



Public Data-based Report



Validation Report Service

Cryo-EM Map Validation Report

Report to assess Cryo-EM Volume Map at Level(s) 0, A

This report has been generated based on data publicly available at [EMDB](#).

Basic Entry Information:

EMDB ID: [EMD-25581](#)

PDB ID: [7t0o](#)

Title: cryoEM reconstruction of the HIV gp140 in complex with the extracellular domains of CD4 and the adnectin domain of Combnectin. The gp140 and CD4 coordinates from entry 6EDU were rigid body fitted to the EM map along with the crystal structure of CD4+adnectin

Authors: [See EMDB entry link](#)

Deposited on: 2021-11-30T00:00:00

Reported Resolution: 8.7 Å

Contact Us:

Instruct Image Processing Center ([I²PC](#))

Biocomputing Unit ([BCU](#))

i2pc@cnb.csic.es

[VRS Website](#)

National Center for Biotechnology (CNB)
St/ Darwin, 3 (Autonomous University of Madrid)
28049 Cantoblanco, Madrid (Spain)

Last update: **September 14, 2026, 2:58am**

Context

Cryo-electron microscopy is currently one of the most active techniques in Structural Biology. The number of maps deposited at the [Electron Microscopy Data Bank](#) is rapidly growing every year and keeping the quality of the submitted maps is essential to maintain the scientific quality of the field. The ultimate quality measure is the consistency of the map and an atomic model. However, this is only possible for high resolution maps. Over the years there have been many suggestions about validation measures of 3DEM maps. Unfortunately, most of these measures are not currently in use for their spread in multiple software tools and the associated difficulty to access them. To alleviate this problem, we made available a validation grading system that evaluate the information provided to assess the map.

This system grades a map from 0 to 5 depending on the amount of information available. In this way, a map could be validated at Level 0 (the deposited map), 1 (two half maps), 2 (2D classes), 3 (particles), 4 (... + angular assignment), 5 (... + micrographs and coordinates). In addition, we can have three optional qualifiers: A (... + atomic model), W (... + image processing workflow), and O (... + other techniques). To know more about this service read this [paper](#)

This Validation Report Service uses Scipion (see this [link](#) for more detail) as workflow engine and ChimeraX (see this [link](#) for more detail) to generate the 3D views. For more information about the different methods and softwares used for this report, see the references [here](#).



Summarized overall quality

The map seems to have some problem in its centering or extra space (see Sec. [2.1](#)). There seems to be a problem with the suggested threshold (see Sec. [2.2](#)). There seems to be a problem with the map's background (see Sec. [2.3](#)).

The overall score (passing tests) of this report is 0 out of 3 evaluable items.

0.a Mass analysis	Sec. 2.1	6 warnings
0.b Mask analysis	Sec. 2.2	1 warnings
0.c Background analysis	Sec. 2.3	2 warnings
0.d B-factor analysis	Sec. 2.4	Does not apply
Level A Analysis	Sec. 4	Does not apply

Summary of the warnings across sections.

Section 2.1 (0.a Mass analysis)

1. **The volume might be significantly decentered in Z.**
2. **There could be little space from X left to effectively correct for the CTF.**
3. **There could be little space from Y left to effectively correct for the CTF.**
4. **There could be little space from X right to effectively correct for the CTF.**
5. **There could be little space from Y right to effectively correct for the CTF.**
6. **There could be little space from Z right to effectively correct for the CTF.**

Section 2.2 (0.b Mask analysis)

1. **There might be a problem with noise and artifacts, because the average noise blob has a volume of 14.930550 Å³.**

Section 2.3 (0.c Background analysis)

1. **The null hypothesis that the background mean is 0 has been rejected because the p-value of the comparison is smaller than 0.001**
2. **There is a significant proportion of outlier values in the background (cdf5 ratio=4289.54)**

Contents

1	Input data	6
2	Level 0 analysis	17
2.1	Level 0.a Mass analysis	17
2.2	Level 0.b Mask analysis	18
2.3	Level 0.c Background analysis	23
2.4	Level 0.d B-factor analysis	26
3	Atomic model	27
4	Level A Analysis	27

1 Input data

Input map: emd_25581.map

SHA256 hash: 4c903a7771b23a9dbbb2dba2bb712e7040d7c8ef21f3f65a52dd40c9fcec26d4

Voxel size: 2.462400 (Å)

Visualization threshold: 4.420000

Resolution estimated by user: 8.7


Orthogonal slices of the input map

Explanation:


In the orthogonal slices of the map, the noise outside the protein should not have any structure (stripes going out, small blobs, particularly high or low densities, ...)

Results:

See Fig. [1](#).



(a) X Slice 49



(b) Y Slice 46




(c) Z Slice 25

Figure 1: Central slices of the input map in the three dimensions


Orthogonal slices of maximum variance of the input map

Results:


See Fig. [2](#).



(a) X Slice 54



(b) Y Slice 38



(c) Z Slice 31

Figure 2: Slices of maximum variation in the three dimensions


Orthogonal projections of the input map

Explanation:


In the projections there should not be stripes (this is an indication of directional overweighting, or angular attraction), and there should not be a dark halo around or inside the structure (this is an indication of incorrect CTF correction or the reconstruction of a biased map).

Results:


See Fig. [3](#).



(a) X Projection



(b) Y Projection



(c) Z Projection

Figure 3: Projections in the three dimensions


Isosurface views of the input map

Explanation:


An isosurface is the surface of all points that have the same gray value. In these views there should not be many artifacts or noise blobs around the map.

Results:


See Fig. 4.



(a) View 1



(b) View 2



(c) View 3

Figure 4: Isosurface at threshold=4.420000. Views generated by ChimeraX at the following X, Y, Z angles: View 1 (0, -90, -90), View 2 (-90, 0, -90), View 3 (0, 0, 0).

Orthogonal slices of maximum variance of the mask with hard borders

Explanation:

The mask with hard borders has been calculated at the suggested threshold 4.420000, the largest connected component was selected, and then dilated by 2Å.

Results:


See Fig. 5.



(a) X Slice 57



(b) Y Slice 18



(c) Z Slice 30

Figure 5: Slices of maximum variation in the three dimensions of the mask with hard borders

Orthogonal slices of maximum variance of the mask with soft borders

Explanation:


The mask with soft borders has been calculated at the suggested threshold 4.420000, the largest connected component was selected, and then dilated by 2Å.

Results:

See Fig. 6.



(a) X Slice 57



(b) Y Slice 39



(c) Z Slice 29

Figure 6: Slices of maximum variation in the three dimensions of the mask with soft borders

2 Level 0 analysis

2.1 Level 0.a Mass analysis

Explanation:

The reconstructed map must be relatively well centered in the box, and there should be at least $30\text{\AA}$ (the exact size depends on the CTF) on each side to make sure that the CTF can be appropriately corrected.

Results:

The space from the left and right in X are 14.77 and $4.92\text{\AA}$, respectively. There is a decentering ratio $(\text{abs}(\text{Right-Left})/\text{Size})\%$ of 4.04%

The space from the left and right in Y are 9.85 and $12.31\text{\AA}$, respectively. There is a decentering ratio $(\text{abs}(\text{Right-Left})/\text{Size})\%$ of 1.08%

The space from the left and right in Z are 32.01 and $4.92\text{\AA}$, respectively. There is a decentering ratio $(\text{abs}(\text{Right-Left})/\text{Size})\%$ of 22.00%

The center of mass is at $(x,y,z)=(49.74, 34.31, 28.55)$. The decentering of the center of mass $(\text{abs}(\text{Center})/\text{Size})\%$ is 0.25, 13.11, and 7.09, respectively.

Automatic criteria: The validation is OK if 1) the decentering and center of mass less than 20% of the map dimensions in all directions, and 2) the extra space on each direction is more than 20% of the map dimensions. For local reconstruction, focused refinement, or similar, warnings are expected.

WARNINGS: 6 warnings

1. **The volume might be significantly decentered in Z.**
2. **There could be little space from X left to effectively correct for the CTF.**
3. **There could be little space from Y left to effectively correct for the CTF.**
4. **There could be little space from X right to effectively correct for the CTF.**
5. **There could be little space from Y right to effectively correct for the CTF.**
6. **There could be little space from Z right to effectively correct for the CTF.**

2.2 Level 0.b Mask analysis

Explanation:

The map at the suggested threshold should have most of its mass concentrated in a single connected component. It is normal that after thresholding there are a few thousands of very small, disconnected noise blobs. However, their total mass should not exceed 10%. The raw mask (just thresholding) and the mask constructed for the analysis (thresholding + largest connected component + dilation) should significantly overlap. Overlap is defined by the overlapping coefficient $(\text{size}(\text{Raw AND Constructed})/\text{size}(\text{Raw}))$ that is a number between 0 and 1, the closer to 1, the more they agree.

Results:

Raw mask: At threshold 4.420000, there are 23 connected components with

a total number of voxels of 29530 and a volume of 440899.14 $\text{\AA}^3$ (see Fig. 7). The size and percentage of the total number of voxels for the raw mask are listed below (up to 95% of the mass or the first 100 clusters, whatever happens first), the list contains (No. voxels (volume in $\text{\AA}^3$), percentage, cumulated percentage):

(27616 (412322.07), 93.52, 93.52)(355 (5300.35), 1.20, 94.72)(353 (5270.48), 1.20, 95.92)

Number of components to reach 95% of the mass: 3

The average size of the remaining 20 components is 60.30 voxels (14.93 $\text{\AA}^3$). Their size go from 353 voxels (5270.48 $\text{\AA}^3$) to 1 voxels (14.93 $\text{\AA}^3$).


The slices of the raw mask can be seen in Fig. 7.



(a) X Slice 54



(b) Y Slice 39



(c) Z Slice 29

Figure 7: Maximum variance slices in the three dimensions of the raw mask

The following table shows the variation of the mass enclosed at different thresholds (see Fig. 8):

Threshold	Voxel mass	Molecular mass(kDa)	# Aminoacids
1.1202	89593.00	1108.26	10075.11
2.2404	60170.00	744.30	6766.37
3.3605	41469.00	512.97	4663.37
4.4807	28938.00	357.96	3254.20
5.6009	20931.00	258.92	2353.78
6.7211	16032.00	198.32	1802.87
7.8413	12552.00	155.27	1411.53
8.9615	9864.00	122.02	1109.25
10.0816	7759.00	95.98	872.53
11.2018	6043.00	74.75	679.56
12.3220	4731.00	58.52	532.02
13.4422	3641.00	45.04	409.45
14.5624	2772.00	34.29	311.72
15.6825	2040.00	25.23	229.41
16.8027	1477.00	18.27	166.09
17.9229	1001.00	12.38	112.57
19.0431	677.00	8.37	76.13
20.1633	410.00	5.07	46.11
21.2834	241.00	2.98	27.10
22.4036	135.00	1.67	15.18
23.5238	84.00	1.04	9.45
24.6440	33.00	0.41	3.71
25.7642	20.00	0.25	2.25
26.8844	6.00	0.07	0.67




Figure 8: Voxel mass as a function of the gray level.

Constructed mask: After keeping the largest component of the previous mask and dilating it by $2\text{\AA}$, there is a total number of voxels of 45582 and a volume of $680564.33 \text{\AA}^3$. The overlap between the raw and constructed mask is 0.94.

Automatic criteria: The validation is OK if 1) to keep 95% of the mass we need to keep at most 5 connected components; and 2) the average volume of the blobs outside the given threshold has a size smaller than $5\text{\AA}^3$; and 3) the overlap between the raw mask and the mask constructed for the analysis is larger than 75%.

WARNINGS: 1 warnings

1. **There might be a problem with noise and artifacts, because the average noise blob has a volume of $14.930550 \text{\AA}^3$.**

2.3 Level 0.c Background analysis

Explanation:

Background is defined as the region outside the macromolecule mask. The


background mean should be zero, and the number of voxels with a very low or very high value (below 5 standard deviations of the noise) should be very small and they should be randomly distributed without any specific structure. Sometimes, you can see some structure due to the symmetry of the structure.

Results:


The null hypothesis that the background mean is 0 was tested with a one-sample Student's t-test. The resulting t-statistic and p-value were -10.00 and 0.000000, respectively.

The mean and standard deviation (sigma) of the background were -0.015886 and 1.023229. The percentage of background voxels whose absolute value is larger than 5 times the standard deviation is 0.25 % (see Fig. 9). The same percentage from a Gaussian would be 0.000057% (ratio between the two percentages: 4289.538854).


Slices of the background beyond 5*sigma can be seen in Fig. 9.



(a) X Slice 52



(b) Y Slice 32



(c) Z Slice 16

Figure 9: Maximum variance slices in the three dimensions of the parts of the background beyond 5σ

Automatic criteria: The validation is OK if 1) the p-value of the null hypothesis that the background has 0 mean is larger than 0.001; and 2) the number of voxels above or below 5 sigma is smaller than 20 times the amount expected for a Gaussian with the same standard deviation whose mean is 0.

WARNINGS: 2 warnings

1. **The null hypothesis that the background mean is 0 has been rejected because the p-value of the comparison is smaller than 0.001**
2. **There is a significant proportion of outlier values in the background (cdf5 ratio=4289.54)**

2.4 Level 0.d B-factor analysis

Explanation:

The B-factor line (see this [link](#) for more details) fitted between $15\text{\AA}$ and the resolution reported should have a slope that is between 0 and $300\text{ \AA}^2$.

Results:

This method cannot be applied to maps with a resolution worse than 8Å.

STATUS: Does not apply

3 Atomic model

Atomic model: 7t0o.cif

See Fig. 10.




Figure 10: Input atomic model Views generated by ChimeraX at a the following X, Y, Z angles: View 1 (0, -90, -90), View 2 (-90, 0, -90), View 3 (0, 0, 0).

4 Level A Analysis

Map and model do not seem to be properly aligned and we were not able to align them manually. Level A analyses will be skipped.