
Genetic algorithms are strong baselines for molecule generation

Austin Tripp
University of Cambridge
ajt212@cam.ac.uk

José Miguel Hernández-Lobato
University of Cambridge
jmh233@cam.ac.uk

Abstract

Generating molecules, both in a directed and undirected fashion, is a huge part of the drug discovery pipeline. Genetic algorithms (GAs) generate molecules by randomly modifying known molecules. In this paper we show that GAs are very strong algorithms for such tasks, outperforming many complicated machine learning methods: a result which many researchers may find surprising. We therefore propose insisting during peer review that new algorithms must have some clear advantage over GAs, which we call the *GA criterion*. Ultimately our work suggests that a lot of research in molecule generation should be re-assessed.

1 Introduction

Drug discovery is ultimately a molecular generation task, albeit a very challenging one with many objectives and constraints. Because of this, many works in machine learning for drug discovery focus on generating molecular graphs¹ (Du et al., 2022). There are many variants of this problem: for example generating novel molecules for virtual screening or generating molecules with one or more desirable property values. Advanced machine learning algorithms have been proposed for all such variants (Du et al., 2022).

Yet, for all the purported difficulty of this problem in some respects generating molecules is surprisingly easy. The rules governing valid molecules are fairly straightforward (a series of bond constraints taught to most high-school students) and can be easily checked using freely available software such as `rdkit`. This means that new molecules can be generated simply by adding, removing, or substituting fragments of known molecules. When repeated iteratively, this strategy is generally called a *genetic algorithm* (GA), and is well-studied for molecules (Jensen, 2019) and in optimization more generally (Holland, 1992).

In this work we apply GAs to several molecular generation tasks and find that they perform quite well: often better than complicated methods based on deep learning, and better than they have been reported previously. Our results suggest that GAs are underused and underappreciated by the machine learning community. Given their simplicity and availability, we believe that researchers in molecule generation should primarily be focusing on methods that *complement* genetic algorithms, and propose the *GA criterion* to evaluate new methods: that they should offer some sort of advantage over GAs (more thoughts in section 4).

2 Background on genetic algorithms

Genetic algorithms (GAs) is a term that describes a broad class of algorithms which all operate similarly. GAs generally consist of the following steps:

¹This is distinct from generating 3D conformations for a given graph structure.

1. **Start with an initial population** P of molecules.
2. **Sample a subset** $S \subseteq P$ from the population. It could be that $S = P$, or S could be biased to contain "better" elements of P .
3. **Use S to generate new molecules** N . The most common ways of doing this are to randomly modify molecules or randomly combine molecules. In GAs these operations are often called *mutation* and *crossover* because of their similarity to analogous processes in biology.
4. **Select a new population** P' from $P \cup N$. For example, P' could consist of the "best" molecules in $P \cup N$.
5. Set $P \leftarrow P'$ and go back to step 2.

The main factor which differentiates GAs from each other is the generation step (3). Many methods have been proposed: for example modifying string representations of molecules (Nigam et al., 2021) or directly modifying molecular graphs (Jensen, 2019). However, the sampling and population selection steps are clearly also important: for example, this could be chosen ensure that the population does not become too homogeneous (Srinivas and Patnaik, 1994, p. 21).²

3 Experiments and Results

In this section we run experiments on several different molecule generation benchmarks. We use the default GA from the MOL_GA package³ as our genetic algorithm, which uses the following settings:

- Samples (step 2) are drawn from the top quantiles of the population (details in Appendix A).
- New molecules are generated (step 3) using the mutation and crossover operations from Jensen (2019), based on the implementation in the GuacaMol benchmark (Brown et al., 2019).
- The population is selected greedily (step 4): i.e. the molecules with the highest scores are added.

3.1 Unconditional molecule generation

We first examine the task of generating molecules which are distinct from a set of reference molecules: a task which has been considered in a large number of machine learning papers. If the set of reference molecules is fairly diverse, intuitively one would expect random perturbations of the reference molecules to be a strong baseline. Previous works have used the ZINC 250K dataset (Sterling and Irwin, 2015) as the reference set and measured success using the validity, novelty (i.e. molecules not found in the reference set), and uniqueness of 10 000 generated molecules.

Table 1 shows the performance of a variety of algorithms on this benchmark, mostly taken from previous papers.⁴ At the bottom of the table are results for MOL_GA (obtained by running steps 2–3 once using the reference set as the population) and the "AddCarbon" method (Renz et al., 2019), which adds a single carbon atom to random molecules from the reference set. Metrics were calculated using the *moses* package (Polykovskiy et al., 2020). Virtually all methods perform similarly, at near 100% on all metrics. This shows both that generating molecules is not a particularly hard task, and that more complex algorithms do not generally perform better than simpler ones. Something missing from this table is *generation speed*: e.g. how many molecules can be generated per second. This would clearly determine the total amount of molecules which could be generated with a given computational budget. Simple methods like genetic algorithms have a clear advantage here which is not reflected in this table.

²See specifically the section entitled "Selection mechanisms and scaling".

³Available at <https://pypi.org/project/mol-ga/>

⁴The lack of error bars is because most papers do not report them, with the laudable exceptions of Verma et al. (2022) and Liu et al. (2021).

Table 1: Unconditional generation results on ZINC 250k dataset. Results with ‘*’ are taken from Popova et al. (2019, Table 3), with ‘†’ from Shi* et al. (2020, Table2), with ‘‡’ from Luo et al. (2021, Table 1), with ‘§’ from Verma et al. (2022, Table 3), and ‘¶’ from Liu et al. (2021, Table 5). All other results are original.

Method	Paper	Validity	Novelty@10k	Uniqueness
JT-VAE*	Jin et al. (2018)	99.8%	100%	100%
GCPN*	You et al. (2018)	100%	100%	99.97%
MolecularRNN*	Popova et al. (2019)	100%	100%	99.89%
Graph NVP†	Madhawa et al. (2019)	100%	100%	94.80%
Graph AF†	Shi* et al. (2020)	100%	100%	99.10%
MoFlow‡	Zang and Wang (2020)	100%	100%	99.99%
GraphCNF‡	Lippe and Gavves (2020)	96.35%	99.98%	99.98%
Graph DF‡	Luo et al. (2021)	100%	100%	99.16%
ModFlow§	Verma et al. (2022)	98.1%	100%	99.3%
GraphEBM¶	Liu et al. (2021)	99.96%	100%	98.79%
AddCarbon	Renz et al. (2019)	100%	99.94%	99.86%
MOL_GA		99.76%	99.94%	98.60%

3.2 Molecule optimization

Many papers consider the task of finding molecules which optimize a particular objective function $f : \mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ (denoting the space of molecules as \mathcal{M}). Since many objectives of practical interest (e.g. binding affinity, toxicity) can at least somewhat be distilled into scalar functions, this abstract task is clearly important. Although the no-free-lunch theorem precludes the development of a *general* algorithm for all functions f , most functions of practical interest have the property that molecules with similar structures usually have similar activities. This property can be exploited by algorithms. In particular, this suggests that producing structurally-similar variants of the best known molecules could be a promising strategy for such problems: essentially what genetic algorithms do.

We evaluate the performance of MOL_GA on the PMO benchmark (Gao et al., 2022) of molecule optimization tasks with a limit of 10 000 evaluations of f (chosen because in practice experiments are expensive so the number of function evaluations is generally limited). Although several genetic algorithms were tested in this benchmark, they used large generation sizes (≈ 100) which limits the number of opportunities for algorithms to improve upon molecules from the previous generation, effectively limiting the possible improvement over the best starting molecule. To allow for maximal performance, we set the number of molecules produced in each iteration to 5, potentially allowing for ≈ 2000 iterations of improvement.

The results of MOL_GA and the two best methods from Gao et al. (2022) are shown in Table 2. Not only does MOL_GA outperform the best GA from Gao et al. (2022), it actually outperforms *every* method from Gao et al. (2022). This result is somewhat surprising. We believe this result is likely an artifact of the tuning of the baselines in PMO, rather than MOL_GA being an especially good method (given that MOL_GA is essentially Graph GA).

4 Discussion

In this paper we have shown that genetic algorithms are very strong baselines for molecular generation tasks, performing at least as well as many more complicated methods in the unconditional and single-objective settings. Although it is tempting to conclude from this that GAs are incredible high-performing algorithms, this is actually *not* our opinion: after all, they are just simple heuristic algorithms. Rather, we view this as an *indictment* of more modern molecular generation methods. For the amount of research that has been done in this area, it appears that surprisingly little progress has been made!

We think that the main cause of this is poor empirical practices in machine learning research. Many experiments are done with an explicit desired outcome, typically that some novel algorithm is the best. A comprehensive evaluation of baseline methods is usually viewed as cumbersome rather

Table 2: AUC top-10 scores on PMO benchmark (Gao et al., 2022). Highest numbers (across all methods including those from Gao et al. (2022) not shown in the table) are in **bold**.

Method Source	REINVENT Gao et al. (2022)	Graph GA Gao et al. (2022)	MOL_GA Our experiments
albuterol_similarity	0.882±0.006	0.838±0.016	0.896±0.035
amlodipine_mpo	0.635±0.035	0.661±0.020	0.688±0.039
celecoxib_rediscovery	0.713±0.067	0.630±0.097	0.567±0.083
deco_hop	0.666±0.044	0.619±0.004	0.649±0.025
drd2	0.945±0.007	0.964±0.012	0.936±0.016
fexofenadine_mpo	0.784±0.006	0.760±0.011	0.825±0.019
gsk3b	0.865±0.043	0.788±0.070	0.843±0.039
isomers_c7h8n2o2	0.852±0.036	0.862±0.065	0.878±0.026
isomers_c9h10n2o2pf2cl	0.642±0.054	0.719±0.047	0.865±0.012
jnk3	0.783±0.023	0.553±0.136	0.702±0.123
median1	0.356±0.009	0.294±0.021	0.257±0.009
median2	0.276±0.008	0.273±0.009	0.301±0.021
mestranol_similarity	0.618±0.048	0.579±0.022	0.591±0.053
osimertinib_mpo	0.837±0.009	0.831±0.005	0.844±0.015
perindopril_mpo	0.537±0.016	0.538±0.009	0.547±0.022
qed	0.941±0.000	0.940±0.000	0.941±0.001
ranolazine_mpo	0.760±0.009	0.728±0.012	0.804±0.011
scaffold_hop	0.560±0.019	0.517±0.007	0.527±0.025
sitagliptin_mpo	0.021±0.003	0.433±0.075	0.582±0.040
thiothixene_rediscovery	0.534±0.013	0.479±0.025	0.519±0.041
trogliatzone_rediscovery	0.441±0.032	0.390±0.016	0.427±0.031
valsartan_smarts	0.178±0.358	0.000±0.000	0.000±0.000
zaleplon_mpo	0.358±0.062	0.346±0.032	0.519±0.029
Sum	14.196	13.751	14.708
Old Rank	1	2	N/A
New Rank	2	3	1

than essential, especially if these baselines might perform well. We propose to address this by introducing the *GA criterion*: a rule of thumb that new methods in molecular generation should offer some advantage over GAs. This advantage can either be empirical (e.g. outperforming GAs in experiments) but also conceptual: what limitation of randomly changing known molecules does the proposed method potentially overcome? We call upon members of this community to enforce this standard in the peer review process.

Our results also suggest another intriguing possibility: maybe newer algorithms do not outperform GAs because *they are also just generating variants of known molecules*, just in an indirect way. Indeed, many newer methods are essentially generative models which are trained on a dataset of known molecules. It would therefore not be surprising if the novel molecules generated by such methods are simply variants of their training data. We think investigating this is an important direction for future work.

Acknowledgments

Austin Tripp acknowledges funding via a C T Taylor Cambridge International Scholarship and the Canadian Centennial Scholarship Fund. José Miguel Hernández-Lobato acknowledges support from a Turing AI Fellowship under grant EP/V023756/1.

References

Brown, N., Fiscato, M., Segler, M. H., and Vaucher, A. C. (2019). Guacamol: benchmarking models for de novo molecular design. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 59(3):1096–1108.

- Du, Y., Fu, T., Sun, J., and Liu, S. (2022). Molgensurvey: A systematic survey in machine learning models for molecule design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14500*.
- Gao, W., Fu, T., Sun, J., and Coley, C. (2022). Sample efficiency matters: a benchmark for practical molecular optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:21342–21357.
- Holland, J. H. (1992). Genetic algorithms. *Scientific american*, 267(1):66–73.
- Jensen, J. H. (2019). A graph-based genetic algorithm and generative model/monte carlo tree search for the exploration of chemical space. *Chemical science*, 10(12):3567–3572.
- Jin, W., Barzilay, R., and Jaakkola, T. (2018). Junction tree variational autoencoder for molecular graph generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2323–2332. PMLR.
- Lippe, P. and Gavves, E. (2020). Categorical normalizing flows via continuous transformations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Liu, M., Yan, K., Oztekin, B., and Ji, S. (2021). Graphebm: Molecular graph generation with energy-based models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.00546*.
- Luo, Y., Yan, K., and Ji, S. (2021). Graphdf: A discrete flow model for molecular graph generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7192–7203. PMLR.
- Madhawa, K., Ishiguro, K., Nakago, K., and Abe, M. (2019). Graphnvp: An invertible flow model for generating molecular graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.11600*.
- Nigam, A., Pollice, R., Krenn, M., dos Passos Gomes, G., and Aspuru-Guzik, A. (2021). Beyond generative models: superfast traversal, optimization, novelty, exploration and discovery (stoned) algorithm for molecules using selfies. *Chemical science*, 12(20):7079–7090.
- Polykovskiy, D., Zhebrak, A., Sanchez-Lengeling, B., Golovanov, S., Tatanov, O., Belyaev, S., Kurbanov, R., Artamonov, A., Aladinskiy, V., Veselov, M., et al. (2020). Molecular sets (moses): a benchmarking platform for molecular generation models. *Frontiers in pharmacology*, 11:565644.
- Popova, M., Shvets, M., Oliva, J., and Isayev, O. (2019). Molecularrrnn: Generating realistic molecular graphs with optimized properties. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13372*.
- Renz, P., Van Rompaey, D., Wegner, J. K., Hochreiter, S., and Klambauer, G. (2019). On failure modes in molecule generation and optimization. *Drug Discovery Today: Technologies*, 32:55–63.
- Shi*, C., Xu*, M., Zhu, Z., Zhang, W., Zhang, M., and Tang, J. (2020). Graphaf: a flow-based autoregressive model for molecular graph generation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Srinivas, M. and Patnaik, L. M. (1994). Genetic algorithms: A survey. *computer*, 27(6):17–26.
- Sterling, T. and Irwin, J. J. (2015). Zinc 15–ligand discovery for everyone. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 55(11):2324–2337.
- Verma, Y., Kaski, S., Heinonen, M., and Garg, V. (2022). Modular flows: Differential molecular generation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:12409–12421.
- You, J., Liu, B., Ying, Z., Pande, V., and Leskovec, J. (2018). Graph convolutional policy network for goal-directed molecular graph generation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- Zang, C. and Wang, F. (2020). Moflow: an invertible flow model for generating molecular graphs. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 617–626.

A Quantile-based sampling

Srinivas and Patnaik (1994) suggests rank-based sampling to avoid premature convergence on page 21. The quantile-based sampling in `MOL_GA` is an attempt to preferentially sample molecules with high objective function values while not exclusively sampling them and depending only on the rank of a given sample. This is accomplished by the following sampling procedure:

$$\begin{aligned}u &\sim \mathcal{U}[-3, 0] \\ \epsilon &= 10^u\end{aligned}$$

A molecule is drawn uniformly from the top ϵ fraction of the population. The sample S consists of i.i.d. via the procedure above.

In practice, the implementation is a quasi Monte-Carlo version of the above, wherein a uniform grid of samples u is created deterministically.