

Chemical knowledge-informed framework for privacy-aware retrosynthesis learning

Guikun Chen¹, Xu Zhang¹, Yi Yang¹, Wenguan Wang^{1*}

¹College of Computer Science and Technology, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310058, Zhejiang, China.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): wenguanwang.ai@gmail.com;
Contributing authors: guikunchen@gmail.com; xu.zhang@zju.edu.cn;
yangyics@zju.edu.cn;

Abstract

Chemical reaction data is a pivotal asset, driving advances in competitive fields such as pharmaceuticals, materials science, and industrial chemistry. Its proprietary nature renders it sensitive, as it often includes confidential insights and competitive advantages organizations strive to protect. However, in contrast to this need for confidentiality, the current standard training paradigm for machine learning-based retrosynthesis gathers reaction data from multiple sources into one single edge to train prediction models. This paradigm poses considerable privacy risks as it necessitates broad data availability across organizational boundaries and frequent data transmission between entities, potentially exposing proprietary information to unauthorized access or interception during storage and transfer. In the present study, we introduce the chemical knowledge-informed framework (CKIF), a privacy-preserving approach for learning retrosynthesis models. CKIF enables distributed training across multiple chemical organizations without compromising the confidentiality of proprietary reaction data. Instead of gathering raw reaction data, CKIF learns retrosynthesis models through iterative, chemical knowledge-informed aggregation of model parameters. In particular, the chemical properties of predicted reactants are leveraged to quantitatively assess the observable behaviors of individual models, which in turn determines the adaptive weights used for model aggregation. On a variety of reaction datasets, CKIF outperforms several strong baselines by a clear margin (*e.g.*, $\sim 20\%$ performance improvement over FedAvg on USPTO-50K), showing its feasibility and superiority to stimulate further research on privacy-preserving retrosynthesis.

Keywords: Retrosynthesis, Data Privacy, Data Island, Artificial Intelligence

1 Introduction

Retrosynthesis is a fundamental technique in organic chemistry that involves designing synthetic routes for a target molecule by working backwards from the desired product to commercially available starting materials. It is of great importance as it allows chemists to discover novel reactions for scarce or even brand-new molecules, optimize existing synthesis pathways, and circumvent processes that are costly, risky, and time-consuming (Subbaraman, 2011; Struble et al, 2020).

Despite the critical role of retrosynthesis in organic chemistry, developing machine learning (ML) models for retrosynthesis presents significant challenges. Chief among these is the necessity for extensive chemical reaction datasets (Zhang et al, 2024), the compilation of which entails considerable expense. This expense arises from the requirement for specialized equipment, skilled labor, and material resources, as well as the conversion of unstructured records into structured data. While a limited number of chemical reaction datasets are available open source (Lowe, 2012, 2017), the majority are proprietary, maintained by commercial entities (Goodman, 2009; Lawson et al, 2014; Mayfield et al, 2017). Furthermore, companies may develop new chemical reactions crucial for advancing key fields (*e.g.*, materials (Bozbag et al, 2012; Fayette and Robinson, 2014), drugs (Blakemore et al, 2018), and energy solutions (Binder and Raines, 2009; Poizot and Dolhem, 2011)), but are often hesitant to share this data. This proprietary stance is primarily due to two reasons. On the one hand, reaction data is often sensitive and confidential, as it may reveal proprietary or classified information that belongs to a specific entity or organization (Shimizu et al, 2015; Simm et al, 2021). For example, a pharmaceutical company may want to protect its findings that leads to the synthesis of a new drug, or a government agency may want to safeguard its reaction data that relates to their future development. On the other hand, reaction data is often valuable and competitive (Muettert, 1977; Schooler, 2011), which may confer an advantage or disadvantage to a certain entity or organization. For instance, a rival company may want to gain insight into the developed reactions of its competitors to gain an edge in the market, or a hostile state may want to access the frequently used reactions of its adversary to prepare for competitions in advance.

As aforementioned, only a limited number of retrosynthesis datasets are available openly, and sharing chemical reaction data with external parties might expose sensitive information (products, processes, intellectual property, *etc.*), which may cause compromised interests and unfair competition. This often leads to the emergence of "data islands" where data collected in different organizations remains siloed and inaccessible to the broader research community. Such fragmentation impedes progress significantly, as the collective benefit of shared insights is lost, slowing the pace of scientific discovery and application. Therefore, there is a pressing need to develop frameworks for privacy-preserving retrosynthesis learning that enable the sharing of valuable knowledge without compromising proprietary information. Developing such frameworks would facilitate a collaborative environment conducive to the advancement of retrosynthesis while addressing both privacy and competitive concerns. Despite its clear benefits for the scientific community and societal good, this area remains surprisingly under-explored in the existing literature. From an ML perspective, the current standard training paradigm for data-driven retrosynthesis models is to use one global

model trained on a large dataset, *i.e.*, learning with centralized data (Coley et al, 2017; Baylon et al, 2019; Yan et al, 2020; Sun et al, 2021c; Wan et al, 2022; Fang et al, 2023). Nonetheless, this straightforward training regime has two major flaws. Firstly, its performance is limited by the availability, amount, and diversity of annotated reaction data which might be sensitive or proprietary. Secondly, one single global model may not capture the specific characteristics or preferences of each chemical entity, leading to suboptimal prediction performance (Zhang et al, 2021; Huang et al, 2021).

To address these challenges, we propose CKIF (chemical knowledge-informed framework), a privacy-preserving learning framework that enables collaborative learning among chemical entities without sharing raw reaction data. During the learning process, CKIF maintains data anonymity and only the model parameters are communicated. In terms of data heterogeneity (*e.g.*, different data distributions caused by research focuses and industrial interests), CKIF further investigates the distributed learning paradigm from a client-centric perspective (Wang et al, 2019; Huang et al, 2021) and thus learns a personalized model for each client. This necessitates the assessment of a model’s effectiveness for different clients, as such evaluations can provide dependable guidance to obtain personalized models. In response, CKIF is equipped with a chemical knowledge-informed weighting (CKIW) strategy that harnesses symbolic knowledge representations — specifically, molecule fingerprints like extended-connectivity fingerprint (ECFP) (Rogers and Hahn, 2010) and molecular access system (MACCS) keys (Durant et al, 2002). This strategy adaptively adjusts weights during model aggregation to better align the model with the specific preferences of each chemical entity. Experiments on a variety of reaction datasets demonstrate that CKIF outperforms locally trained models, and even models trained on centralized data. In a nutshell, CKIF ensures data privacy and enhances efficiency by distributing computations across multiple clients. It also supports the training of personalized models for each client and leverages reaction data from diverse clients for scalable model training. These benefits make CKIF a feasible and cost-effective approach to advancing retrosynthesis research in a privacy-aware setting.

2 Results

Privacy-aware retrosynthesis with CKIF. We prioritize the privacy of chemical reaction data by ensuring that sensitive information is not shared among participants. Instead of gathering raw reaction data into one single edge, CKIF supports distributed model training through the sharing of processed, non-sensitive chemical knowledge (*i.e.*, model parameters) derived from reaction data. CKIF operates through iterative communication rounds, each comprising two stages: local learning and chemical knowledge-informed model aggregation. During local learning, clients independently train their models on proprietary reaction data, initializing from either random value in the first round or from their personalized aggregated model from the previous communication round. In the aggregation stage, clients exchange trained model parameters to leverage collective knowledge while maintaining data privacy. The core of CKIF is its CKIW strategy, which replaces conventional fixed-weight averaging methods. When a client receives models from other participants, it evaluates their relevance using local




Fig. 1: Overview of the existing training paradigms and the proposed CKIF. **a**, Local learning involves individual clients training a model independently on their own reaction data, without interaction or data exchange with other clients. **b**, Central learning trains a global model with access to reaction data from all clients. It is the current standard learning paradigm for retrosynthesis. Our privacy-preserving learning process operates through iterative communication rounds, each comprising two stages: local learning (**c**) and chemical knowledge-informed model aggregation (**d**). **c**, In the first round, the model parameters are initialized randomly, while in subsequent communication rounds, they are initialized from the personalized aggregated model obtained in the previous round. **d**, CKIF incorporates chemical knowledge, *i.e.*, molecule fingerprints, to calculate adaptive weights based on the similarity of molecular fingerprints. These weights are used to guide the model aggregation process.

proxy reaction data and molecular fingerprint similarity metrics. Specifically, each client computes similarities between reactants predicted by other clients’ models and ground truth reactants using molecular fingerprints, generating adaptive weights that quantify the value of other clients’ models for its specific learning objectives. These chemistry-aware weights guide model aggregation, creating personalized models that reflect each client’s preference while benefiting from the collective knowledge of all participants.

Improvements with CKIF. We evaluate the performance of CKIF on a variety of reaction datasets. Top- K accuracy, which indicates the proportion of ground truth reactants that appear in (exactly matched) the top- K confident predicted reactants, is used for evaluation. Two additional metrics also reported to comprehensively evaluate models’ performance. The first is Maximal fragment (MaxFrag) accuracy (Tetko et al, 2020; Zhong et al, 2022), a relaxed version of top- K accuracy, which focuses on main compound transformations. The second is RoundTrip accuracy (Chen and Jung, 2021; Wan et al, 2022), which evaluates whether the predicted reactants can indeed synthesize the target product by utilizing a pre-trained forward synthesis model as an oracle. Tables 1, 2, and 3 report the aforementioned evaluation metrics of different methods, namely, Locally Trained (models trained on their single local dataset, see Fig. 1a), Centrally Trained (a single global model trained on all reaction datasets combined, see Fig. 1b), FedAvg (McMahan et al, 2017) (a strong, commonly-used federated baseline), and our proposed method, CKIF (which explicitly models the personalized target distribution for each client, and uses chemical knowledge-informed

Table 1: Top- K retrosynthesis accuracy (%) on the USPTO-50K dataset. Note that Centrally Trained gathers all reaction data and the comparison is unfair. Bold values indicate the best results among Locally Trained, FedAvg and CKIF. MF and RT denote MaxFrag accuracy and RoundTrip accuracy, respectively.

Client	Method	$K = 1$	3	5	10	1 (MF)	3	5	10	1 (RT)
C_1	Locally Trained	41.9	57.1	65.0	69.8	56.8	69.7	73.4	75.5	51.0
	Centrally Trained	40.1	58.8	69.1	73.9	51.0	68.2	76.1	79.4	59.2
	FedAvg	15.0	30.9	37.2	40.8	19.2	38.3	45.0	48.7	30.3
	CKIF (Ours)	43.9	60.2	67.1	70.3	56.5	71.1	76.3	78.0	51.2
C_2	Locally Trained	4.1	8.6	9.2	11.1	13.8	18.2	19.4	21.5	6.9
	Centrally Trained	19.0	28.6	33.7	37.0	27.2	40.4	43.9	47.8	52.6
	FedAvg	0.0	0.4	0.9	1.2	0.2	1.1	2.1	2.8	16.4
	CKIF (Ours)	23.6	33.3	37.6	40.0	36.7	46.9	50.6	52.7	41.3
C_3	Locally Trained	28.0	41.6	46.1	47.7	29.9	43.2	47.3	48.6	30.7
	Centrally Trained	23.6	39.5	45.3	49.0	24.0	40.6	46.8	50.5	46.9
	FedAvg	12.7	23.2	27.2	28.7	12.8	23.7	27.5	29.1	27.8
	CKIF (Ours)	30.9	47.4	52.9	55.5	32.3	48.7	54.0	56.6	35.9
C_4	Locally Trained	37.1	49.9	54.9	56.9	39.1	51.7	57.0	58.9	40.2
	Centrally Trained	39.3	58.3	65.5	70.6	42.3	61.0	68.0	72.0	50.7
	FedAvg	12.3	29.0	35.3	37.9	13.2	30.8	37.2	40.5	27.2
	CKIF (Ours)	39.4	55.3	60.9	63.2	41.1	57.1	62.5	64.4	43.7

model aggregation to learn personalized models, see Fig. 1cd). Note that Centrally Trained with full access to all reaction data may bring significant privacy concerns.

The experimental results in Table 1 evidence that CKIF consistently outperforms Locally Trained across four clients sampled from USPTO-50K dataset (Schneider et al, 2016). Taking client C_2 as an example, Locally Trained performs poorly with an accuracy of 4.1% at $K=1$, whereas CKIF shows a significant improvement, achieving an accuracy of 23.6%. This substantial enhancement suggests that the proposed CKIF

Table 2: Top- K retrosynthesis accuracy (%) on the USPTO-50K and USPTO-MIT dataset. Note that Centrally Trained gathers all reaction data and the comparison is unfair. Bold values indicate the best results among Locally Trained, FedAvg and CKIF. Here MF and RT denote MaxFrag accuracy and RoundTrip accuracy, respectively. The low RoundTrip accuracy for C_6 can be attributed to the used pre-trained forward synthesis model not having encountered C_6 's reactions during training.

Client	Method	$K = 1$	3	5	10	1 (MF)	3	5	10	1 (RT)
C_1	Locally Trained	41.9	57.1	65.0	69.8	56.8	69.7	73.4	75.5	51.0
	Centrally Trained	30.8	47.5	56.1	65.1	39.5	57.3	66.0	74.0	57.1
	FedAvg	14.1	31.0	39.8	45.4	18.6	40.0	49.8	55.5	31.9
	CKIF (Ours)	44.2	64.5	72.4	77.0	58.7	76.1	80.7	82.8	57.1
C_2	Locally Trained	4.1	8.6	9.2	11.1	13.8	18.2	19.4	21.5	6.9
	Centrally Trained	18.0	33.5	39.0	45.5	30.2	48.1	54.5	60.0	54.9
	FedAvg	15.5	39.8	48.8	56.6	18.8	48.8	57.1	64.3	19.9
	CKIF (Ours)	30.7	43.6	48.9	52.6	42.2	57.0	61.6	64.0	51.1
C_3	Locally Trained	28.0	41.6	46.1	47.7	29.9	43.2	47.3	48.6	30.7
	Centrally Trained	18.0	36.0	43.3	48.4	18.6	36.6	44.4	49.4	52.3
	FedAvg	1.6	5.3	7.1	9.5	2.6	7.9	10.4	13.9	37.2
	CKIF (Ours)	36.9	56.5	62.4	64.8	38.4	57.6	63.3	65.8	40.2
C_4	Locally Trained	37.1	49.9	54.9	56.9	39.1	51.7	57.0	58.9	30.7
	Centrally Trained	20.4	33.0	40.3	46.6	23.7	37.4	45.0	49.5	52.3
	FedAvg	15.3	32.5	38.7	42.0	15.3	32.7	38.9	42.5	37.2
	CKIF (Ours)	40.9	58.7	63.4	67.1	42.2	60.7	64.8	68.3	47.7
C_5	Locally Trained	36.5	51.8	59.0	63.9	50.1	63.9	68.7	71.4	55.5
	Centrally Trained	23.2	36.0	42.8	48.7	30.9	45.5	52.8	59.3	53.4
	FedAvg	13.0	29.0	34.8	41.4	14.5	31.8	38.2	44.5	35.8
	CKIF (Ours)	34.6	53.2	62.6	67.5	48.5	65.3	72.0	74.7	56.9
C_6	Locally Trained	11.7	17.8	20.5	22.5	19.3	27.2	29.6	31.6	0.0
	Centrally Trained	18.7	31.9	36.7	42.0	26.6	40.2	45.1	50.1	0.6
	FedAvg	10.5	24.7	30.5	34.8	13.0	31.6	37.6	42.4	0.6
	CKIF (Ours)	21.7	33.3	38.2	42.1	28.9	40.3	45.2	48.8	0.6
C_7	Locally Trained	20.6	29.0	32.6	34.5	27.5	36.2	39.4	40.9	22.9
	Centrally Trained	21.8	34.4	39.8	43.7	27.2	41.6	46.7	50.6	45.6
	FedAvg	2.3	7.6	10.7	12.9	3.7	9.6	13.6	16.7	27.1
	CKIF (Ours)	35.8	49.4	54.2	57.7	44.5	56.4	60.9	63.5	40.6
C_8	Locally Trained	18.3	25.7	29.9	31.5	25.8	34.1	37.0	38.5	30.4
	Centrally Trained	27.7	41.6	47.7	51.8	33.2	49.2	55.1	58.7	69.6
	FedAvg	5.0	7.0	8.4	9.2	6.8	12.0	15.1	17.2	42.1
	CKIF (Ours)	25.9	38.0	43.2	46.4	32.0	45.8	50.1	52.5	56.2

effectively leverages the chemical knowledge-guided model aggregation to enhance the performance over the Locally Trained baseline. In addition, CKIF exhibits comparable or even superior performance compared to the centrally trained model in several cases. For example, CKIF outperforms Centrally Trained on client C_3 by up to 8.8%. This highlights the potential of CKIF in leveraging the personalized target distribution and CKIW-based model aggregation compared to training a single global model on all reaction datasets combined. FedAvg, a strong baseline used in federated learning, treats all clients equally and aggregates updates from them to create a global model, ignoring personalized target distributions of each client. In contrast, CKIF explicitly models the non-independent and identically distributed nature for each client. As a result, CKIF demonstrates considerable performance advantages over FedAvg.

Scalability to number of clients. To investigate the effect of increasing the number of clients, we conduct experiments using eight clients sampled from USPTO-50K (Schneider et al, 2016) and USPTO-MIT (Jin et al, 2017). The experimental results in Table 2 demonstrate that as the number of clients increases, the performance of all clients further improves, highlighting the scalability of CKIF. For example, CKIF achieves a top-1 accuracy of 30.9% with four participants and an improved one of 36.9% with eight participants in terms of C_3 . This finding suggests that the collaborative nature of CKIF enables the extraction of beneficial guidance from a larger pool of clients, leading to enhanced performance for all participating clients.

In addition, the experimental results reveal a counterintuitive decline in performance for Centrally Trained as data volume increases, challenging the common assumption that more data invariably improves performance (Edunov et al, 2018; Sugiyama and Yoshinaga, 2019). We attribute this to three factors: lack of specialization, distribution mismatch, and bias towards majority reaction data. The centrally trained model, while capturing overall trends, may overlook client-specific characteristics. It also faces potential distribution mismatches between diverse training reaction data and distributions of individual chemical entities. In addition, reaction data from certain clients may dominate the training process, potentially biasing the model. In contrast, our CKIF maintains individual models for each client, explicitly modeling both global consistency and personalized preferences. Such a framework enables better alignment with client-specific data distributions, yielding improved performance.

Analysis of accuracy for different reaction types. In the realm of chemistry, reaction classes serve as invaluable tools for chemists to navigate vast databases of reactions and extract similar members within the same class for analysis and determination of optimal reaction conditions. Moreover, reaction classes offer a concise and efficient means of communication, enabling chemists to describe the functionality and underlying mechanisms of chemical reactions in terms of atomic rearrangements. USPTO-50K dataset provides high-quality annotations which assigns one of ten reaction classes to each reaction, facilitating further investigation into the performance gains associated with specific reaction classes. From the results shown in Fig. 2, we can observe that CKIF outperforms the Locally Trained and FedAvg baselines by a considerable margin among all reaction classes and achieves excellent results. Also, we find that C-C bond formation is the easiest to improve among the ten reaction classes, while heteroatom alkylation and arylation is the most challenging one. The reasons




Fig. 2: Top-10 accuracy of prediction of different classes of reactions. CKIF outperforms the strong baseline by a considerable margin on all reaction types.

are two folds: 1) C-C bond formation has more diverse possibilities for choosing reactants and reactions than other reaction classes (Tetko et al, 2020), while the reaction data utilized by Locally Trained is insufficient to learn such transformations. 2) There are sufficient reaction data of heteroatom alkylation and arylation for Locally Trained to learn. Note that reaction classes are usually unknown in the real world, we do not utilize such information in all experiments as (Zhong et al, 2022).

Scalability to number of training samples. Tables 1 and 2 demonstrate the effectiveness and scalability of the CKIF compared to several strong baselines. We can observe that some clients suffer from limited data volume, *e.g.*, top-1 accuracy of 4.1% on C_2 . Such data scarcity problem can be mitigated with more reaction data in the same distribution. Although collecting data is expensive and time-consuming, one may wonder whether doing so can lead to better prediction performance. To gain insights into the performance gains of CKIF when clients have sufficient data volume and further validate scalability of CKIF, we conduct experiments on USPTO 1k TPL dataset (Schwaller et al, 2021), where the clients have larger data volume.

From the experimental results in Table 3, we have the following findings: 1) With a sufficient volume of client data, all the methods, including Locally Trained, Centrally Trained, FedAvg, and CKIF, show impressive performance compared to previous

Table 3: Top- K retrosynthesis accuracy (%) on the USPTO 1k TPL dataset. Note that Centrally Trained gathers all reaction data and the comparison is unfair. Bold values indicate the best results among Locally Trained, FedAvg and CKIF. Here MF and RT denote MaxFrag accuracy and RoundTrip accuracy, respectively.

Client	Method	$K = 1$	3	5	10	1 (MF)	3	5	10	1 (RT)
C_9	Locally Trained	53.8	67.4	73.3	76.6	63.1	74.3	78.5	80.0	53.1
	Centrally Trained	50.8	71.0	80.1	86.3	58.2	77.6	84.7	88.9	69.5
	FedAvg	44.5	64.6	72.3	77.1	49.7	70.1	76.7	81.0	61.7
	CKIF (Ours)	63.5	77.6	85.2	88.7	70.3	83.7	88.7	90.6	63.5
C_{10}	Locally Trained	60.4	72.2	76.9	79.4	66.4	76.9	80.1	81.7	53.3
	Centrally Trained	31.9	54.1	64.3	70.8	44.2	65.7	74.9	80.1	67.0
	FedAvg	38.0	57.5	66.4	72.0	45.7	65.5	74.5	80.5	59.2
	CKIF (Ours)	66.6	80.2	86.3	90.3	71.4	85.0	89.0	91.4	63.5
C_{11}	Locally Trained	55.5	65.9	70.7	73.5	61.7	71.4	74.5	75.7	48.2
	Centrally Trained	40.7	61.0	70.3	76.2	50.3	69.3	75.9	79.9	66.3
	FedAvg	42.2	59.7	67.8	74.6	48.8	65.7	71.9	77.5	60.2
	CKIF (Ours)	62.0	76.1	84.5	87.9	69.8	82.4	87.5	89.2	63.3
C_{12}	Locally Trained	55.8	69.2	73.5	76.0	62.4	73.8	77.5	79.3	51.1
	Centrally Trained	33.9	54.6	65.6	72.7	43.7	64.2	72.7	77.4	63.0
	FedAvg	37.4	55.2	62.6	68.3	45.8	63.8	69.8	73.9	58.8
	CKIF (Ours)	58.7	75.3	83.9	87.7	66.1	81.4	87.4	89.3	61.0
C_{13}	Locally Trained	56.4	69.7	75.9	79.0	63.5	75.3	78.9	81.0	51.9
	Centrally Trained	40.7	62.1	72.2	77.8	49.1	68.8	76.7	80.7	66.5
	FedAvg	39.7	60.0	68.5	73.6	45.2	64.4	71.8	76.0	61.2
	CKIF (Ours)	64.2	78.6	86.1	89.3	71.5	83.9	88.7	90.6	62.1
C_{14}	Locally Trained	53.6	66.1	71.2	74.8	62.1	71.6	75.6	77.6	45.4
	Centrally Trained	54.1	73.1	83.5	89.3	63.2	81.0	87.8	91.5	61.5
	FedAvg	35.3	54.8	63.5	69.3	43.4	62.8	70.7	75.3	53.0
	CKIF (Ours)	61.5	76.7	83.1	87.5	69.5	82.1	87.1	89.1	55.0
C_{15}	Locally Trained	55.8	69.2	73.9	76.5	63.4	74.6	78.1	79.5	52.2
	Centrally Trained	59.0	77.4	89.9	96.0	68.2	87.0	94.5	96.4	72.3
	FedAvg	40.9	59.8	69.1	74.5	48.1	66.7	75.1	78.8	61.8
	CKIF (Ours)	61.2	77.1	87.3	91.1	70.7	84.2	90.2	92.2	64.3
C_{16}	Locally Trained	54.0	67.3	74.8	78.5	63.8	75.8	80.0	82.3	49.9
	Centrally Trained	56.5	75.9	86.0	91.8	66.2	83.7	90.3	93.1	67.4
	FedAvg	39.0	58.8	67.8	73.3	47.3	66.0	73.5	78.4	56.4
	CKIF (Ours)	62.6	76.9	86.2	89.8	70.2	84.0	89.8	91.4	61.0

experiments. This indicates that the availability of a larger volume of data allows models to learn sufficient underlying patterns so as to enhance their retrosynthesis prediction accuracy. 2) Despite considerable performance of Locally Trained models with sufficient client data, the experimental results show that CKIF can still further improve retrosynthesis accuracy. For instance, CKIF achieves an average performance improvement of +6.9% and +16.6% on top-1 accuracy compared to locally and centrally trained models, respectively. In a nutshell, the experimental results with larger data volume show that CKIF can further improve the performance even when clients have sufficient data volume to train their own personalized models. CKIF consistently




Fig. 3: Examples of predictions by baselines and CKIF. The examples are sampled from **a** “acylation and related processes” subset of USPTO-50K dataset, **b** “ring formation” subset of USPTO-MIT dataset, and **c** mixed subset of USPTO 1k TPL dataset.

outperforms the Locally Trained baseline and brings performance benefits to clients with both low and high data volumes. This reaffirms the scalability and effectiveness of CKIF in leveraging chemical knowledge and personalized target distribution for enhanced retrosynthesis accuracy.

Qualitative analysis. To compare the qualitative results of these strong baselines and CKIF, we showcase three reactions with their characteristics (reaction types), as depicted in Fig. 3. Experimental results indicate that CKIF consistently outperforms the other baselines and provides plausible synthesis routes. Taking the ring formation reaction (Fig. 3b) as an example, the ability of CKIF to comprehend the structural requirements for forming rings leads to correct predictions, while the other baselines struggle to predict the ring formation, resulting in incorrect reactants. The superior performance of CKIF highlights the efficacy of leveraging both local (personalized model for each client) and global (client-centric weighting strategy) information to achieve accurate retrosynthetic predictions in a privacy-aware setting.

Analysis of the chemical knowledge-informed weighting strategy. To ascertain the effectiveness of our proposed CKIW strategy, we conducted a comparative




Fig. 4: Ablative experiments on the USPTO-50K dataset, including **a** performance comparison between CKIF and count-based averaging strategies, **b** trends in average top- K accuracy with increasing local training epochs, and **c** trends in average top- K accuracy with increasing clients participating in the federated learning process.

analysis against a robust baseline: Average Aggregation, which uses average model aggregation instead of using the proposed chemical knowledge-informed model aggregation. The results shown in Fig. 4a demonstrate a significant enhancement; CKIF improved predictive accuracy by +0.93% in terms of average top- K accuracy. Given that this improvement is averaged over 16 metrics for 4 clients in USPTO-50K, it illustrates the considerable benefit of CKIF. This analysis highlights the substantial benefits of incorporating chemical knowledge into model aggregation, suggesting a powerful alternative to heuristic methods such as count-based model averaging.

Sensitivity analysis. After verifying the effectiveness of CKIF, we conduct ablation experiments to assess the robustness of CKIF under varying learning settings. In particular, we explore the impact of two critical hyperparameters: the number of communication rounds and the number of clients. The resilience of CKIF to the number of communication rounds is tested with values set at 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50. The results, as illustrated in Fig. 4b, show a gradual improvement in model accuracy from 47.73% to 48.84% as the number of epochs increased. Similarly, we investigate the effect of varying the number of clients participating in the learning process. The configurations tested include 2, 3, and 4 clients, with corresponding accuracies of 13.85%, 24.65%, and 33.63% (Fig. 4c). This progression demonstrates a robust scaling behavior of CKIF as the network grows, highlighting its capability to harness chemical knowledge across more clients. These findings underscore the resilience and scalability of CKIF, affirming its effectiveness across diverse experimental settings.

Robustness analysis. The robustness of CKIF against contaminated client data is evaluated by investigating the scenario with contamination across all participating clients. We simulate contamination by randomly exchanging reactants and products while shuffling SMILES tokens. To ensure fair comparison, the test split of all clients remains unchanged. Results (Fig. 5) demonstrate that CKIF maintains a significant performance advantage over Locally Trained models across varying contamination




Fig. 5: Robustness analysis on the USPTO-50K dataset, where all participating clients experience varying degrees of contamination.

levels. Even with 5~10% contaminated data, CKIF might achieve comparable performance to that of Locally Trained models trained on clean data. The core reason is that CKIF dynamically adjusts each client’s contribution during model aggregation so as to mitigate the impact of contaminated data. These findings highlight CKIF’s inherent robustness to data contamination. Note that CKIF is not immune to malicious attacks such as data poisoning. While the comprehensive handling of contaminated client data and defense mechanisms against malicious attacks warrant thorough investigation, they extend beyond the scope of this work and are addressed in the Discussion section.

3 Discussion

As an essential skill for organic chemists, retrosynthesis requires expert knowledge, creativity, and intuition. In the modern era, chemical reaction data become a valuable asset across various scientific domains such as materials science, pharmaceuticals, and energy. However, sharing such data can expose trade secrets, violate patents, and lead to unfair competition or security compromises. To address these challenges, this paper introduces CKIF, a distributed machine learning framework that enables collaborative

training without the need to exchange raw reaction data, thereby ensuring data privacy — a major concern in sensitive scientific domains. By leveraging the distributed and heterogeneous nature of reaction data sources, CKIF not only improves efficiency but also reduces communication overhead, latency, and bandwidth consumption. CKIF allows for the distribution of computation across multiple clients closer to data sources, enhancing parallelism and fault tolerance.

CKIF incorporates chemical symbolic knowledge in the form of molecule fingerprints to guide model aggregation, resulting in personalized models that enhance the accuracy and relevance of retrosynthesis predictions. This knowledge-based approach allows each participating chemical entity to benefit from the collective insights. In addition, empirical results suggest that CKIF’s performance improves with an increasing number of clients and training samples, showcasing CKIF’s scalability. By applying CKIF to retrosynthesis, one can expect the collaborative discovery and optimization of new chemical transformations from various and confidential data sources. Experiments on various experimental settings show that CKIF outperforms locally trained models (Locally Trained) and even those trained on centralized data (Centrally Trained). We hope that CKIF opens up new possibilities for advancing privacy-aware retrosynthesis and related fields. In addition, we aim to inspire more research on privacy-preserving ML methods for other scientific domains and applications.

Despite these strengths, our work has limitations that necessitate further exploration. First, CKIF’s performance relies on the quality of local data from each chemical entity, which might vary significantly in practice. Second, the model aggregation based on chemical knowledge uses the same molecule fingerprints and measurements for all clients, which might not accurately capture the personalized target distribution of each client and might contain unintentional bias. Future work will explore customized molecule fingerprints or measurements that meet the unique needs of each client. Third, our evaluation metrics are focused on the validity and uniqueness of the generated synthetic routes, overlooking the practicality and feasibility of the synthesis in terms of cost, yield, and environmental impact.

During the privacy-aware learning process, each chemical entity trains their personalized models locally and only model parameters are communicated. However, this process is not immune to privacy threats, as malicious attackers can infer sensitive information from the model updates exchanged between the clients (Xie et al, 2019; Lyu et al, 2022), *i.e.*, data representation leakage from gradients or models. Several methods have been proposed to address this essential issue of privacy leakage, such as encrypting the model updates or adding noise to them using differential privacy (Abadi et al, 2016; Sun et al, 2021b). While addressing privacy leakage and other security concerns (such as data poisoning) remains an active research area (Tolpegin et al, 2020; Sun et al, 2021a; Nowroozi et al, 2025), our contribution is orthogonal to these developments. These methods, in principle, can be seamlessly incorporated into our framework.

4 Methods

Problem formulation. In the present study, we focus in particular on the challenge of learning retrosynthesis models in a privacy-aware setting where reaction data are proprietary and cannot be shared among chemical entities (clients) or with an external central server. To address this, CKIF is specifically designed to allow for the collaborative improvement of retrosynthesis models without sharing sensitive reaction data between participants. The collaboration occurs through multiple rounds of communication where only implicit and explicit chemical knowledge—rather than raw reaction data—is exchanged. For the retrosynthesis prediction task itself, we define it as the process of training a machine learning model (or hypothesis) that maps a target molecule to its corresponding precursors (*i.e.*, reactants).

Privacy-aware model training. The standard Transformer (Vaswani et al, 2017) is adopted to learn a probabilistic mapping $P(y|x)$ from a given target molecule x to reactants y . Suppose there are a total of K clients, each possessing a local reaction dataset $\{(x_n, y_n)\}_{n=1}^{N_i}$, where N_i denotes the number of reactions stored on the i -th client C_i . Our objective is to collaboratively learn a retrosynthesis model with parameters Θ , without centralizing or sharing training reaction data. In the remaining content, we first formally define the steps of each communication round of CKIF, and introduce the learning objective of retrosynthesis model. We then elaborate on the CKIW strategy which learns a personalized model for each client.

At each communication round of CKIF, three procedures are performed sequentially for all clients. Firstly, model parameters generated by the previous round are used for parameter initialization (random initialization for the first round). Secondly, the initialized models of each client are trained locally on their own reaction data for

Algorithm 1 Procedure of the Chemical Knowledge-Informed Framework

Require: Number of chemical entities K , number of communication rounds R_T , local epochs R_L , number of fine-tuning rounds R_F

Ensure: Personalized models $\{\Theta^{C_1}, \Theta^{C_2}, \dots, \Theta^{C_K}\}$

```
1: Initialize models  $\{\Theta_0^{C_1}, \Theta_0^{C_2}, \dots, \Theta_0^{C_K}\}$ 
2: for  $t = 1$  to  $R_T$  do
3:   for  $k = 1$  to  $K$  do
4:      $\Theta_t^{C_k} \leftarrow \text{LocalLearning}(\Theta_{t-1}^{C_k}, R_L)$ 
5:   end for
6:   Compute  $\{w_{i,k}^a\}$  with chemical knowledge guidance (Algorithm 2)
7:   for  $i = 1$  to  $K$  do
8:      $\Theta_t^{C_i} \leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^K w_{i,k}^a \Theta_t^{C_k}$ 
9:   end for
10: end for
11: for  $k = 1$  to  $K$  do
12:    $\Theta^{C_k} \leftarrow \text{LocalLearning}(\Theta_{R_T}^{C_k}, R_L * R_F)$ 
13: end for
14: return  $\{\Theta^{C_1}, \Theta^{C_2}, \dots, \Theta^{C_K}\}$ 
```

a fixed number of epochs (or iterations) to minimize the following objective function:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\log P(y|x; \Theta). \quad (1)$$

Once trained, each client C_i sends their parameters Θ^{C_i} to the central server. Thirdly, after collection, these parameters are aggregated (*i.e.*, weighted sum) to a new global model by the central server: $\Theta^G = \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \Theta^{C_k}$, where w_k is the weighting factor for client C_k . As one of the most widely used methods in federated learning, FedAvg (McMahan et al, 2017) defines the weighting factor for C_i as the proportion of training samples: $w_i = N_i / (\sum_{k=1}^K N_k)$.

Despite being prevalent, mainstream federated learning methods like FedAvg struggle to handle data heterogeneity (Wang et al, 2019; Huang et al, 2021) — one common characteristic of chemical entities, where reaction data often reflects specialized research focuses or industrial interests. To address this, CKIF further investigates the problem of privacy-preserving retrosynthesis learning with a focus on client-specific needs. Concretely, CKIF enables each chemical entity to have a personalized model that adapts to their own data distribution and preferences, while also benefiting from the chemical knowledge of other clients by only exchanging model parameters. Consequently, instead of performing a standard aggregation of global parameters Θ^G at each communication round, CKIF redefines the aggregation process to create a personalized model for each client (see Algorithm 1). For instance, the personalized model for client C_i is obtained by:

$$\Theta^{C_i} = \sum_{k=1}^K w_{i,k}^a \Theta^{C_k}, \quad (2)$$

where $w_{i,k}^a$ denotes the adaptive weighting factor power by the proposed CKIW strategy (Algorithm 2). $w_{i,k}^a$ quantifies the importance of models from other clients C_k relative to the given client C_i , and is normalized as:

$$w_{i,k}^a = \begin{cases} \mu, & i = k \\ (1 - \mu) \frac{\exp(s_{i,k}/\tau)}{\sum_{j=1, i \neq j}^K \exp(s_{i,j}/\tau)}, & i \neq k \end{cases}, \quad (3)$$

where μ and τ are hyperparameters that control the influence of self’s model Θ^{C_i} and neighboring clients’ models Θ^{C_k} . $s_{i,k}$ represents the similarity score between the reactants predicted by Θ^{C_k} and the annotated ones stored in C_i . Note that the process of measuring similarity involves using proxy reaction data, which are stored securely and processed locally on each client. During the collaborative training process, only the model parameters are communicated. In our experiment, all reaction data in the validation set are chosen as the proxy reaction data. Clients can optionally provide additional proxy reaction data for improved measurement.

In the above distributed training procedure, the strategy used to assign weights to individual models during aggregation is of great importance (Zhang et al, 2021) for the performance, convergence, *etc.* Generic weighting strategies, such as count-based averaging, rely on handcrafted metrics. Such heuristic methods have significant limitations:

Algorithm 2 Procedure of the Chemical Knowledge-Informed Weighting Strategy

Require: Client models $\{\Theta^{C_1}, \Theta^{C_2}, \dots, \Theta^{C_K}\}$, proxy reaction data $\{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_K\}$, hyperparameters μ, τ

Ensure: Adaptive weighting factors $\{w_{i,k}^a\}$

```
1: for  $i = 1$  to  $K$  do
2:   for  $k = 1$  to  $K$  do  $\triangleright$  Client  $C_i$  evaluates model  $\Theta^{C_k}$  locally on its own proxy
   data without sharing
3:     if  $i = k$  then
4:        $w_{i,k}^a \leftarrow \mu$ 
5:     else
6:        $s_{i,k} \leftarrow 0$ 
7:       for  $(x, y) \in D_i$  do
8:          $\hat{y} \leftarrow \text{PredictReactants}(x, \Theta^{C_k})$ 
9:          $f_y \leftarrow \text{ExtractFingerprint}(y)$ 
10:         $f_{\hat{y}} \leftarrow \text{ExtractFingerprint}(\hat{y})$ 
11:         $s_{i,k} \leftarrow s_{i,k} + \text{MolecularSimilarity}(f_y, f_{\hat{y}})$ 
12:      end for
13:       $s_{i,k} \leftarrow s_{i,k} / |D_i|$ 
14:    end if
15:  end for
16:  for  $k = 1$  to  $K, k \neq i$  do
17:     $w_{i,k}^a \leftarrow (1 - \mu) \frac{\exp(s_{i,k}/\tau)}{\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^K \exp(s_{i,j}/\tau)}$ 
18:  end for
19: end for
20: return  $\{w_{i,k}^a\}$ 
```

they ignore the potential heterogeneity in data distributions across different chemical entities. This raises a fundamental question: how to compute meaningful weights $s_{i,k}$ that quantify how valuable one client’s model is for another client’s learning objectives? To address this, CKIF is equipped with the CKIW strategy that harnesses the explicit, symbolic chemical knowledge—specifically, molecule fingerprints like ECFP (Rogers and Hahn, 2010) and MACCS keys (Durant et al, 2002). By calculating the molecule similarity between predicted and actual reactants, CKIW assesses the model’s effectiveness (*i.e.*, $s_{i,k}$) across reaction data of different clients. The computation procedure of $s_{i,k}$ is detailed as follows. For each reaction pair (x, y) stored on the validation set of C_i , we first get the predicted reactants \hat{y} through the personalized model Θ^{C_k} . Then, molecule fingerprints (Rogers and Hahn, 2010; Durant et al, 2002) of y and \hat{y} are extracted by RDKit (Landrum et al, 2013). Thereby, we can measure the similarity of the molecules by analyzing the molecule fingerprints with established measurement methods (Bajusz et al, 2015). The selection of measurement methods and molecule fingerprints is flexible, allowing CKIW to take advantage of advancements in these areas. Finally, we can obtain $s_{i,k}$ by averaging molecule similarities over all pairs in the proxy reaction data. In summary, $s_{i,k}$ represents the overall performance of Θ^{C_k} on C_i ’s proxy data, with higher values indicating greater similarity between the clients’

data distributions. Note that throughout the aggregation process, each client C_i only uses their own proxy data locally to evaluate other clients’ models. The only information shared between clients are the model parameters Θ^{C_k} , ensuring that private reaction data remains protected.

Implementation details and hyperparameters. We formulate retrosynthesis as a sequence-to-sequence (Sutskever et al, 2014) problem where each element in the sequence is a SMILES token. We use a standardization protocol (Wan et al, 2022; Chen and Jung, 2021; Schwaller et al, 2019) using RDKit’s canonical SMILES representation (rdkit.Chem.MolToSmiles with canonical=True). This standardization step is applied before fingerprint calculation and model training, ensuring consistent molecular representation across all clients. A standard Transformer (Vaswani et al, 2017) composed of an encoder-decoder architecture is adopted as the retrosynthesis model. All the baseline models use the same transformer architecture. Specifically, the adopted transformer consists of a 6-layer encoder and a 6-layer decoder, and the number of attention heads is set to 8. We train the Personalized and centrally trained models for 250 epochs with a batch size of 64. We employ an Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2017) with a learning rate of 0.0002, $\beta_1 = 0.9$, and $\beta_2 = 0.998$. Dropout (Srivastava et al, 2014) is applied to the whole model to avoid overfitting. For CKIF, we trained the models for R_T rounds, each with R_L local epochs with a batch size of 64. Inspired by (Wang et al, 2019; Yu et al, 2020), in the last R_F rounds, we perform local fine-tuning instead of model aggregation. For all experiments, R_T , R_L , and R_F are set to 50, 5, and 10, respectively. The hyperparameters μ and τ are set to be $1/K$ and 1.5, respectively. MACCS keys (Durant et al, 2002) and Tanimoto similarity (Bajusz et al, 2015) are employed to measure the similarity of molecules. OpenNMT-py (Klein et al, 2017), an open-source neural machine translation framework in PyTorch (Paszke et al, 2019), is adopted to build our models.

Dataset collection. Our CKIF is evaluated on a variety of federated datasets sampled from U.S. patent database curated by (Lowe, 2012, 2017) for retrosynthesis prediction and reaction classification: USPTO-50K (Schneider et al, 2016), USPTO-MIT (Jin et al, 2017), and USPTO 1k TPL (Schwaller et al, 2021).

- USPTO-50K is a high-quality reaction dataset comprising approximately 50,000 reactions, each with manually annotated reaction type. We split the dataset in the same way as (Liu et al, 2017; Dai et al, 2019). Five clients are obtained according to the reaction classes. In addition, the reactions with chirality (a property of asymmetry) compose another client.
- USPTO-MIT is a larger dataset which contains approximately 470,000 reactions. We split the datasets in the same way as (Jin et al, 2017). Two clients are obtained according to the reaction characteristics, *i.e.*, ring opening and ring formation.
- USPTO 1k TPL is a reaction dataset containing the 1,000 most common reaction templates as classes, which is built by (Schwaller et al, 2021) for reaction classification. Eight clients are obtained according to the reaction classes (templates). Since reaction classes or reaction templates are usually unknown in the real world, we do not utilize such information in all experiments as (Zhong et al, 2022).

An overview of the datasets used for training and evaluation, including data split and statistics, is shown in Extended Data Table 1.

Pre- and post-processing. For all chemical reactions from datasets, reactants and products are extracted to form paired reaction data. Following previous works (Segler and Waller, 2017; Dai et al, 2019; Wan et al, 2022), other factors, such as reagents and edge products, are ignored in all experiments. We focus on single-step retrosynthesis (Shi et al, 2020; Yan et al, 2020; Somnath et al, 2021; Wang et al, 2021), where reactions containing multiple products are split into individual reactions to ensure that each reaction exclusively featured a single product. Canonical SMILES (Weininger et al, 1989) is used to represent molecules in all experiments. For post-processing, we use beam search (Freitag and Al-Onaizan, 2017) to systematically explore potential reactant combinations. The ranking of reactant candidates was performed based on the models’ confidence scores, which reflected the likelihood of a given reactant combination leading to the desired product.

Evaluation metrics. We use top- K ($K = \{1, 3, 5, 10\}$) retrosynthesis accuracy, the most widely metric used among current literatures (Liu et al, 2017; Karpov et al, 2019; Kim et al, 2021; Sacha et al, 2021; Wang et al, 2021; Zhong et al, 2022, 2023), which indicates the proportion of ground truth reactants that appear (exactly matched) among the top- K confident predicted reactants, to evaluate the performance on each client. For comprehensive evaluation, we additionally report MaxFrag accuracy (Tetko et al, 2020) which focuses on main compound transformations, and RoundTrip accuracy (Chen and Jung, 2021; Wan et al, 2022) which evaluates whether the predicted reactants can indeed synthesize the target product.

5 Data availability

All chemical reaction data used in this work are publicly available. The USPTO-50K dataset can be found at <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/6ideflxcakrak10/AADTbFBC0F8ax55-z-EDgrIza>. The USPTO-MIT dataset can be found at <https://github.com/wengong-jin/nips17-rexgen/blob/master/USPTO/data.zip>. The USPTO 1k TPL dataset can be found at <https://ibm.ent.box.com/v/MappingChemicalReactions>.

6 Code availability

The source code and implementation details that support the findings of CKIF are publicly available at <https://github.com/guikunchen/CKIF>.

References

- Abadi M, Chu A, Goodfellow I, et al (2016) Deep learning with differential privacy. In: ACM SIGSAC Conf. Comput. Commun. Secur., pp 308–318
- Bajusz D, Racz A, Heberger K (2015) Why is tanimoto index an appropriate choice for fingerprint-based similarity calculations? J Cheminform 7(1):1–13

- Baylon JL, Cilfone NA, Gulcher JR, et al (2019) Enhancing retrosynthetic reaction prediction with deep learning using multiscale reaction classification. *J Chem Inf Model* 59(2):673–688
- Binder JB, Raines RT (2009) Simple chemical transformation of lignocellulosic biomass into furans for fuels and chemicals. *J Am Chem Soc* 131(5):1979–1985
- Blakemore DC, Castro L, Churcher I, et al (2018) Organic synthesis provides opportunities to transform drug discovery. *Nat Chem* 10(4):383–394
- Bozbag S, Sanli D, Erkey C (2012) Synthesis of nanostructured materials using supercritical co 2: Part ii. chemical transformations. *J Mater Sci* 47:3469–3492
- Chen S, Jung Y (2021) Deep retrosynthetic reaction prediction using local reactivity and global attention. *JACS Au* 1(10):1612–1620
- Coley CW, Rogers L, Green WH, et al (2017) Computer-assisted retrosynthesis based on molecular similarity. *ACS Cent Sci* 3(12):1237–1245
- Dai H, Li C, Coley C, et al (2019) Retrosynthesis prediction with conditional graph logic network. In: *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*
- Durant JL, Leland BA, Henry DR, et al (2002) Reoptimization of mdl keys for use in drug discovery. *J Chem Inf Comput Sci* 42(6):1273–1280
- Edunov S, Ott M, Auli M, et al (2018) Understanding back-translation at scale. In: *Conf. Empir. Methods Nat. Lang. Process.*, p 489
- Fang L, Li J, Zhao M, et al (2023) Single-step retrosynthesis prediction by leveraging commonly preserved substructures. *Nat Commun* 14(1):2446
- Fayette M, Robinson RD (2014) Chemical transformations of nanomaterials for energy applications. *J Mater Chem A* 2(17):5965–5978
- Freitag M, Al-Onaizan Y (2017) Beam search strategies for neural machine translation. In: *Proc. First Workshop Neural Mach. Transl.*
- Goodman J (2009) Computer software review: Reaxys
- Huang Y, Chu L, Zhou Z, et al (2021) Personalized cross-silo federated learning on non-iid data. In: *AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, 9, pp 7865–7873
- Jin W, Coley C, Barzilay R, et al (2017) Predicting organic reaction outcomes with weisfeiler-lehman network. In: *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*
- Karpov P, Godin G, Tetko IV (2019) A transformer model for retrosynthesis. In: *Int. Conf. Artif. Neural Netw.*, pp 817–830

- Kim E, Lee D, Kwon Y, et al (2021) Valid, plausible, and diverse retrosynthesis using tied two-way transformers with latent variables. *J Chem Inf Model* 61(1):123–133
- Kingma DP, Ba J (2017) Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In: *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*
- Klein G, Kim Y, Deng Y, et al (2017) Opennmt: Open-source toolkit for neural machine translation. In: *Assoc. Comput. Linguist.*, pp 67–72
- Landrum G, et al (2013) Rdkit: A software suite for cheminformatics, computational chemistry, and predictive modeling. *Greg Landrum* 8
- Lawson AJ, Swienty-Busch J, Géoui T, et al (2014) The making of reaxys—towards unobstructed access to relevant chemistry information. In: *Future Hist. Chem. Inf.* ACS Publications, p 127–148
- Liu B, Ramsundar B, Kawthekar P, et al (2017) Retrosynthetic reaction prediction using neural sequence-to-sequence models. *ACS Cent Sci* 3(10):1103–1113
- Lowe D (2017) Chemical reactions from US patents (1976-Sep2016). doi: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5104873.v1>
- Lowe DM (2012) Extraction of chemical structures and reactions from the literature. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge
- Lyu L, Yu H, Ma X, et al (2022) Privacy and robustness in federated learning: Attacks and defenses. *IEEE Trans Neural Netw Learn Syst*
- Mayfield J, Lowe D, Sayle R (2017) Pistachio: Search and faceting of large reaction databases. In: *Abstr. Pap. Am. Chem. Soc.*
- McMahan B, Moore E, Ramage D, et al (2017) Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In: *Artif. Intell. Stat.*, pp 1273–1282
- Muetterties E (1977) Molecular metal clusters: Cluster chemistry may provide valuable insights to chemisorption and catalysis on surfaces. *Science* 196(4292):839–848
- Nowroozi E, Haider I, Taheri R, et al (2025) Federated learning under attack: Exposing vulnerabilities through data poisoning attacks in computer networks. *IEEE Trans Netw Serv Manag*
- Paszke A, Gross S, Massa F, et al (2019) Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In: *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*
- Poizot P, Dolhem F (2011) Clean energy new deal for a sustainable world: from non-co 2 generating energy sources to greener electrochemical storage devices. *Energy Environ Sci* 4(6):2003–2019

- Rogers D, Hahn M (2010) Extended-connectivity fingerprints. *J Chem Inf Model* 50(5):742–754
- Sacha M, Błaz M, Byrski P, et al (2021) Molecule edit graph attention network: modeling chemical reactions as sequences of graph edits. *J Chem Inf Model* 61(7):3273–3284
- Schneider N, Stiefl N, Landrum GA (2016) What’s what: The (nearly) definitive guide to reaction role assignment. *J Chem Inf Model* 56(12):2336–2346
- Schooler J (2011) Unpublished results hide the decline effect. *Nature* 470(7335):437–437
- Schwaller P, Laino T, Gaudin T, et al (2019) Molecular transformer: a model for uncertainty-calibrated chemical reaction prediction. *ACS Cent Sci* 5(9):1572–1583
- Schwaller P, Probst D, Vaucher AC, et al (2021) Mapping the space of chemical reactions using attention-based neural networks. *Nat Mach Intell* 3(2):144–152
- Segler MH, Waller MP (2017) Neural-symbolic machine learning for retrosynthesis and reaction prediction. *Chem Eur J* 23(25):5966–5971
- Shi C, Xu M, Guo H, et al (2020) A graph to graphs framework for retrosynthesis prediction. In: *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, pp 8818–8827
- Shimizu K, Nuida K, Arai H, et al (2015) Privacy-preserving search for chemical compound databases. *BMC Bioinform* 16(18):1–14
- Simm J, Humbeck L, Zalewski A, et al (2021) Splitting chemical structure data sets for federated privacy-preserving machine learning. *J Cheminform* 13(1):1–14
- Somnath VR, Bunne C, Coley C, et al (2021) Learning graph models for retrosynthesis prediction. In: *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, pp 9405–9415
- Srivastava N, Hinton G, Krizhevsky A, et al (2014) Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *J Mach Learn Res* 15(1):1929–1958
- Struble TJ, Alvarez JC, Brown SP, et al (2020) Current and future roles of artificial intelligence in medicinal chemistry synthesis. *J Med Chem* 63(16):8667–8682
- Subbaraman N (2011) Flawed arithmetic on drug development costs. *Nat Biotechnol* 29(5):381–382
- Sugiyama A, Yoshinaga N (2019) Data augmentation using back-translation for context-aware neural machine translation. In: *Proc. Fourth Workshop Discourse Mach. Transl.*, pp 35–44

- Sun G, Cong Y, Dong J, et al (2021a) Data poisoning attacks on federated machine learning. *IEEE Internet Things J* 9(13):11365–11375
- Sun J, Li A, Wang B, et al (2021b) Provable defense against privacy leakage in federated learning from representation perspective. In: *Proc. IEEE Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit.*
- Sun R, Dai H, Li L, et al (2021c) Towards understanding retrosynthesis by energy-based models. In: *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, pp 10186–10194
- Sutskever I, Vinyals O, Le QV (2014) Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. In: *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*
- Tetko IV, Karpov P, Van Deursen R, et al (2020) State-of-the-art augmented nlp transformer models for direct and single-step retrosynthesis. *Nat Commun* 11(1):5575
- Tolpegin V, Truex S, Gursoy ME, et al (2020) Data poisoning attacks against federated learning systems. In: *Proc. Eur. Symp. Res. Comput. Secur.*, pp 480–501
- Vaswani A, Shazeer N, Parmar N, et al (2017) Attention is all you need. In: *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*
- Wan Y, Hsieh CY, Liao B, et al (2022) Retroformer: Pushing the limits of end-to-end retrosynthesis transformer. In: *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, pp 22475–22490
- Wang K, Mathews R, Kiddon C, et al (2019) Federated evaluation of on-device personalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:191010252*
- Wang X, Li Y, Qiu J, et al (2021) Retroprime: A diverse, plausible and transformer-based method for single-step retrosynthesis predictions. *Chem Eng J* 420:129845
- Weininger D, Weininger A, Weininger JL (1989) Smiles. 2. algorithm for generation of unique smiles notation. *J Chem Inf Comput Sci* 29(2):97–101
- Xie C, Huang K, Chen PY, et al (2019) Dba: Distributed backdoor attacks against federated learning. In: *Proc. Int. Conf. Learn. Represent.*
- Yan C, Ding Q, Zhao P, et al (2020) Retroxpert: Decompose retrosynthesis prediction like a chemist. In: *Proc. Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, pp 11248–11258
- Yu T, Bagdasaryan E, Shmatikov V (2020) Salvaging federated learning by local adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:200204758*
- Zhang M, Sapra K, Fidler S, et al (2021) Personalized federated learning with first order model optimization. In: *Proc. Int. Conf. Learn. Represent.*

Zhang X, Mo Y, Wang W, et al (2024) Retrosynthesis prediction enhanced by in-silico reaction data augmentation. arXiv preprint arXiv:240200086

Zhong W, Yang Z, Chen CYC (2023) Retrosynthesis prediction using an end-to-end graph generative architecture for molecular graph editing. Nat Commun 14(1):3009

Zhong Z, Song J, Feng Z, et al (2022) Root-aligned smiles: a tight representation for chemical reaction prediction. Chem Sci 13(31):9023–9034