of the 'tools' programs.

*Xtal3.2* may be installed on any computer or operating system which has a FORTRAN compiler. The macros supplied allow for the setting of local computer characteristics, *e.g.* available memory. The standard distribution is

0907-4449/93/010100-07506.00 © 1993 International Union of Crystallography

from the University of Western Australia on a single 0.5" magnetic tape with implementation and application documentation. A customized version is also available for PCs on disk. The versatility and portability of the *Xtal* package works well in the increasingly common networked computing and workstation environments.

In the following section, the current programs of *Xtal3.2*  are listed in alphabetical order of their calling mnemonic with a brief description of the purpose of each program. Later sections give special emphasis to the programs designed to aid in macromolecular calculations. It should be noted that some of the 'service' routines, such as file creation and reflection sort/merge serve both the small-molecule and macromolecule programs. Therefore a straightforward categorization of the programs is not possible. Finally, there is a section devoted to the experimental programs for the utilization of maximum entropy for phase determination and extension.

# 2. Crystallographic **and service programs in** Xta/3.2

In what follows 'BDF' designates a 'binary data file'.







#### *3. Xtal3.2* **programs for macromolecular structures**

*Xtal3.2* requires a user to invoke crystallographic routines based on an order which is dictated by the problem at hand. The narrative which follows should give the reader a sense of the programs available in the order in which they would often be used. The programs *STARTX, ADDMUL, ADDREF, SORTRF, MERGDS and REMSET* are used to form and fill data files with the unit-cell information, the intensity data for the parent and isomorphous derivatives, including sorting, merging and scaling of multiple data sets from heavy-atom derivatives. Once known, atom parameters may be loaded by means of *PROATM* or, for the heavy-atom parameters prior to a multiple isomorphous replacement run, by *ADDATM.*  Programs for carrying out initial and extended phasing include *MIR, SIMWGT, PATSEE, MESTAR, MERUN and MEPHAS. The* programs *BFOURR, FOURR, RFOURR, CONVOL, MKMASK, APMASK, FOSTAT, FOMERG and MAKBRK* allow for the preparation and manipulation of Fourier transforms. *FOURR* is a general reciprocal space to direct space Fourier transform program. *RFOURR* does the reverse transformations. *BFOURR* is used to form the special coefficients such as Bijvoet differences,  $|F_{+}-F_{-}|$ , useful in determining macromolecular structures. While *MKMASK and APMASK are used* for flattening or other simple modifications of the electron-density maps. *MAK-*BRK is an example of an interfacing program in *Xtal.* It produces a file which is to be read by the external *FRODO*  program. Once the trial structure is established by Fourier fitting methods the atom parameters may be refined using *PRECED and CEDAR* or *PROTIN and PROLSQ. These*  programs are specifically coded to deal with the refinement of macromolecular structures. *RCALC* will give R factors as a function of various quantities,  $e.g. \sin\theta/\lambda$ . There are also a number of programs which serve for housekeeping or program checking tools. *PHACMP* will allow the comparison of phases determined by two different methods; *EDTBDF, MODHKL, VUBDF* allow editing and examination of binary files. *CIFIO* will produce an ASCII file from a binary data file so that a local line editor may be used to edit data files. *PHONYD* generates ideal F data with a specified amount of pseudo-random error. It can be useful for making test runs before trying a solution or refinement method with 'real' data.

#### **4. Maximum-entropy implementation** in *Xtal*

There are two distinct algorithmic approaches to the use of maximum entropy in the *Xtal* system. One is due to Collins (Collins, 1982; Collins & Mahar, 1983) and the other to Prince (Prince, Sj61in & Alenljung, 1988; Prince, 1989). Collins' scheme is embodied in the programs *MERUN, MEDENS and MEFFIT.* While *MEPHAS* is an *Xtal* adaptation of the programs of Prince. In both procedures it is necessary to have a *'prior'* electron-density map. This map may be generated using, for example, multiple isomorphous replacement phases or by inserting only phases for the origin- and enantiomorph-defining reflections by means of *MESTAR. The* purpose of *MESTAR* is to allow the insertion of structure-factor phases for any chosen reflections and the resetting of the remainder to 'unknown'. This *prior* electron-density map is then used to compute a constrained exponential electron-density distribution by means of *MEDENS. MEDENS* is modeled on subroutine *MAXENT* by Prince. The map prepared by use of *MEDENS* is the *prior* used in further calculations. The output function from *MEDENS* is a function of maximum entropy and will be used for the extrapolation, interpolation, determination and smoothing of reflection phases. All negative areas will have been scaled above zero and all large positive regions will have been sharpened. In *MEDENS the* input electron density is scanned to establish the maximum, minimum and average electron density. The process is very sensitive to average electron density, and will not work if the  $F_{000}$  term is omitted from the original electron-density calculation, or is far from the true value. The process becomes ill conditioned and will fail as the mean of the electron density approaches zero from the positive. This may present a challenge in the case of macromolecules where the contribution of the solvent portion is initially not well known. It is also important that the grid of the input electron density be 'fine' enough to provide the resolution that will allow the phase extension in the subsequent *RFOURR runs. The* output electron density with unit sharpening is an exponential representation which satisfies two constraints:

(1) The mean of the electron density remains constant. (2) The mean square of the electron density remains constant.

This is accomplished by calculating the new electron density,  $\rho_{\text{new}}$ , from the old electron density,  $\rho_{\text{old}}$ , by

$$
\rho_{\text{new}} = \exp[ZB + (1 - Z)A],
$$

where

$$
Z = [\rho_{\text{old}} - \min(\rho_{\text{old}})]/[\max(\rho_{\text{old}}) - \min(\rho_{\text{old}})]
$$

The scale factors  $A$  and  $B$  are obtained by a Newton-Raphson iteration.

# **5. Xta/3.2 program** *MEFFIT* **for phase and moduli refinement**

*MEFFIT* combines a positive-definite map of constrained exponential electron density formed by *MEDENS and a*  difference map prepared by *FOURR* using phases calculated by *RFOURR* from the *MEDENS* output map. The effect of this process is to produce a new map such that the maximum-entropy phases and the observed structure moduli will be produced upon Fourier transformation of the new map. The program may be run by use of the *Xtal*  program *MERUN* which sets up an input stream to drive all the programs needed in the refinement process.

**The** focus of program *MEFFIT* is adjustment of a positive-definite density map toward agreement with observed structure-factor magnitudes. The designed application is sequential improvement of an imperfectly phased set of structure factors through manipulation of its corresponding noisy or low-resolution density function by *MEDENS, MEFFIT* and necessary Fourier routines. On a grid suitably fine for the desired final resolution, an initial electron-density function is converted by *MEDENS* into a maximum-entropy density, which is a positive-definite exponential function. This map is used as input to *RFOURR*  to calculate structure factors (including phases), which, it is expected, are subsequently used in *FOURR* to form a companion difference electron-density map. *MEFFIT*  generates a new positive-definite exponential density in a maximum-entropy adjustment of the *prior* exponential density. The new density is computed by pointwise multiplication of the *prior* by

### $\rho_{\text{new}} = \rho_{\text{old}} \exp(\text{constant} \times \Delta \rho)$

The  $\rho_{\text{new}}$  is then scaled to restore the original mean value. As a stand alone process, this combination of a positivedefinite density and the difference density,  $\Delta \rho$ , constitutes one maximum-entropy step in the adjustment of a positive-definite density to match more closely the experimentally observed moduli. Watenpaugh has tested phase extension using this algorithm by setting up a test using the refined structure of phospholipase  $A_2$  (K49 variant) (space group  $P4_32_12_1$ ,  $a = b = 71.53$ ,  $c = 57.59$  Å, R -- 14.7%) (Holland *et al.,* 1990). Table 1 shows the average phase error for acentric reflections and the count of the number of agreements for centric reflections when the phases of the final structure factors are compared to the phases recovered from the maximum-entropy process. The phase extension power of the method seems to become useful when extending phases from the 3.0-2.5 A region to 2.0 A or possibly higher resolution. Starting at lower resolution produces quite fiat electron-density maps that can be easily satisfied with small changes in the starting phases resulting in little phase extension. These lowresolution maps have very little negative density and are, therefore, not greatly modified by the maximum-entropy criterion. At higher resolution preventing negative density is a very powerful element in the phase extension process. After the desired number of iterations have been run, the last step of which is *RFOURR* to compute structure factors, the final  $F_{obs}$  Fourier map may be calculated. This gives the electron density in its standard formulation but with structure-factor phasing corresponding to the final exponential density. This whole process has the structure: *FOURR; MEDENS; RFOURR; (FOURR; MEFFIT; RFOURR); FOURR, in* which the parentheses show the inner loop of program usage. By this process an electrondensity map for which the conventional  *value is zero* may be produced, *i.e.* every  $|F_{obs}|$  matches every  $|F_{calc}|$ .

#### **6. Xta/3.2 program** *MEPHAS* **for phase determination**

*MEPHAS* is the name given to the *Xtal* program version of the method of Prince. In this process a constrained exponential input electron-density map, the *prior,* based on a smaller number of starting reflections, is used as a basis to establish, by maximum-entropy criteria, the phases of the chosen reflections. This process is used to extend the number of phased reflections. At each stage in the process of establishing the maximum-entropy phases for the chosen reflections the constrained exponential electron-density function is held everywhere positive, and the magnitudes of the  $F_{\text{calc}}$  implied by the electron density is refined by a dual function procedure which forces a match in the magnitudes of the  $F_{obs}$  and  $F_{calc}$  of the chosen subset of reflections. The *prior* map may have been prepared by the use of: (i) as few reflections as the number of phases allowed to define the origin and enantiomorph of the space group being treated; (ii) the reflections in (i) plus others determined from other information; (iii) the reflections in (i) plus those determined by a previous run of *MEPHAS*  itself. In the description that follows two terms are used: ' trial and iteration. A trial refers to the use of one set of phases applied to a subset of reflections to be phased. An iteration refers to an iteration of the application of Prince's dual function to bring the moduli to conformance.

#### Table 1. *Results of maximum-entropy phase extension by MEFFIT*

[Start/End] shows starting map resolution  $(A)/e$ xtended map resolution  $(A)$ . (Acentric) shows average phase error (°)/total number of acentric reflections phased. (Centric) shows number concordant/total number of centric reflections phased. Test case: phospholipase  $A_2$  (K49 variant) (space group  $P4_32_12_1$ ,  $a = b = 71.53$ ,  $c = 57.59$  Å,  $R = 14.7\%$ ).



\* In the 6 A test 2.4/261 acentric and 186/186 centric phased reflections were used to begin the test.

*The MEPHAS* program is designed to run in four distinct modes:

(1) This is called the ' $MEsign$ ' mode. Sixteen centric reflections are tested. From 49 to 289 separate trials are carried out until the phases corresponding to the maximum entropy of the constrained exponential electron density have been found. In each trial dual-function iterations are performed until a good fit of the 16 reflection moduli **is** achieved. The first 32 trials consist of assigning 16 patterns of centric phases and their supplements to the chosen subset of reflections. The difference in entropy associated with the maps from each pair of trials is used in Yates' algorithm (Yates, 1937) to predict the maximumentropy phase set. A check is made to see if any of the 32 trials show a greater entropy than the Yates result. The phases from one or the other source are then tested by taking the supplement of each phase reflection by reflection. If the entropy rises, the phase is accepted and the next reflection tested until all have been 'checked'. This checking will be confined to checking each of the 16 reflections once, or optionally, repeatedly until no changes are detected. That is a possible maximum of 256 trials. The final phases and their  $F_{\text{calc}}$  are output without changing any other reflections previously treated. In addition the final constrained exponential density, as modified, is saved to become the next *prior.* 

(2) This **is** called the *'MEosc"* mode. A specified number of centric reflections are oscillated by  $180^\circ$  in phase. At each trial, when the F-fitting iterations are completed, if the entropy has risen the current value of the reflection phase is saved and left unchanged as the trials continue. This is tantamount to running the last part of the *MEsign*  procedure.

(3) This is called the 'MEcyc' mode. A small number of general reflections, usually one, may be specified along with a phase 'step' to be applied. These reflections will then be tested against the maximum-entropy criterion at each step from 0 to  $360^\circ$  less the step. Once the maximumentropy phase is established for each reflection in turn that value is used while the next reflection is tested.

(4) This is called the *"MErit"* mode. A number of general reflections may be specified for moduli fitting. In this mode the initial phases will be those obtained from the input BDF. Usually a previous run of *RFOURR using the*  last previous constrained exponential electron-density map will be required. In this case the map will be refined in one trial of as many iterations as are required to bring the moduli into conformance. This is the many-reflection moduli-fitting mode of operation. Note that, unlike the Collins approach except for special cases, input phases are held fixed in the logarithm of density while the constrained exponential map is modified to fit exactly the input  $|F_{\text{obs}}|$ . The phases derived from the modified map will then show a departure from the phases of the *prior* electron-density map.

#### 7. Preliminary **tests of** *Xtal progrmn MEPHAS*

For the purpose of testing the behavior of the phasing algorithm a test case using idealized data for bovine pancreatic phospholipase  $A_2$  (space group  $P2_12_12_1$ ,  $a = 47.07$ ,  $b = 64.45$ ,  $c = 57.59$  Å,  $R = 14.7\%$ ) (Dijkstra, Kalk, Hol & Drenth, 1981) was prepared. In these tests no examination of the maps in the manner described by Sjölin, Prince, Svensson & Gilliland (1991) was carried out. Four of the largest centric reflections suitable for defining the origin and enantiomorph were assigned the  $F_{\text{calc}}$  phases and the sixteen largest  $F$ -centric reflections were treated by *MEPHAS.* In each of the 49 trials the entropy of the map is very similar, ranging from  $-0.102472$  to  $-0.091110$ . The trial with the refined structure  $F_{\text{calc}}$  phases forced into it showed an entropy of  $-0.102346$ . It is next to the lowest. The 16 reflections in the maximum-entropy trial yielded seven which were in agreement with the  $F_{\text{calc}}$  phases.

In a second *a priori* test the four starting reflections used were those determined by the direct-methods program *GENTAN* while the 16 reflections to be determined were again those of highest 'unphased'  $F$  values. In this test the entropy over the 49 trials ranged from  $-0.084946$ to  $-0.075564$ . The trial with the refined-structure  $F_{\text{calc}}$ phases introduced showed an entropy of  $-0.084726$ , again one above the minimum-entropy trial. The 16 reflections from the maximum-entropy trial showed eight in agreement with the  $F_{\text{calc}}$  phases.

For contrast with the first two tests, a *prior* map with all 13 295 reflections with their  $F_{\text{calc}}$  phases was formed and converted to an exponential map. Then the same high F reflections which were used in the first test were treated by *MEPHAS. In* this test the entropy over the 49 trials ranged from  $-0.582014$  to  $-0.452263$ . The trial with the refined-structure  $F_{\text{calc}}$  phases introduced showed an entropy of  $-0.582014$ . This was the minimum-entropy trial. The next highest entropy was  $-0.565033$ . Of the 16 reflections from the maximum-entropy trial only two were in agreement with the  $F_{\text{calc}}$  phases. Table 2 presents a summary of this and the first test showing the number of phases of the sixteen tested which agree with the  $F_{\text{calc}}$ phases, as a function of decreasing entropy.

These results contrast with those of Sj61in *et al.* (1991) on recombinant bovine chymosin. In that study maximum entropy was an effective figure of merit, but in these studies it was not. Ultimately the important question is: 'Can an automated procedure find a set of phases that lead to an *interpretable* map?' The answer to this question will require continuing modification of the programs and further simulation studies.

# **8. Summary and concluding remarks**

In trials of these programs it has been found that both the Collins method and the Prince method cause the formation of an electron-density map which is everywhere positive and which includes the observed moduli for all the reflections in the *prior.* In fact the application of maximum entropy to the modification of the density such that the reflection moduli are expressed is outstanding. However, it has become clear that the entropy alone is not always a sufficient criterion for selecting the correct phases for a structure. When the number of reflections is low, the algorithm can powerfully fit the moduli without allowing the density to be non-positive regardless of the phases chosen. The three tests for *MEPHAS* shown here suggest that the entropy of the map with the correct phases is not necessar-

### Table 2. *Examples of maximum-entropy phase trials by MEPHAS*

The left trial is for a prior map with 20 contributing reflections. The right trial is for a prior map with 13295 contributing reflections. In both trials the 16 centric reflections which were tested are those of highest  $F$ magnitude. Test case: bovine pancreatic phospholipase  $A_2$  (space group  $P2_12_12_1$ ,  $a = 47.07$ ,  $b = 64.45$ ,  $c = 57.59$  Å,  $R = 14.7\%$ ).





ily the maximum-entropy map. This observation indicates that an additional criterion will be required if this method is to succeed as an *a priori* phasing scheme.

Other methods for making use of information in addition to the magnitudes of the moduli have been proposed. Bricogne (1988) has put forward a log-likelihood figure of merit for ranking phase sets. Lunin (1988) has shown that the use of electron-density histograms can remove the uncertainty in the early stages of phasing. Zhang & Main (1990) have described a program *SQUASH* which, starting from a low-resolution map, uses histograms, solvent fiattening, Sayre's equation and density modification based on a least-squares procedure to improve macromolecular models. Because of the open flexible structure of the *Xtal*  system, these approaches and others like them will be incorporated into this package. This will be done either to enhance the effectiveness of present programs or to add new methods to the library as it exists.

The contribution of JMS to this work has been supported under contracts N00014-88-K-0323 and N00014- 92-J-1556 of the Office of Naval Research.

#### **References**

- BRICOGNE, G. (1988). *Acta Cryst.* A44, 517-545.
- BROWN, I. D. (1988). *Acta Cryst.* A44, 232.
- COLLINS, D. M. (1982). *Nature* (London), 298, 49-51.
- COLLINS, D. M. & MAHAR, M. C. (1983). *Acta Cryst.* A39, 252-256.
- DUKSTRA, B. W., KALK, K. H., HOL, W. G. & DRENTH, J. (1981). J. *Mol. Biol.* 147, 97-123.
- Evans and Sutherland Computer Corporation (1985). MOGL/. Evans and Sutherland Computer Corporation, Salt Lake City, USA.
- HALL, S. R. (1985). *RFPP. Ratmac to Fortran77 Preprocessor Manual.*  Univ. of Western Australia, Australia.
- HALL, S. R., ALLEN, F. R. & BROWN, I. D. (1991). *Acta Cryst.* A47, 655 -685.
- HALL, S. R. & STEWART, J. M. (1992). Editors. *Xtal3.2 Reference Man*ual. Univs. of Western Australia, Australia, and Maryland, USA. In preparation.
- HOLLAND, D. R., CLANCY, L. C., MUCHMORE, S. W., RYDEL, T. J., EINSPAHR, H. M., FINZEL, B. C., HEINRICKSON, R. L. & WATENPAUGH, K. D. (1990). *J. Biol. Chem.* 265, 17649-17656.
- JONES, T. A. (1985). *Methods Enzymol.* 115, 144-150.
- 'KELLER, E. (1988). *SCHAKAL. A FORTRAN Program for the Graphical Representation of Molecular and Crystallographic Models.* Kristallographisches Institut der Univ. Frieburg, Germany.
- LUNIN, V. Y. (1988). *Acta Cryst.* A44, 144-150.
- Murk, R. J., STEWART, J. M., NORDEN, A. P. & PAGOAGA, M. K. (1980). *Ratmac Primer.* Tech. Rep. LBL-11847. NRCC, Canada, and Univ. of Maryland, USA.
- PRINCE, E. (1989). *Acta Cryst.* A45, 200-203.
- PRINCE, E., SJÖLIN, L. & ALENLJUNG, R. (1988). *Acta Cryst.* A44, 216-222.
- SJÖLIN, L., PRINCE, E., SVENSSON, L. A. & GILLILAND, G. L. (1991). *Acta Cryst.* A47, 216-223
- YAms, F. (1937). The *Design and Analysis of Factorial Experiments.*  London: Imperial Bureau of Soil Science.
- ZHANG, K. Y. J. & MAIN, P. (1990). *Acta Cryst. A46,* 377-381