
ADMET property prediction through combinations of molecular fingerprints

James H. Notwell
MapLight Therapeutics
jnotwell@maplightrx.com

Michael W. Wood
MapLight Therapeutics
mwood@maplightrx.com

Abstract

While investigating methods to predict small molecule potencies, we found random forests or support vector machines paired with extended-connectivity fingerprints (ECFP) consistently outperformed recently developed methods. A detailed investigation into regression algorithms and molecular fingerprints revealed gradient-boosted decision trees, particularly CatBoost, in conjunction with a combination of ECFP, Avalon, and ErG fingerprints, as well as 200 molecular properties, to be most effective. Incorporating a graph neural network fingerprint further enhanced performance. We successfully validated our model across 22 Therapeutics Data Commons ADMET benchmarks. Our findings underscore the significance of richer molecular representations for accurate property prediction.

1 Summary

We set out to find a potency predictor for small molecules that inhibit a novel class A GPCR (subsequently referred to as GPRX) where no crystal structure was available. Excited by the developments in applying different neural network architectures to molecular property prediction, we applied deep message passing neural networks (Chemprop [6]), text-based transformers (ChemBERTa [4] and ChemBERTa2 [2]), and graph neural networks (Grover [17]) to more than 300 molecules we had synthesized for this program. Unfortunately, even models that leveraged pretraining on large molecular datasets did not outperform random forests or support vector machines coupled with extended-connectivity fingerprints (ECFP) [16].

This observation led us to investigate different regression algorithms coupled with different molecular fingerprints. We learned several things from this exercise: 1. Gradient-boosted decision trees (GBDT) performed better than other algorithms, and CatBoost [15] performed slightly but consistently better than other GBDT implementations, 2. ECFP and Avalon fingerprints [5] performed better than other molecular fingerprints available through RDKit [12], and modifying the parameters of these fingerprints had little effect on potency prediction error, and 3. Combining the ECFP and Avalon fingerprints with 200 molecular properties, e.g. number of rings, molecular weight, etc., performed better than the ECFP and Avalon fingerprints on their own.

Having now synthesized and assayed hundreds of additional inhibitors of GPRX, we wanted to see if we could get more performance out of our best performing model through hyperparameter optimization. To ensure the generalization of our model, we used a time-split validation [18] and set aside all molecules profiled after a given date, as well as those being synthesized, to serve as a test set. With the remaining molecules, we performed a scaffold split, reserving 20% of the molecules for model validation. While CatBoost was the most accurate GBDT regressor in our testing, we found LightGBM [10] easier to work with when combined with the Optuna [3] hyperparameter optimization framework, including having its own tuner [14]. We explored a number of cross-validation strategies, including grouping molecules with similar scaffolds or potencies into the same or different folds, as well as randomizing across these properties, but observed consistent overfitting across extensive hyperparameter searching. When evaluating the validation set, we found it difficult to outperform




Figure 1: Relative performance of the MapLight model, with (orange) and without (yellow) GNN fingerprints, compared to the current TDC leaderboards (dark blue). Bar heights and error bars correspond to the mean and standard deviation across 5 random seeds.

LightGBM or CatBoost with default parameters, with the sole exception of modifying the random strength in CatBoost.

The idea of combining molecular features is not new. Concatenating featurizers is supported in the molfeat package [13] and was used in the top submission [11] for the 1st EUOS/SLAS Joint Challenge to predict compound solubility [20]. Intrigued by our initial results, we leveraged molfeat featurizers to explore all combinations of 1, 2, or 3 featurizers. This search highlighted a third type of fingerprint that performed well when used in conjunction with ECFP and Avalon fingerprints: extended reduced graph approach (ErG) [19]. Interestingly, the neural network fingerprints, regardless of architecture type, performed worse compared to traditional molecular fingerprints. Having performed extensive searches across model space, we applied our model to the test portion of our time split and observed excellent generalization with error similar to the validation set. We wondered if our model’s performance would extend to other molecular property prediction tasks.

The Therapeutics Data Commons (TDC) has compiled 22 benchmarks across different ADMET property prediction tasks, such as aqueous solubility or cytochrome P450 enzyme inhibition [9]. To further probe its generalization, we applied our final model, consisting of a CatBoost classifier or regressor coupled with molecular representations that were a combination of ECFP, Avalon, and ErG fingerprints, as well as 200 molecular properties, to these benchmarks. When doing so, our model achieved top-1 performance in 6 of 22 benchmarks and top-3 performance in 16 of 22 benchmarks (Figure 1). To test the limits of combining fingerprints, we added a graph isomorphism network (GIN - supervised masking variant [7]) fingerprint to our molecular representation, and achieved top-1 performance in 11 of 22 benchmarks and top-3 performance in 19 of 22 benchmarks (Figure 1).

Lurking in the background of longer and longer molecular descriptors is the curse of dimensionality. Given the generalization of a single model across 22 benchmarks, as well as to the time-split of our internally generated GPRX inhibitors, the performance of our model is unlikely the result of overfitting. While we combine fingerprints, our total molecular representation is less than 50% larger

than common implementations of ECFP fingerprints (ECFP counts (length 1024) + Avalon counts (length 1024) + ErG (length 315) + molecular properties (length 200) + GIN supervised masking (length 300) = length 2863). We modify a single CatBoost hyperparameter (random strength), although qualitatively similar performance can be achieved with other GBDT implementations, e.g. LightGBM, with default parameters. In comparison with other approaches, such as those from Huang et al. [8], we achieve strong results with a single model.

A recent editorial was titled "For Chemists, the AI revolution has yet to happen" [1]. While this article places much of the blame on the availability of training data, a contributing factor is how we describe molecules. A key finding from our work is that richer molecular representations, achieved through combining fingerprints, provide strong predictive power. Looking across the 22 TDC ADMET leaderboards, we see additional evidence for this: the deep message passing neural network (Chemprop) is a generally good performer but does even better when combined with molecular properties (Chemprop-RDKit). This is a promising avenue for future work.

2 Software Availability

The software for combining molecular fingerprints can be found at <https://github.com/maplightrx/MapLight-TDC> and is released under the MIT License.

References

- [1] For chemists, the AI revolution has yet to happen. *Nature*, 617(7961):438–438, May 2023. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-01612-x. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-01612-x>.
- [2] W. Ahmad, E. Simon, S. Chithrananda, G. Grand, and B. Ramsundar. ChemBERTa-2: Towards Chemical Foundation Models, Sept. 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.01712>. arXiv:2209.01712 [cs, q-bio].
- [3] T. Akiba, S. Sano, T. Yanase, T. Ohta, and M. Koyama. Optuna: A Next-generation Hyperparameter Optimization Framework. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '19*, pages 2623–2631, New York, NY, USA, July 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-6201-6. doi: 10.1145/3292500.3330701. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3330701>.
- [4] S. Chithrananda, G. Grand, and B. Ramsundar. ChemBERTa: Large-Scale Self-Supervised Pretraining for Molecular Property Prediction, Oct. 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.09885>. arXiv:2010.09885 [physics, q-bio].
- [5] P. Gedeck, B. Rohde, and C. Bartels. QSAR - How Good Is It in Practice? Comparison of Descriptor Sets on an Unbiased Cross Section of Corporate Data Sets. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 46(5):1924–1936, Sept. 2006. ISSN 1549-9596. doi: 10.1021/ci050413p. URL <https://doi.org/10.1021/ci050413p>. Publisher: American Chemical Society.
- [6] E. Heid, K. P. Greenman, Y. Chung, S.-C. Li, D. E. Graff, F. H. Vermeire, H. Wu, W. H. Green, and C. J. McGill. Chemprop: A Machine Learning Package for Chemical Property Prediction, Aug. 2023. URL <https://chemrxiv.org/engage/chemrxiv/article-details/64d1f13d4a3f7d0c0dcd836b>.
- [7] W. Hu, B. Liu, J. Gomes, M. Zitnik, P. Liang, V. Pande, and J. Leskovec. Strategies for Pretraining Graph Neural Networks, Feb. 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.12265>. arXiv:1905.12265 [cs, stat].
- [8] D. Huang, S. R. Chowdhuri, A. Li, A. Li, A. Agrawal, K. Gano, and A. Zhu. A Unified System for Molecular Property Predictions: Oloren ChemEngine and its Applications, Oct. 2022. URL <https://chemrxiv.org/engage/chemrxiv/article-details/6350b9d186473a47d31a8492>.
- [9] K. Huang, T. Fu, W. Gao, Y. Zhao, Y. Roohani, J. Leskovec, C. W. Coley, C. Xiao, J. Sun, and M. Zitnik. Artificial intelligence foundation for therapeutic science. *Nature Chemical Biology*, 18(10):1033–1036, Oct. 2022. ISSN 1552-4469. doi: 10.1038/s41589-022-01131-2. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41589-022-01131-2>. Number: 10 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.

- [10] G. Ke, Q. Meng, T. Finley, T. Wang, W. Chen, W. Ma, Q. Ye, and T.-Y. Liu. LightGBM: A Highly Efficient Gradient Boosting Decision Tree. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/hash/6449f44a102fde848669bdd9eb6b76fa-Abstract.html.
- [11] A. Kengkanna and M. Ohue. Enhancing Model Learning and Interpretation Using Multiple Molecular Graph Representations for Compound Property and Activity Prediction, Apr. 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2304.06253>. arXiv:2304.06253 [cs, q-bio].
- [12] G. Landrum, P. Tosco, B. Kelley, Ric, D. Cosgrove, Sriniker, Gedeck, R. Vianello, NadineSchneider, E. Kawashima, D. N, G. Jones, A. Dalke, B. Cole, M. Swain, S. Turk, AlexanderSavelyev, A. Vaucher, M. Wójcikowski, Ichiru Take, D. Probst, K. Ujihara, V. F. Scalfani, G. Godin, J. Lehtivarjo, R. Walker, A. Pahl, Francois Berenger, Jasondbiggs, and Strets123. rdkit/rdkit: 2023_03_3 (Q1 2023) Release, Aug. 2023. URL <https://zenodo.org/record/591637>.
- [13] E. Noutahi, C. Wognum, H. Mary, H. Hounwanou, D. Gilmour, J. Burns, J. St-Laurent, T. DomInvivo, Saurav Maheshkar, and Rbyrne-Momatx. datamol-io/molfeat: 0.9.2, Aug. 2023. URL <https://zenodo.org/record/8209790>.
- [14] K. Ozaki. LightGBM Tuner: New Optuna Integration for Hyperparameter Optimization, Oct. 2022. URL <https://medium.com/optuna/lightgbm-tuner-new-optuna-integration-for-hyperparameter-optimization-8b7095e99258>.
- [15] L. Prokhorenkova, G. Gusev, A. Vorobev, A. V. Dorogush, and A. Gulin. CatBoost: unbiased boosting with categorical features. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2018/hash/14491b756b3a51daac41c24863285549-Abstract.html.
- [16] D. Rogers and M. Hahn. Extended-Connectivity Fingerprints. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 50(5):742–754, May 2010. ISSN 1549-9596. doi: 10.1021/ci100050t. URL <https://doi.org/10.1021/ci100050t>. Publisher: American Chemical Society.
- [17] Y. Rong, Y. Bian, T. Xu, W. Xie, Y. Wei, W. Huang, and J. Huang. Self-Supervised Graph Transformer on Large-Scale Molecular Data. June 2020. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2007.02835. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.02835v2>.
- [18] R. P. Sheridan. Time-Split Cross-Validation as a Method for Estimating the Goodness of Prospective Prediction. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(4):783–790, Apr. 2013. ISSN 1549-9596. doi: 10.1021/ci400084k. URL <https://doi.org/10.1021/ci400084k>. Publisher: American Chemical Society.
- [19] N. Stiefl, I. A. Watson, K. Baumann, and A. Zaliani. ErG: 2D Pharmacophore Descriptions for Scaffold Hopping. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 46(1):208–220, Jan. 2006. ISSN 1549-9596. doi: 10.1021/ci050457y. URL <https://doi.org/10.1021/ci050457y>. Publisher: American Chemical Society.
- [20] A. Zaliani, J. Tang, J. Martin, R. Harmel, and W. Wang. 1st EUOS/SLAS Joint Challenge: Compound Solubility, 2022. URL <https://kaggle.com/competitions/euos-slas>.