

Chimera: Accurate retrosynthesis prediction by ensembling models with diverse inductive biases

Krzysztof Maziarz^{*1}, Guoqing Liu (刘国庆)^{*1}, Hubert Misztela², Aleksei Kornev²,
Piotr Gaiński^{1,3}, Holger Hoeffling², Mike Fortunato², Rishi Gupta², Marwin Segler¹

¹Microsoft Research AI for Science; ²Novartis Biomedical Research;

³Jagiellonian University; *Equal core contributor

Correspondence to {krmaziar, guoqingliu, marwinsegler}@microsoft.com

Abstract

Planning and conducting chemical syntheses remains a major bottleneck in the discovery of functional small molecules, and prevents fully leveraging generative AI for molecular inverse design. While early work has shown that ML-based retrosynthesis models can predict reasonable routes, their low accuracy for less frequent, yet important reactions has been pointed out. As multi-step search algorithms are limited to reactions suggested by the underlying model, the applicability of those tools is inherently constrained by the accuracy of retrosynthesis prediction. Inspired by how chemists use different strategies to ideate reactions, we propose Chimera: a framework for building highly accurate reaction models that combine predictions from diverse sources with complementary inductive biases using a learning-based ensembling strategy. We instantiate the framework with two newly developed models, which already by themselves achieve state of the art in their categories. Through experiments across several orders of magnitude in data scale and time-splits, we show Chimera outperforms all major models by a large margin, owing both to the good individual performance of its constituents, but also to the scalability of our ensembling strategy. Moreover, we find that PhD-level organic chemists prefer predictions from Chimera over baselines in terms of quality. Finally, we transfer the largest-scale checkpoint to an internal dataset from a major pharmaceutical company, showing robust generalization under distribution shift. With the new dimension that our framework unlocks, we anticipate further acceleration in the development of even more accurate models.

Introduction

Chemical Synthesis is central to the discovery and supply of small molecule-based medicines, materials, and fine chemicals. However, as syntheses often

fail, and thus constitute a critical bottleneck, using computational methods to propose better synthesis routes is highly desirable. Computer-aided synthesis planning has a long research tradition, going back to the vision of Vleduts and Corey in the 1950ies, with tools usually implemented via rule-based expert systems.^{1,2} However, over several decades progress had been limited.³ Only recently, by reframing synthesis planning as a machine learning (ML) problem, where deep neural networks are trained on large reaction datasets to predict synthetic disconnections and reaction outcomes, which are then coupled with neural-guided search, a paradigm shift has been achieved.^{4,5} Since then, several new ML models⁶⁻¹⁴ and search algorithms¹⁵⁻¹⁸ have been introduced. Incorporated into tools for retrosynthetic search, which are increasingly used in computational workflows and as a source of inspiration for route planning, ML-based synthesis planning has been experimentally validated.¹⁹⁻²¹

Concurrently, Corey’s expert system approach of manually coding reaction rules has been reimplemented^{22,23} by Szymkuc and coworkers, and experimentally validated on hand-selected test cases.^{24,25}

While conceptually ML-based synthesis planning promises viable scaling with the ever-growing body of knowledge of organic chemistry in the literature, patents, and electronic laboratory notebooks, so far, compared to hand-coded expert systems, ML-based planning suffered from limited accuracy in particular for rare reaction classes. In addition, chemists often combine multiple strategies, from direct pattern matching to envisioning new transformations, which contemporary computational approaches currently do not reflect.

In this work, we introduce Chimera, a framework for retrosynthesis prediction that uses an ensemble of models with diverse inductive biases and a learning-to-rank strategy. Instantiated with two newly introduced state-of-the-art models – one based on edit rules and one on de-novo generation using a modern Transformer – we achieve high accuracy on common




Figure 1: Framework for ensemble-based retrosynthesis with learned reranking.

and rare reactions alike, as well as superior performance in multi-step search. We show quantitatively that organic chemists prefer Chimera over its components.

Computer-Aided Synthesis Planning

Systems for Computer-Aided Synthesis Planning usually perform retrosynthesis, i.e. predicting transformations which correspond to reverse chemical reactions starting with the target molecule, and have four components: (1) a single-step model or algorithm to propose transformations that correspond to feasible reactions in the forward direction, (2) a search algorithm that chains together transformations into multi-step routes, (3) ranking criteria for the routes, and (4) admissible building block molecules into which the target has to be deconstructed.^{26,27} Thus, an accurate single-step model is crucial as it defines the search space of possible reactions to explore. As the model is called recursively during search, the requirements for accuracy are very strict, as errors compound with multiple steps, and a single error will invalidate the entire route.

Current single-step models can be classified into *editing* models, which change only the parts of the molecule involved in the reaction, e.g. make or break bonds and add leaving groups, or *de-novo* models, which generate the reactant structures from scratch, including regeneration of the unchanged parts. While in recent years several models have been proposed, high accuracy still poses a significant challenge, especially for reaction types of lower precedence.^{6–13,28–34} However, rarer reactions are often highly specific and strategically useful.

Ensembling

Model ensembling is an ML technique where several models trained to perform the same task are combined to obtain better performance than any of the

ensembled models would in isolation.³⁵ It is believed to work best when the models being combined are diverse.³⁶ While ensembling for reaction prediction and retrosynthesis has been attempted, results have been limited so far. Schwaller et al.⁷ ensemble up to 20 forward reaction models, but report only minimal gains at the cost of a significant increase in inference time. However, they employ the default method in OpenNMT,³⁷ which averages next token probability distributions predicted by the different models, and is limited to models sharing the same output space.

Combinations of models have been reported with specialized models for ring-forming reactions³⁸ or enzymatic catalysis.^{39,40} Lin et al.⁴¹ combine outputs from different models, but determining the final order relies on a separately trained ranking model, effectively discarding the rich information present in the order predicted by the original models. Torren-Peraire observed differences in the solutions different single-step models find.⁴² In a recent paper by Saigiridharan et al., it was explicitly pointed out that while different models have been combined ad-hoc,⁴² no principled ensembling approach is available.⁴³

In retrosynthesis prediction, instead of directly ensembling in token probability space, we can also perform count-based ensembling in the molecule space by aggregating outputs shared by ensembled models, which we hypothesize to be more expressive. Moreover, count-based ensembling is much more versatile, as it can ensemble any set of models, as well as other non-model sources of reactions; for example, it would allow to mix in proposals coming from lookups in reaction databases, or manual input from chemists.

Proposed ensembling strategy We propose a strategy to merge several output ranking lists based on overlaps between them, which for the first time leads to substantial gains over the ensembled models.

Given ranked outputs $r_{i,k}$ from m retrosynthesis models, where $r_{i,k}$ denotes the k -th top prediction from the i -th model, we rank unique reactant sets r

by decreasing $\text{score}(r)$ defined as

$$\text{score}(r) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{k_{max}} \mathbb{1}[r = r_{i,k}] \cdot \theta_{i,k}, \quad (1)$$

where k_{max} is the maximum number of predictions considered per model and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times k_{max}}$; we omit the dependence of score and losses defined below on θ for clarity. In other words, a reactant set occurring on rank k in the output of model i is assigned score $\theta_{i,k}$, with the scores aggregated over the models. Intuitively, reactant sets that rank high across several models simultaneously will be assigned a larger score than those suggested only by a single model.

To determine ensembling weights θ we propose to learn them from model predictions on the validation set \mathcal{D}_{val} . Inspired by work on learning to rank,⁴⁴ we learn θ by minimizing the following ranking loss

$$\mathcal{L}_{rank} = \mathbb{E}_{(p,r^+) \in \mathcal{D}_{val}} \sum_{r^- \in \mathcal{R}^-} \mathcal{L}_{rank}(r^+, r^-), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{R}^- = \{r_{i,k} : r_{i,k} \neq r^+\}$ is the set of model predictions differing from the ground-truth r^+ . Loss stemming from a particular (r^+, r^-) pair is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{rank}(r^+, r^-) = \sigma \left(\frac{\text{score}(r^-) - \text{score}(r^+) + \epsilon}{T} \right),$$

where ϵ is a small constant. For $\epsilon, T \rightarrow 0$, $\mathcal{L}_{rank}(r^+, r^-) \rightarrow \mathbb{1}[\text{score}(r^-) > \text{score}(r^+)]$, i.e. indicator of whether r^+ and r^- are ordered incorrectly. In the limit \mathcal{L}_{rank} has zero gradients almost everywhere, thus in practice we start with $T > 0$ and linearly anneal it to 0 over the course of optimization.

One could minimize \mathcal{L}_{rank} directly, but small validation set size and poor coverage of cases where r^+ appears at higher ranks lead to overfitting and poor generalization. To fix this, we constrain θ to be decreasing and convex ($\theta_{i,k} > \theta_{i,k+1}$ and $\theta_{i,k} - \theta_{i,k+1} > \theta_{i,k+1} - \theta_{i,k+2}$), expressing the intuition that later ranks are less likely to be correct, and differences between ranks are more pronounced closer to the top.

In the experiments we optimize θ on the validation set of the considered dataset and then evaluate on the test set; see Methods for more details and hyperparameters of this procedure. We find that our strategy consistently outperforms other approaches, and learns non-trivial schemes where relative model importance depends on k (Extended Data Figure 6).

Ensembling public models on USPTO-50K

To test our ensembling strategy, we consider 7 retrosynthesis models available as part of syntheseus:⁴⁵ Chemformer,⁴⁶ GLN,⁸ Graph2Edits,⁴⁷ LocalRetro,⁹

MEGAN,²⁹ RetroKNN¹² and R-SMILES.¹⁰ We additionally retrain R-SMILES – the best performing model in this set – to study the effect of ensembling two instances of the same model; we refer to it as R-SMILES’. We also include our reimplementation of a template classification model, which has in later literature been referred to as NeuralSym.⁴ We focus on $m = 2$ and study the results of all pairwise model combinations (Extended Data Figure 7). Remarkably, ensembling any model pair results in performance better than attained by either model in isolation. This is true even when combining a strong model with a much weaker one: for example, top-5 accuracy of R-SMILES can be improved by 0.9% by ensembling with MEGAN, and 1.5% by ensembling with GLN, despite both being significantly weaker than R-SMILES. We also note the emergence of model clusters which show only a small benefit from being combined: NeuralSym and GLN (both based on global prediction of standard reaction templates), LocalRetro and RetroKNN (based on local prediction of minimal templates), and the two checkpoints of R-SMILES. This suggests diversity is key to strong performance of the ensemble; consequently, best result for a particular top-k is not obtained by ensembling the two top performers on that metric, but rather the best model with one belonging to a different cluster, e.g. the de-novo R-SMILES model with an editing model such as LocalRetro.

This motivates us to propose *two* new models – one based on molecule editing and one on de-novo generation – and investigate the performance of their ensemble at scale. Prior work often considers model ensembles as incomparable to individual models due to higher computational cost,⁷ but we challenge this assumption by noting that ensembling a fast editing model with a de-novo Transformer can lead to only a negligible increase in inference cost over the latter. In the following sections, we introduce our models and benchmark them at increasing data scales.

Ensembles discussed above already set a new state of the art on USPTO-50K, even outperforming model-reranker combinations.⁴¹ However, in the following sections we show even better performance by utilizing our proposed models and larger ensembles.

Model architecture

We instantiate Chimera as an ensemble of two separately trained models – one based on molecule editing and one on de-novo generation – each designed to address specific limitations in their respective modeling classes. As the edit-based model can be implemented very efficiently, Chimera delivers inference cost comparable to a single de-novo model such as R-SMILES,




Figure 2: **a**, Architecture of the editing model (NeuralLoc). Product and templates are encoded through Graph Neural Network encoders to produce contextualized atom representations. Template scores are computed by multiplying product representation with template representations. Localization scores are computed as products of product atom representations and template left-hand side atom representations. All templates in the batch are used for classification, but only a subset is used for localization for a given product. **b-e**, Inference process. **b**, Product is input into the network (atom IDs are not part of model input; shown to contextualize the localization). **c**, Classification head selects a template from the library. **d**, Product and template atom representations determine localization scores (shown for first 15 atoms). **e**, As the template is symmetric, application produces two reactant sets depending on how the C:5-C:6 bond is matched. Localization differentiates them, suggesting to match C:5 in the product with C:5 in the template (red square in **d**). This proceeds for several top templates; resulting reactants are ranked based on a combination of classification and localization. In this case, NeuralLoc correctly prefers the result that is more chemically plausible.

however – as seen in the later sections – with superior predictive performance.

Editing Model Molecule-editing models are generally believed to stay closer to the data distribution due to reliance on symbolic transformations that have support in the training data, especially when the edits are limited to stricter reaction rules or templates. Even though they were the first ML-based retrosynthesis model, template classification continues to be a default choice in commonly used workflows. However, two limitations hinder these models at scale: (1) weights responsible for choosing the template are usually treated as free parameters, precluding repre-

sentational transfer between templates; and (2) applying a selected template can produce more than one prediction due to multiple locations in the input molecule matching its left-hand side, and these alternatives are often not differentiated. Prior work has explored partial solutions to these challenges: (1) by using a template encoder to handle uncommon templates through transfer from similar ones,⁴⁸ and (2) by separately predicting the reaction centre to constrain template match^{8,9,49} or by introducing a separate module to rank the final reactant sets.⁸ However, narrowing the template application to a chosen reaction centre may not be enough to uniquely specify the reactants in case of symmetries (Figure 2c).

Inspired by these works we design a new template

classification model (Figure 2a), which we term NeuralLoc. Apart from an encoder for the input product as in NeuralSym, NeuralLoc also contains a separate template encoder; unlike MHNreact,⁴⁸ this encoder directly processes the template as a graph using a specialized featurization method for graph rewrites (Methods). Our model produces template probabilities by multiplying template and product representations, which are input to a standard cross-entropy classification loss. To predict where the template needs to be applied, we utilize node-level representations of the atoms in the product pattern of the template, and perform an all-pairs dot product with atom-level representations for the input molecule; intuitively, these products predict the likelihood that a particular atom in the product pattern should be matched to a particular atom in the input. We denote the result of normalizing these values via softmax across the input atoms as localization scores; these scores are input to a localization loss which sums appropriate cross-entropy losses over the product pattern atoms. NeuralLoc is trained end-to-end to minimize the sum of classification and localization losses; during inference (Figure 2b-e) we first call the classification branch to select a number of top templates, and then compute the localization scores for those to globally rank the resulting reactants based on a weighted sum of both objectives; see Methods for architectural details, hyperparameters, and description of model training and inference.

De-Novo Model To develop our new de-novo model, we build upon the Seq2Seq framework pioneered by Liu et al,⁶ and the recently successful R-SMILES model,^{7,10} which utilizes an aligned SMILES format to represent input products and ground-truth reactants. This involves training an encoder-decoder model based on the Transformer architecture.⁵⁰⁻⁵² Unlike previous work relying on the OpenNMT library,³⁷ we employ an improved architecture with three modifications. First, we use Group-Query Attention (GQA)⁵³ instead of standard multi-head attention, which reduces computational complexity by sharing query vectors within groups. Second, we apply pre-normalization using RMSNorm,⁵⁴ which is simpler and more efficient than LayerNorm. Third, in the feedforward layers, we incorporate the SwiGLU activation⁵⁵ in place of ReLU, enhancing expressivity and improving gradient flow. These modifications increase the model’s accuracy and inference speed. The model is trained by minimizing cross-entropy loss on reactant sequences. Finally, we also refined the beam search algorithm. Unlike OpenNMT, which keeps completed sequences until two conditions are met – the pool size equals the beam size and the top-rated

sequence in the beam is lower in quality than all in the pool – our method maintains finished sequences in the beam. The process ends only when each sequence in the beam finishes with the EOS token. We refer to our updated model as R-SMILES 2 (Extended Data Figure 8); see Methods for more details.

Results on reaction prediction

To investigate the performance of our framework and models, we perform initial ensembling experiments on USPTO-50K – a commonly used small benchmark dataset – and then scale up to the largest available public dataset and better curated in-house datasets.

USPTO For an initial comparison on public data we use established USPTO-50K and USPTO-FULL datasets preprocessed by prior work.⁸ We follow best evaluation practices⁴⁵ and use syntheseus to benchmark our models as well as those baselines that are integrated into the library. We selected the baselines to include best performing methods while avoiding juxtaposing results obtained on different dataset versions which was often done in prior work; see Methods for further discussion.

We find that NeuralLoc and R-SMILES 2 generally match or surpass the state of the art within their own model classes, while Chimera performs better than either and sets new state of the art for $k > 1$ on both USPTO-50K and USPTO-FULL, pushing the top-10 accuracy by 1.7% and 1.6%, respectively (Extended Data Figure 9a, Extended Data Tables 1 and 2). To test the scaling of our ensembling strategy, we also evaluated an ensemble containing both our proposed models and most of the baselines, and found it pushes the state of the art even further, although it may not be practical due to excessive resources required for inference. Nevertheless, these results may inspire future work to distill the knowledge present in a large ensemble back into a single model.

To obtain a good trade-off between resource requirements and accuracy, we limit the following experiments to ensembling pairs of models, and scale Chimera to larger and more diverse datasets.

Pistachio We scale our models to the proprietary Pistachio dataset, which is better curated and represents more than a 3.5x increase in number of samples compared to USPTO-FULL. We use the data prepared by Maziarz et al,⁴⁵ where reactions present in the database as of June 2023 were grouped by product and randomly split into three folds. We reuse the training and validation sets, and build a new test set relying on time-split. Specifically, we use reactions that were added to Pistachio in 2024, were marked




Figure 3: Benchmarking Pistachio-trained models (our models shown as solid lines, baselines as dashed). **a**, Accuracy on Pistachio (left) and Novartis data (right). **b**, Top-50 accuracy on Pistachio with samples grouped by fingerprint similarity to a training product (left) or template frequency (middle, right). **c**, Fraction of non-ground-truth predictions accepted by feasibility model (left) and forward model (right), as a function of position in the output list; dashed line shows the acceptance rate of dataset ground-truths. **d**, Solve rate on the SimpRetro dataset (left) and on hard products from Pistachio (right). **e**, Model ratings estimated from pairwise expert comparison. Percentages show predicted win rate (difference of 70 ELO corresponds to a win rate of $\approx 60\%$).

as high quality by the database curator, and whose product had fingerprint similarity to a training product below 0.95 (see Methods for details). This gave rise to a high quality test set of 146 393 reactions both temporally and structurally separate from the data seen by the models during training and validation; we use it as our default test set and defer the results on the original test set to Extended Data Figure 9. As there are no published results on this version of Pistachio, we also train and evaluate selected baselines (LocalRetro, R-SMILES, NeuralSym).

Similarly to the results on USPTO, our models establish state-of-the-art performance within their respective model classes (Figure 3a). Chimera matches

the robust performance of R-SMILES 2 for small k while delivering much stronger results for larger k due to the pooling of diverse inductive biases from its constituents. With only 10 of its top results, Chimera reaches the accuracy of considering 50 results from the best baseline R-SMILES.

To further understand the strengths of the individual models, we analysed top-50 recall as a function of fingerprint similarity to training data, as well as frequency of the ground-truth template (Figure 3b, see Methods for details). All models perform better on reactions more similar to training data, or those utilizing more common templates. When moving farther from training data, de-novo models degrade less

abruptly than edit-based ones, giving credence to a common belief that the former may generalize better.^{34,56} While R-SMILES 2 outperforms Neural-Loc on reactions with little to no template precedence, for moderate template support the trend reverses, showing that our editing model can learn to use a template effectively from just a few examples.

When the models are combined into Chimera, their complementary inductive biases lead to superior performance for both frequent and rare reaction types alike, effectively addressing the "rare reactions problem". Moreover, Chimera reaches close to optimal recall on well-precedented reactions.

Transfer to internal data To assess performance on real world medicinal chemistry, we also test Chimera together with its constituents on a dataset of 10 444 reactions extracted from an internal database maintained by Novartis. This is conducted in a zero-shot setting, where no additional finetuning of the models is performed, and ensembling coefficients θ are kept as determined on Pistachio. While top-1 accuracy is comparatively lower compared to Pistachio (Figure 3a), which could be due to distribution shift, Chimera still delivers the best performance, outperforming both R-SMILES 2 and NeuralLoc. This highlights that Chimera can be used beyond its original data distribution with no extra training, and bring strong performance in a real-world setting. We anticipate performance would likely improve with further fine-tuning.

Reaction quality Accuracy only tests how well a given model can recall the ground-truth reactions, but not whether its non-ground-truth predictions are reasonable, which is arguably more important for multi-step search.⁴⁵ To assess how feasible model outputs are overall, it is common to either feed the predicted reactants to a forward model to measure round-trip accuracy,^{9,57} or feed entire reactions to a feasibility model.¹⁴ In general, feasibility models are preferred as those are typically trained with both positive and negative reactions, and can handle cases where the reactants would not react.⁴⁵ For our analysis we explore both routes: we trained a forward model based on the R-SMILES 2 architecture and a feasibility model based on the approach of Gaiński et al.¹⁴ Both models were trained on Pistachio; see Methods for details.

Analysing quality of k top predictions can be confounded by some models having higher top- k accuracy, while others returning less than k outputs altogether. To study the quality of non-ground-truth predictions directly, we filter the test products to those where all compared models return at least k outputs and recover the ground-truth answer within that; af-

ter removing the ground-truths from the output lists, we obtain $k - 1$ non-ground-truth predictions for each input, which are fed into subsequent analysis.

We set $k = 10$ and filter the Pistachio test set down to 113 135 products ($\approx 66.7\%$) according to the aforementioned criteria, with 9 non-ground-truth predictions associated with each. We then run both quality assessment models on the ground-truth reactions for those products, and calibrate so that each accepts around 95% of ground-truths; for the forward model this translates to accepting a reaction if its product is within top 2 predicted products given the reactants, while for the feasibility model if the predicted feasibility is above 0.1. With these thresholds we use the models as binary filters, and compute average acceptance rate for each reaction model and rank (Figure 3c). Interestingly, we see the two scoring models partially disagree in their ranking of the different reaction models: while both the forward and feasibility model consider Chimera of higher quality than R-SMILES 2, the forward model judges Neural-Loc much more highly. This highlights that while the two approaches to scoring correctly distinguish generated predictions from ground-truths, they do so by leveraging disparate heuristics.

Results on multi-step search

SimpRetro To benchmark Chimera in multi-step search we integrate our models into syntheseus, and start with an initial exploration of success rate on a dataset collected by Li et al.⁵⁸ We reuse the experimental setup from SimpRetro, including the choice of the search algorithm, building blocks (23.1M commercially available molecules from *eMolecules*), GPU type, and time limit. We consistently see higher success rates than SimpRetro, with Chimera also outperforming its constituent models, and obtaining close to 100% solve rate under the largest time limit (Figure 3d). However, the creation of the SimpRetro test set did not control for similarity to Pistachio training data. To supplement this initial analysis, we move to a harder dataset of targets based on Pistachio.

Pistachio To collect a challenging search dataset sufficiently distinct from training data, we started with Pistachio test products and performed a sequence of filtering and clustering steps. Specifically, we kept molecules with high SAScore,⁵⁹ filtered out outliers, selected a diverse subset based on fingerprint similarity, and finally removed molecules for which a short search using NeuralSym could find any routes (see Methods for details). This procedure left us with 951 hard targets which we split into 151 for validation and 800 for testing.




Figure 4: Example routes identified by Chimera. Targets were selected from the Pistachio test set, and represent commonly observed challenges in state-of-the-art medicinal chemistry synthesis. Note that in route **a** (from **5** to **6**) the model proposes to use a less frequent Hemetsberger–Knittel indole synthesis. As reagents, solvents and reaction conditions were not predicted in this study, they were omitted from the depiction. Boc is tert-butyloxycarbonyl.

We search with Retro^{*15} using the same building block set as used in SimpRetro. To ensure a fair comparison, we first tuned temperature for every model on validation targets, and then used the best value for test targets. Generally, all of our models yield a better solve rate than the baselines, with NeuralLoc performing best early on due to its higher efficiency, but losing to R-SMILES 2 and Chimera in the long run (Figure 3d). Chimera performs best for medium-to-long search times, and finds routes for even highly challenging molecules (Figure 4).

Qualitative analysis

In order to understand the complementary strengths of our proposed models, as well as how ensembling manages to improve upon their results, we run qualitative analyses using the models trained on Pistachio.

Quality assessment by experts To measure the quality of model predictions, we conducted double-blind AB-tests between models. Here, predictions for the same target molecule from two models were presented to PhD-level organic chemists, who were asked to express preference for one of the options.

We determine model scores using a Bradley-Terry model and scale them to form ELO scores (Figure 3e). Interestingly, NeuralLoc and R-SMILES 2 exhibit similar quality, while Chimera is clearly preferred. As a control, we employed a baseline which naively applies only uncommon reaction templates without any ML ranking; we normalized the ELO ratings so that this model has rating 0 (see Methods for details and Extended Data Figure 10 for all pairwise win rates).

Ensembling visualization To visualize what errors are being made by our models and how ensembling helps to mitigate them, we used an early ver-




Figure 5: Visualization of how predictions from R-SMILES 2 and NeuralLoc are combined by Chimera. Molecule in row i and column j is the j -th reactant set predicted by the i -th model. (A, B) \rightarrow C denotes that a prediction was rank A in the output of R-SMILES 2, rank B in the output of NeuralLoc, and rank C in the combined output (X signifies a prediction was not found in one of the lists). Segments connect molecules that are shared. Green box is ground-truth, red box highlights a hallucinated prediction which is chemically implausible.

sion of the feasibility model with a low acceptance threshold to mine unlikely predictions on Pistachio test data. In a selected example (Figure 5), we see that while all models correctly predict the ground-truth as their first prediction, they diverge further down the list. In particular, the 5th output from R-SMILES 2 is an erroneous version of the ground truth, where one of the rings has been turned aromatic. As this is chemically implausible and not covered by template library, it is not predicted by NeuralLoc, and thus downweighed in Chimera’s outputs in favour of predictions shared by both submodels. Note that the unlikely prediction still appears in Chimera’s output; while in this case it may seem undesirable, many predictions made only by R-SMILES 2 turn out to be correct, which is reflected in the ensembling weights θ . Our ensembling formalism permits a solution in which outputs predicted by both models are ranked above those predicted by only one of the models, but this is not selected by the optimization procedure due to being empirically inferior on the validation set.

After further analysis, we found more instances of mistakes made by R-SMILES 2: copy errors (Extended Data Figure 11), implausible bond-breaking reactions (Extended Data Figure 12), and duplicating one of the reactants (Extended Data Figure 13). These cases are ranked lower by Chimera. However,

note that these examples were purposefully cherry-picked to be erroneous; our models generally make qualitatively reasonable predictions for most inputs.

Conclusion

In this work, we introduced a meta-framework for building more powerful retrosynthesis models by ensembling. Instantiated with two new models exhibiting favorable performance in their own categories, we demonstrated Chimera’s efficacy on commonly used datasets. Through time-split experiments, we provided key insight into the strengths of different model classes. For the first time, we have demonstrated close to optimal retrieval for rare reaction classes, and shown that the ensemble is preferred over single models. In search experiments on both existing and new benchmarks, we validated that Chimera’s strong performance carries over to multi-step search.

We hope that our results open up ensembling strategies as a new dimension of optimization, and also inspire new developments using the latest progress in Transformers, as well as more powerful representation learning for chemical transformations, to achieve the goal of even more accurate retrosynthesis models in the future.

Code Availability

Source code and models are currently being prepared for release.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Bichlien Nguyen, Jake Smith and Fabio Lima for helpful chemistry discussions; Jingyun Bai for design; Usman Munir for help with project management and open-sourcing; Elise van der Pol and Jose Garrido Torres for useful discussions on reaction prediction and retrosynthesis; Austin Tripp for his contributions to syntheseus; Hannes Schulz, Jean Helie, Maik Riechert and Ran Bi for engineering support; Junren Li, Paola Gori Giorgi and Rianne van den Berg for feedback; and Tao Qin for helpful discussions and guidance. Moreover, we would like to acknowledge the whole AI for Science team at Microsoft Research, as well as our collaborators at Novartis, for their ongoing support.

Contributions

Krzysztof, Guoqing and Marwin conceptualized the work. Guoqing created R-SMILES 2, while Krzysztof developed NeuralLoc and the ensembling procedure. Hubert and Aleksei performed evaluations on Novartis data. Holger, Rishi and Mike advised the project. Piotr built the feasibility model, which was scaled up to Pistachio by Krzysztof. Guoqing built the forward model. Marwin performed data curation, analysed model outputs, and conducted the study with expert chemists. Krzysztof ran the search experiments. Paper was written by Krzysztof, Guoqing and Marwin, with feedback from the other authors. The project was mentored by Marwin.

References

- [1] Vleduts, G. Concerning one system of classification and codification of organic reactions. *Information Storage and Retrieval* **1**, 117–146 (1963).
- [2] Corey, E. J. & Wipke, W. T. Computer-assisted design of complex organic syntheses: Pathways for molecular synthesis can be devised with a computer and equipment for graphical communication. *Science* **166**, 178–192 (1969).
- [3] Ihlenfeldt, W.-D. & Gasteiger, J. Computer-assisted planning of organic syntheses: the second generation of programs. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition in English* **34**, 2613–2633 (1996).
- [4] Segler, M. H. & Waller, M. P. Neural-symbolic machine learning for retrosynthesis and reaction prediction. *Chemistry—A European Journal* **23**, 5966–5971 (2017).
- [5] Segler, M. H., Preuss, M. & Waller, M. P. Planning chemical syntheses with deep neural networks and symbolic ai. *Nature* **555**, 604–610 (2018).
- [6] Liu, B. *et al.* Retrosynthetic reaction prediction using neural sequence-to-sequence models. *ACS central science* **3**, 1103–1113 (2017).
- [7] Schwaller, P. *et al.* Molecular transformer: a model for uncertainty-calibrated chemical reaction prediction. *ACS central science* **5**, 1572–1583 (2019).
- [8] Dai, H., Li, C., Coley, C., Dai, B. & Song, L. Retrosynthesis prediction with conditional graph logic network. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **32** (2019).
- [9] Chen, S. & Jung, Y. Deep retrosynthetic reaction prediction using local reactivity and global attention. *JACS Au* **1**, 1612–1620 (2021).
- [10] Zhong, Z. *et al.* Root-aligned smiles: a tight representation for chemical reaction prediction. *Chemical Science* **13**, 9023–9034 (2022).
- [11] Igashov, I., Schneuing, A., Segler, M., Bronstein, M. & Correia, B. Retrobridge: Modeling retrosynthesis with markov bridges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16212* (2023).
- [12] Xie, S. *et al.* Retrosynthesis prediction with local template retrieval. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, 5330–5338 (2023).
- [13] Laabid, N., Rissanen, S., Heinonen, M., Solin, A. & Garg, V. Alignment is key for applying diffusion models to retrosynthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17656* (2024).
- [14] Gaiński, P. *et al.* Retrogn: Diverse and feasible retrosynthesis using gflownets. In *Workshop on Generative and Experimental Perspectives for Biomolecular Design (ICLR-W 2024)* (2024).
- [15] Chen, B., Li, C., Dai, H. & Song, L. Retro*: learning retrosynthetic planning with neural guided a* search. In *International conference on machine learning*, 1608–1616 (PMLR, 2020).
- [16] Xie, S. *et al.* Retrograph: Retrosynthetic planning with graph search. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2120–2129 (2022).

- [17] Liu, G. *et al.* Retrosynthetic planning with dual value networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 22266–22276 (PMLR, 2023).
- [18] Tripp, A., Maziarz, K., Lewis, S., Segler, M. & Hernández-Lobato, J. M. Retro-fallback: retrosynthetic planning in an uncertain world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09270* (2023).
- [19] Coley, C. W. *et al.* A robotic platform for flow synthesis of organic compounds informed by ai planning. *Science* **365**, eaax1566 (2019).
- [20] Genheden, S. *et al.* Aizynthfinder: a fast, robust and flexible open-source software for retrosynthetic planning. *Journal of cheminformatics* **12**, 70 (2020).
- [21] Shields, J. D. *et al.* Aizynth impact on medicinal chemistry practice at astrazeneca. *RSC Medicinal Chemistry* **15**, 1085–1095 (2024).
- [22] Hastedt, F. *et al.* Investigating the reliability and interpretability of machine learning frameworks for chemical retrosynthesis. *Digital Discovery* **3**, 1194–1212 (2024).
- [23] Schwaller, P. *et al.* Machine intelligence for chemical reaction space. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science* **12**, e1604 (2022).
- [24] Klucznik, T. *et al.* Efficient syntheses of diverse, medically relevant targets planned by computer and executed in the laboratory. *Chem* **4**, 522–532 (2018).
- [25] Mikulak-Klucznik, B. *et al.* Computational planning of the synthesis of complex natural products. *Nature* **588**, 83–88 (2020).
- [26] Strieth-Kalthoff, F., Sandfort, F., Segler, M. H. & Glorius, F. Machine learning the ropes: principles, applications and directions in synthetic chemistry. *Chemical Society Reviews* **49**, 6154–6168 (2020).
- [27] Tu, Z., Stuyver, T. & Coley, C. W. Predictive chemistry: machine learning for reaction deployment, reaction development, and reaction discovery. *Chemical science* **14**, 226–244 (2023).
- [28] Tetko, I. V., Karpov, P., Van Deursen, R. & Godin, G. State-of-the-art augmented nlp transformer models for direct and single-step retrosynthesis. *Nature communications* **11**, 5575 (2020).
- [29] Sacha, M. *et al.* Molecule edit graph attention network: modeling chemical reactions as sequences of graph edits. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* **61**, 3273–3284 (2021).
- [30] Hassen, A. K. *et al.* Mind the retrosynthesis gap: bridging the divide between single-step and multi-step retrosynthesis prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.11809* (2022).
- [31] Tu, Z. & Coley, C. W. Permutation invariant graph-to-sequence model for template-free retrosynthesis and reaction prediction. *Journal of chemical information and modeling* **62**, 3503–3513 (2022).
- [32] Wang, Y. *et al.* Retrosynthesis prediction with an interpretable deep-learning framework based on molecular assembly tasks. *Nature Communications* **14**, 6155 (2023).
- [33] Zhang, X., Mo, Y., Wang, W. & Yang, Y. Retrosynthesis prediction enhanced by in-silico reaction data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00086* (2024).
- [34] Westerlund, A. M. *et al.* Do chemformers dream of organic matter? evaluating a transformer model for multistep retrosynthesis. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* **64**, 3021–3033 (2024).
- [35] Sewell, M. Ensemble learning. *RN* **11**, 1–34 (2008).
- [36] Theisen, R., Kim, H., Yang, Y., Hodgkinson, L. & Mahoney, M. W. When are ensembles really effective? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36** (2024).
- [37] Klein, G., Kim, Y., Deng, Y., Senellart, J. & Rush, A. OpenNMT: Open-source toolkit for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of ACL 2017, System Demonstrations*, 67–72 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Vancouver, Canada, 2017). URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P17-4012>.
- [38] Thakkar, A., Selmi, N., Reymond, J.-L., Engkvist, O. & Bjerrum, E. J. “ring breaker”: neural network driven synthesis prediction of the ring system chemical space. *Journal of medicinal chemistry* **63**, 8791–8808 (2020).
- [39] Levin, I., Liu, M., Voigt, C. A. & Coley, C. W. Merging enzymatic and synthetic chemistry with computational synthesis planning. *Nature Communications* **13**, 7747 (2022).

- [40] Kim, T. *et al.* Readretro: natural product biosynthesis predicting with retrieval-augmented dual-view retrosynthesis. *New Phytologist* (2024).
- [41] Lin, M. H., Tu, Z. & Coley, C. W. Improving the performance of models for one-step retrosynthesis through re-ranking. *Journal of cheminformatics* **14**, 15 (2022).
- [42] Torren-Peraire, P. *et al.* Models matter: The impact of single-step retrosynthesis on synthesis planning. *Digital Discovery* **3**, 558–572 (2024).
- [43] Saigiridharan, L. *et al.* Aizynthfinder 4.0: developments based on learnings from 3 years of industrial application. *Journal of Cheminformatics* **16**, 57 (2024).
- [44] Burges, C. *et al.* Learning to rank using gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, 89–96 (2005).
- [45] Maziarz, K. *et al.* Re-evaluating retrosynthesis algorithms with syntheseus. *Faraday Discussions* (2024).
- [46] Irwin, R., Dimitriadis, S., He, J. & Bjerrum, E. J. Chemformer: a pre-trained transformer for computational chemistry. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology* **3**, 015022 (2022).
- [47] Zhong, W., Yang, Z. & Chen, C. Y.-C. Retrosynthesis prediction using an end-to-end graph generative architecture for molecular graph editing. *Nature Communications* **14**, 3009 (2023).
- [48] Seidl, P. *et al.* Improving few-and zero-shot reaction template prediction using modern hopfield networks. *Journal of chemical information and modeling* **62**, 2111–2120 (2022).
- [49] Sacha, M., Sadowski, M., Kozakowski, P., van Workum, R. & Jastrzębski, S. Molecule-edit templates for efficient and accurate retrosynthesis prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07313* (2023).
- [50] Vaswani, A. *et al.* Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **30** (2017).
- [51] Touvron, H. *et al.* Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models (2023). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288>. 2307.09288.
- [52] Jiang, A. Q. *et al.* Mistral 7b (2023). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06825>. 2310.06825.
- [53] Ainslie, J. *et al.* GQA: Training generalized multi-query transformer models from multi-head checkpoints. In Bouamor, H., Pino, J. & Bali, K. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 4895–4901 (Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 2023). URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.298>.
- [54] Zhang, B. & Sennrich, R. Root mean square layer normalization. In Wallach, H. *et al.* (eds.) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32 (Curran Associates, Inc., 2019). URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019/file/1e8a19426224ca89e83cef47f1e7f53b-Paper.pdf.
- [55] Shazeer, N. GLU variants improve transformer. *CoRR* **abs/2002.05202** (2020). URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.05202>. 2002.05202.
- [56] Tu, H., Shorewala, S., Ma, T. & Thost, V. Retrosynthesis prediction revisited. In *NeurIPS 2022 AI for Science: Progress and Promises* (2022).
- [57] Schwaller, P., Nair, V. H., Petraglia, R. & Laino, T. Evaluation metrics for single-step retrosynthetic models. In *Second Workshop on Machine Learning and the Physical Sciences* (NeurIPS Vancouver, Canada, 2019).
- [58] Li, J., Lin, K., Pei, J. & Lai, L. Challenging complexity with simplicity: Rethinking the role of single-step models in computer-aided synthesis planning. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* **64**, 5470–5479 (2024).
- [59] Ertl, P. & Schuffenhauer, A. Estimation of synthetic accessibility score of drug-like molecules based on molecular complexity and fragment contributions. *Journal of cheminformatics* **1**, 1–11 (2009).
- [60] Kingma, D. P. & Ba, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [61] Paszke, A. *et al.* Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **32** (2019).
- [62] Willett, P., Barnard, J. M. & Downs, G. M. Chemical similarity searching. *Journal of chemical information and computer sciences* **38**, 983–996 (1998).

- [63] Steffen, A., Kogej, T., Tyrchan, C. & Engkvist, O. Comparison of molecular fingerprint methods on the basis of biological profile data. *Journal of chemical information and modeling* **49**, 338–347 (2009).
- [64] Li, M. *et al.* Dgl-lifesci: An open-source toolkit for deep learning on graphs in life science. *ACS Omega* (2021).
- [65] Heid, E., Liu, J., Aude, A. & Green, W. H. Influence of template size, canonicalization, and exclusivity for retrosynthesis and reaction prediction applications. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* **62**, 16–26 (2021).
- [66] Corso, G., Cavalleri, L., Beaini, D., Liò, P. & Veličković, P. Principal neighbourhood aggregation for graph nets. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**, 13260–13271 (2020).
- [67] Fey, M. & Lenssen, J. E. Fast Graph Representation Learning with PyTorch Geometric (2019). URL https://github.com/pyg-team/pytorch_geometric.
- [68] Rampášek, L. *et al.* Recipe for a general, powerful, scalable graph transformer. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35**, 14501–14515 (2022).
- [69] Beaini, D. *et al.* Towards foundational models for molecular learning on large-scale multi-task datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04292* (2023).
- [70] Maziarz, K. *et al.* Learning to extend molecular scaffolds with structural motifs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2022)* (2022).
- [71] Zhai, X., Mustafa, B., Kolesnikov, A. & Beyer, L. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 11975–11986 (2023).
- [72] Han, Y. *et al.* Retrosynthesis prediction with an iterative string editing model. *Nature Communications* **15**, 6404 (2024).
- [73] Wang, X. *et al.* Retroprime: A diverse, plausible and transformer-based method for single-step retrosynthesis predictions. *Chemical Engineering Journal* **420**, 129845 (2021).
- [74] Yan, C. *et al.* Retroxpert: Decompose retrosynthesis prediction like a chemist. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**, 11248–11258 (2020).
- [75] Sheridan, R. P. Time-split cross-validation as a method for estimating the goodness of prospective prediction. *Journal of chemical information and modeling* **53**, 783–790 (2013).
- [76] Campello, R. J., Moulavi, D. & Sander, J. Density-based clustering based on hierarchical density estimates. In *Pacific-Asia conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, 160–172 (Springer, 2013).

Methods

Ensembling

We learn ensembling parameters θ using the Adam optimizer⁶⁰ to minimize $\mathcal{L}_{rank} + w_{reg} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{reg}$, where \mathcal{L}_{reg} is a regularization term to ensure relative model importance does not change too rapidly across ranks

$$\mathcal{L}_{reg} = \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{k_{max} - 1} \sum_{k=1}^{k_{max}-1} \left| \frac{\theta_{i,k}}{\theta_{j,k}} - \frac{\theta_{i,k+1}}{\theta_{j,k+1}} \right|$$

We find that a regularization of this form gives a modest improvement for $m = 2$ and is roughly neutral for large m ; we thus use a small weight of $w_{reg} = 0.2$.

Due to correlations between the rankings produced by the different models, in the majority of cases the relative ordering of r^+ and r^- is preserved across all models, especially when m is small. Those cases, while contributing non-zero gradient to \mathcal{L}_{rank} for $T > 0$, are bound to be ranked in the same way for any row-wise decreasing θ . Thus, in practice we skip those pairs (r^+ , r^-) in Equation 2 to reduce variance.

Constraining θ To reduce overfitting we fix θ to be decreasing and convex. To do this, we parameterize each θ_i as `flip(cumsum(cumsum(exp(x_i))))`, where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{k_{max}}$ are free parameters, `cumsum` computes a cumulative sum, and `flip` reverses the vector.

Implementation details To optimize θ , we first map the entire validation set into a single tensor containing ranks of r^+ and r^- across all models, which allows \mathcal{L}_{rank} to be computed efficiently through a handful of PyTorch⁶¹ primitives. We do not use batching, and instead optimize the full loss directly for 1000 steps. Both the learning rate and the temperature T start at 0.1 and decay by a factor of 0.9 every 25 steps. We set the margin ϵ in Equation 2 to 10^{-4} .

Fingerprint similarity

We make use of fingerprint similarity in several aspects of our work: filtering out near matches when constructing the Pistachio test set, bucketing the test samples for Figure 3b, and generating synthetic negative reactions for training the feasibility model.

In all cases we use count-based Morgan fingerprints with radius 2 folded modulo a large prime. To compute similarity between x and y we employ Tanimoto similarity adapted to count fingerprints:^{62,63}

$$\text{sim}(x, y) = \frac{\sum_i x_i y_i}{\sum_i x_i^2 + \sum_i y_i^2 - \sum_i x_i y_i}$$

In practice we care about all-pairs similarities between two large sets of molecules; we thus make use of

an efficient GPU-based implementation that pads the fingerprints to the nearest power of 2 and rephrases computing `sim` in terms of matrix multiplication.

Editing submodel (NeuralLoc)

Input featurization To featurize the input product, we follow prior work⁹ and represent a molecule as a graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with nodes V and edges E corresponding to atoms and bonds, respectively. To construct domain-specific node and edge features, we employ the featurizers available in the `dglife` library.⁶⁴ Specifically, we use `WeaveAtomFeaturizer` for atoms and `CanonicalBondFeaturizer` for bonds. Following `LocalRetro`⁹ we set the atom types supported by the atom featurizer to `dglife.data.uspto.atom_types` extended by Tantalum. We do not include loops in \mathcal{G} by setting `self_loop=False`.

Template featurization Prior work has explored simple template featurization by converting both sides to molecular fingerprints.⁴⁸ This offers limited flexibility, and only produces aggregate representations, while NeuralLoc requires node embeddings to perform localization; we therefore design a new template featurization method to meet this desiderata, which turns an input template into a graph.

As both sides of the template resemble molecular structures, a starting point is to convert them into two graphs $\mathcal{G}_L = (V_L, E_L)$ and $\mathcal{G}_R = (V_R, E_R)$, respectively. Structures involved in templates are often not fully complete or valid molecules, thus it is not possible to reuse the input featurizer directly. However, we find that if we switch to a basic atom featurizer (`CanonicalAtomFeaturizer` without the chiral tag feature), it is enough to parse the molecules using `MolToSmarts` followed by calling `UpdatePropertyCache(strict=False)` to get the graph featurization to work successfully. Apart from standard features that are taken into account by the atom featurizer, an atom on the left-hand side of a template can also be associated with an atom SMARTS – a logical pattern describing more nuanced match conditions. In principle, these patterns could be parsed and encoded via a specialized procedure invariant to equivalent logical transformations; for simplicity, we instead opt for a simple one-hot encoding over a vocabulary of atom SMARTS patterns that occur in the data. Next, we add binary features distinguishing V_L from V_R to encode directionality. The last ingredient is to relate \mathcal{G}_L to \mathcal{G}_R by converting the atom mapping to a set of edges $M = \{(u, v) : u \in V_L, v \in V_R, u \text{ is matched to } v\}$; these edges are assigned a special edge feature to clearly differentiate from $E_L \cup E_R$. We define the graph representing the entire template as $\mathcal{G} = (V_L \cup V_R, E_L \cup E_R \cup M)$.

We note that our template featurization procedure is invariant under certain operations that do not affect the semantics of the template, including varying the linearization of the graphs, and permuting the atom mapping identifiers. Two syntactically different representations of the same template will therefore be mapped to the same graph, which can serve a similar purpose to template canonicalization algorithms.⁶⁵

Architecture Bulk of the neural processing in NeuralLoc is performed by two separate GNNs, GNN^{in} and GNN^{tpl} , which – after several message passing layers interleaved with normalization and dropout – produce atom representations h_v^{in} and h_v^{tpl} , respectively for atoms in the input product and the template. Both GNNs have a similar architecture based on the PNA⁶⁶ message passing scheme as implemented in PyTorch Geometric.⁶⁷ We experimented with a GPS layer⁶⁸ from Graphium⁶⁹ to extend PNA with global attention, and found it results in a minor performance improvement but significantly higher memory requirement. This trade-off was only beneficial on the small USPTO-50K dataset, thus we use PNA combined with GPS on USPTO-50K, and only PNA on USPTO-FULL and Pistachio. As one of the downstream objectives is graph-level, representations h_v^{in} and h_v^{tpl} are aggregated similarly to prior work⁷⁰ using two separate aggregation layers based on multi-head attention to form h^{in} and h^{tpl} , respectively. Due to a slight deficiency in the expressivity of our graph-level aggregation method, disconnected templates formed by repeating a fixed component a varying number of times are assigned the same representation, which would prevent the model from differentiating those templates downstream. Thus, we also introduce an additional template embedding of size d_{free} , which is learned end-to-end as opposed to being produced by the template encoder, and concatenate that to h^{tpl} . Finally, we linearly project graph-level representations of both input and template into a shared dimension d_{clf} ; those projections are then used for the classification objective. Network sizes vary across datasets, and were informed by overfitting concerns on USPTO-50K, and memory considerations on larger datasets (see Extended Data Table 3 for the exact values).

Classification objective For classification, the input representation is multiplied by stacked template representations, and the resulting dot products are interpreted as unnormalized template selection scores. Unlike MHNreact,⁴⁸ our template processing is learned, and thus templates used for classification have to be repeatedly encoded in each batch. The cost to do so grows with the number of templates

and at sufficient scale becomes prohibitive. While on USPTO-50K we can encode all templates afresh in each forward pass, on USPTO-FULL and Pistachio doing so would require excessive amounts of GPU memory. Therefore, on larger datasets we only include a subset of templates in the classification objective, which include the ground-truth answers in a given batch and r^{clf} randomly sampled templates per batch input as additional negatives; those negatives participate in classification for all inputs, not only those they were sampled for. While we use a simple softmax cross-entropy classification loss for the case of including all templates in each forward pass, when including a subset we found that the losses stemming from different templates have to be re-weighted according to template frequency to allow for learning appropriate marginals. In this case we use a sigmoid pairwise classification loss inspired by prior work.⁷¹ We found increasing r^{clf} generally tends to improve results, and so we set it as high as possible given memory constraints (Extended Data Table 3).

Localization objective Localization requires assigning each atom in the left-hand side of the template (V_L) an appropriate atom in the input (V). To that end, we multiply h_v^{tpl} for $v \in V_L$ with h_u^{in} for $u \in V$, and interpret resulting dot products as unnormalized localization scores, which are passed through a softmax along the template atoms dimension. The primary purpose of localization is to differentiate outputs resulting from applying a single template, but during inference we use a combination of classification and localization to rerank all outputs globally; thus it is beneficial for the localization subnetwork to be exposed to other templates beyond the ground-truth one during training. Therefore, in practice we use not only the node representations extracted for the ground-truth template, but also include r^{loc} other templates from the current batch that best match a given input according to classification scores; this requires minimal additional computation as node representations for those templates were already computed for classification. The final localization loss is as a sum of cross-entropy losses over the template nodes. For nodes in the ground-truth template the target is to select the corresponding atom in V , whereas for nodes in additional negative templates the network is trained to instead select an auxiliary $h_{\text{neg}}^{\text{tpl}}$ representation, which is concatenated to h_v^{in} and trained end-to-end. Often there may be several localizations of the ground-truth template that result in correct predicted reactants; we label all of those localizations during preprocessing, so that the loss for atoms in the ground-truth template can use a uniform distribution over all correct choices in V as the target.

Training We train NeuralLoc by minimizing a sum of the classification and localization losses. Training proceeds for a fixed number of epochs followed by checkpoint selection according to validation MR. Following prior work¹⁰ we select several best checkpoints (typically 5-10), and perform checkpoint averaging in parameter space to produce the final weights.

Inference During training, atom- and graph-level template representations evolve with each update to GNN^{tpl} , and thus have to be recomputed each time they are used downstream. However, upon saving each checkpoint we encode all templates in the library and include the resulting outputs in the checkpoint file; this allows for fast inference as GNN^{tpl} no longer needs to be used. Given a test input, we first multiply h_{in} with template representations and extract $r^{\text{app}} \cdot n$ top-scoring templates to apply, where n is the number of results requested downstream; this step is identical to performing inference in the NeuralSym model. r^{app} is set to 1 during search, and to a larger value for single-step evaluation (Extended Data Table 3). After applying the selected templates – which can be done efficiently using multiprocessing – for each template we group the predictions based on the resulting reactants, in order to account for several localizations producing the same result. Next, we rerank all unique outputs according to $s^{\text{clf}} + w^{\text{loc}} \cdot s^{\text{loc}}$, where s^{clf} is the normalized template log-probability, s^{loc} is the average normalized localization log-probability over template atoms, and $w^{\text{loc}} = 2.25$ is a coefficient chosen empirically. When computing s^{loc} we sum localization probabilities over potentially several correct choices, as highlighted by the aforementioned grouping. Finally, we truncate the output list to n results (100 for single-step benchmarking, 50 during search).

De-Novo submodel (R-SMILES 2)

Architecture We build upon R-SMILES,¹⁰ and train an encoder-decoder model based on a Transformer backbone.⁵⁰ Unlike previous work³⁷ we reimplement the model from scratch using PyTorch,⁶¹ allowing us to freely customize the architecture. We applied key modifications described in the main text, which were inspired by the recent success of large language models such as Llama⁵¹ and Mistral.⁵²

Data augmentation Previous studies^{10,72} have shown that the general-purpose SMILES neglects the characteristics of chemical reactions, where the molecular graph topology remains largely unchanged from reactants to products. To address this, we employ root-aligned SMILES,¹⁰ which ensures an aligned mapping between product and reactant SMILES. This strict mapping, along with a reduced

edit distance, simplifies the task for the transformer, allowing it to focus on learning the chemistry involved in reactions rather than syntax. We generate multiple input-output pairs as augmented training data by enumerating different product atoms as the root of SMILES. We apply 20× augmentation to the USPTO-50K dataset, 5× to USPTO-FULL, and 10× to Pistachio.

Tokenization We follow Schwaller et al.’s⁷ regular expression to tokenize products and reactants SMILES into meaningful tokens. The regular expression is defined as:

```
token_regex = "(\\[[^\\]]+\\]|Br?|Cl?|N|O|S|P|F|I|b|c|n|o|s|p|\\(|\\)|\\.|=|#|-|\\+|\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\|:|~|@|\\?|>|\\*|\\$|\\%|[0-9]{2}|[0-9])"
```

This pattern accounts for the diverse range of symbols and characters within SMILES strings, including brackets, elemental symbols, numbers, and special characters. Notably, it matches sequences within brackets, elemental symbols (including Br, Cl, N, O, S, P, F, I), lower-case letters (b, c, n, o, s, p), parentheses, dot, other symbols (=, #, -, +, \\, /, :, ~, @, %, ?, >, *, \$), and two-digit numbers preceded by a percentage symbol, as well as single-digit numbers.

Training objective We train R-SMILES 2 to minimize a standard cross-entropy loss with respect to the token sequence describing ground-truth reactants.

Inference During inference we use beam search to find the top k predicted reactant sequences; however, we tailored the beam search logic to retrosynthesis as described in the main text. We found that this new design makes the top- k list more reliable and significantly improves accuracy, particularly for $k \geq 20$, without visibly increasing inference time.

Quality assessment models

Forward model We utilized the same Pistachio reaction dataset and model architecture as the R-SMILES 2 model for the forward model development. This involved applying 10× R-SMILES augmentation to the Pistachio data in the forward direction. After a training for 10 epochs, we used the final checkpoint for quality assessment. To validate the performance of the forward model, we evaluated the trained model on the USPTO-50K test dataset, resulting in top-1 accuracy of 88.6%, top-3 accuracy of 97.8%, and top-50 accuracy of 99.9%. When evaluated on the Pistachio test set, the model achieved top-1 accuracy of 70.76%, top-3 accuracy of 81.3%, and top-50 accuracy of 87.3%. We deemed this accuracy sufficient for conducting convincing quality assessments.

Feasibility model To build our feasibility model, we scaled up the approach from prior work¹⁴ developed on USPTO-50K to the larger Pistachio dataset. The feasibility model encodes the reactants and product using two separate GNNs, concatenates their aggregated representations, and predicts a single feasibility probability value. We train it using a standard cross-entropy loss on a dataset consisting of both positive and negative reactions. We use the Pistachio training data for the former, while the latter is generated synthetically; we gather approximately 10 negative examples for each positive example, for a total of 32M training data points.

We use two separate sources of negative examples: forward template application and similarity-based replacement. Both hinge on the assumption that if a reaction $R \rightarrow P$ is observed in the data, then other products P' are not formed, i.e. $R \rightarrow P'$ is a negative example. For the forward template application we follow prior work⁵ and use the same templates as used by NeuralLoc, but applied in the forward direction to reactants sampled from the training data. For the similarity-based replacement, given a positive reaction (R, P) , we find several similar examples (R', P') maximizing $\text{sim}(R, R') + \text{sim}(P, P')$ where sim is fingerprint similarity defined previously. We then use (R', P') as the negative example; intuitively, due to the high similarity between R and R' , this gives rise to a sample that is more difficult than if one were to pair reactants and products randomly.

Datasets and baselines

USPTO-50K As baselines for USPTO-50K we selected models integrated into the synthesus library,⁴⁵ and additionally included our NeuralSym implementation for completeness, and RetroExplainer³² due to strong performance. We did not include RetroWISE³³ as a baseline, as it utilized extra data from the larger USPTO database. However, it is worth noting that our best ensemble outperforms RetroWISE for $k \geq 5$ despite not using additional data. We note that some prior works do not compare to R-SMILES on USPTO-50K as the corresponding paper discusses pretraining on USPTO-FULL,¹⁰ but our investigation suggests the checkpoint evaluated in synthesus did not use pretraining, and so it is fully comparable with other USPTO-50K-trained models (this is consistent with the fact that, as seen in Extended Data Figure 7, our R-SMILES checkpoint re-trained from scratch reached performance close to the released one).

For large ensembles shown in Extended Data Table 1 we included all baseline models from the corresponding table apart from RetroKNN, as its adapter network was trained on \mathcal{D}_{val} , which artificially inflates

the model’s validation result and degrades the performance of ensembles containing RetroKNN.

USPTO-FULL Although commonly reported on in prior work, we find many versions of USPTO-FULL are in use, utilizing different methods for filtering and processing; this can be seen through the varying size of the test fold (94696,⁷³ 95389⁷⁴ or 96023¹⁰). Due to this, most reported results on USPTO-FULL are not fully comparable to each other due to using a different test set. For a fair comparison we select a single version of the dataset¹⁰ and only include baselines numbers reported on that version,^{9,10,33} which includes the method with the highest reported top-1 accuracy.³³ Finally, similarly to USPTO-50K, we also included our NeuralSym implementation as a baseline, which we found to produce much stronger performance than reported in prior work.

Pistachio test set Time-split validation is considered to be the gold standard for ML model validation in chemistry, as it most closely mimics the prospective use of the models.⁷⁵ In contrast, random splitting can lead to over-optimistic assessments, especially as reaction data is usually published in clusters, often from the same document (paper or patent), where similar routes are used towards related products.

To construct the time-split test set, we selected reactions added to Pistachio in 2024 as part of the Q2-2024 release. Based on the Pistachio quality tier assignment we used all reactions from tiers S, A, B; for tiers C and D only reactions with an assigned namerxn name reaction label were used. All other reactions, including the entire tier E, were rejected. Finally, we removed reactions of type resolution (RXNO class 11).

We then used fingerprint similarity folded modulo 4093 to filter out products whose maximum similarity to a training product was at least 0.95. Finally, the remaining reactions were processed by the same filtering and deduplication pipeline as the training data.

Bucketing test data To produce Figure 3b, we bucket Pistachio test data in two ways: based on maximum fingerprint similarity sim to a training product, and based on the frequency of the ground-truth template in the training template library.

Note that NeuralLoc only considers templates that appear in training data at least twice, so it is unable to predict a template that occurs once or does not occur at all. Despite this, as seen in Figure 3b (middle), NeuralLoc still shows non-zero accuracy on samples with template frequency less than 2. This is explained by the fact that several distinct templates could potentially yield the same reactants after being applied to a particular product; hence even if the canonically

determined template for a test sample is not available to NeuralLoc, there may be another template in the library that gives rise to the right reactant set.

Search benchmark

Target set construction To build a challenging test set for search, we started with 146 393 Pistachio test products and performed the following steps:

- Filter out building blocks (138 699 targets left).
- Filter out products whose SAScore is below 4 (25 482 targets left).
- Filter out products containing deuterium atoms (23 850 targets left).
- Cluster products with HDBSCAN⁷⁶ (minimum cluster size 3, cluster merge threshold 0.15) using fingerprint similarity `sim` to define a distance measure. Discard 4437 noisy (unclustered) products, and pick the highest SAScore product in each non-trivial cluster (1784 targets left).
- Filter out products for which shallow search using Retro*¹⁵ (depth of 6 nodes, equivalent to 3 reactions) with the NeuralSym model can find any routes in one minute (951 targets left).

We then randomly split the resulting hard targets into 151 targets for validation and 800 for testing. Simple random split was justified as due to the clustering any two targets at this stage had fingerprint similarity below 0.87.

Hyperparameter tuning We found that varying the search policy temperature T can have a large effect on the behaviour of Retro*, with low temperatures promoting deep greedy exploration of the few most likely predicted steps, while higher temperatures leading to a balanced exploration closer to a breadth-first search. To ensure a fair comparison, for each of the compared models we first ran separate 10-minute searches on the 151 validation targets with T sampled approximately uniformly in log-scale i.e. $T \in \{0.25, 0.35, 0.5, 0.71, 1.0, 1.41, 2.0, 2.83, 4.0\}$. We then computed solve rate at the 30, 60, 120, 300 and 600 second mark, and for each model selected the value of T that yielded the largest area under the solve rate curve. We used this temperature setting to produce the final results on 800 test targets shown in Figure 3d.

Assessment by domain experts

The participants in this study were PhD-level organic chemists, with a track record of publications

in synthetic organic chemistry. To gather qualitative model output assessments from the expert chemists, we collected outputs on the Pistachio test set from five sources: dataset ground truth, our models (NeuralLoc, R-SMILES 2 and Chimera), and a dummy baseline which applies only rare reaction templates (omitting the most common 4000) without any ranking. This allows us to compare between our models and the ground truths, as well as ground the results in a null baseline which, despite respecting some basic syntactic rules due to the use of templates, achieves close to zero recall of the reactants reported in the Pistachio dataset, and leads to mostly nonsensical suggestions which an attentive chemist should be able to immediately spot. For every pair of sources, we randomly sample several test products, and for each test product consider the top-2 predictions, as well as sample two more predictions from the top-10 from each source, selected so that we only compare between predictions at the same rank. Model predictions which match the test ground truth are discarded.

Given a dataset of pairs of predictions, we ask the organic chemists to judge which of the predictions they prefer. The chemists were given no indication as to the source of each reaction, and order within the pairs was randomized to remove bias. We used the collected pairs in a Bradley-Terry model to estimate scores s_i that fit pairwise win rates:


$$P(\text{source } i \text{ wins with source } j) \approx \frac{e^{s_i}}{e^{s_i} + e^{s_j}}$$

As pairwise win probabilities determined by s_i are shift invariant, we then shifted the scores so that the dummy baseline has $s_{\text{dummy}} = 0$, and scaled them as $s'_i = 400 \cdot \log_{10} e \cdot s_i$ to convert into a more common ELO style shown in Figure 3e.


Compute requirements

Both of our backward models (NeuralLoc and R-SMILES 2), as well as the forward model based on R-SMILES 2, took up to a week to train on a single node with 4-8 A100 GPUs. The feasibility model was trained in a few days using a single A100 GPU. Ensembling was done on CPU based on saved model outputs for the underlying models; this allows for learning θ and evaluating the ensemble without the need to run inference of the original models.


Each search experiment was parallelized over 4-8 GPUs, with each GPU responsible for a subset of targets; we used V100 GPUs for the SimpRetro benchmark and A100 GPUs for our new benchmark based on Pistachio.



Extended Data Figure 6: **a**, Ablation study for ensembling weight optimization on USPTO-50K. We consider the same models as in Extended Data Figure 7 together with NeuralLoc and R-SMILES 2, yielding a total of 11 models. For every k , we show average accuracy gain (over all 55 model pairs) compared to a baseline formed by taking maximum accuracy among the models in the pair. Our proposed constrained optimization method performs better than a naive approach (no monotonicity or convexity constraints, $w_{reg} = 0$), and several hand-designed weighting schemes: linear ($\theta_{i,k} = k_{max} + 1 - k$), reciprocal ($\theta_{i,k} = \frac{1}{k}$), and weighted reciprocal ($\theta_{i,k} = \frac{c_i}{k}$ where c_i is set to 2 for the model with higher top-1 accuracy and 1 for the weaker model). **b**, Learned weights for combining R-SMILES and LocalRetro on USPTO-50K. We see that the curves cross: R-SMILES is assigned higher weight than LocalRetro for $k \leq 2$ but lower for larger k . This highlights that it is not enough to learn the relative model strengths without dependence on rank. We find a similar trend whenever ensembling a template-free model with a template-based one.



Extended Data Figure 7: Top-5 (**a**) and top-50 (**b**) accuracy of ensembles of pairs of models. All values are in percent; color palette blue-to-yellow corresponds to low-to-high accuracy (best results shown in bold). 2x2 squares correspond to the model clusters described in the main text. Within each plot models are ordered by their result when evaluated in isolation (shown on the main diagonal), with the exception of swapping GLN and MEGAN in the left plot to make the model cluster consecutive. Off-diagonal entries show ensemble results.




Extended Data Figure 8: Architecture of the de-novo model (R-SMILES 2). The input product is converted to a SMILES string and tokenized into a sequence of tokens. Before the sequence is processed further, sinusoidal positional embeddings are incorporated to infuse positional information. The sequence then undergoes transformation through layers composed of grouped multi-query attention, RMS normalization, and feedforward layers with SwiGLU activations. The autoregressive decoder predicts the SMILES sequence of reactants utilizing self-attention over already produced tokens and cross-attention over encoder output. The model is trained using a cross-entropy loss.

Model	top-1	top-3	top-5	top-10	top-20	top-50
NeuralSym	45.6%	68.1%	75.5%	82.5%	87.9%	92.7%
LocalRetro	51.5%	76.5%	84.3%	91.0%	<u>95.0%</u>	<u>96.7%</u>
● GLN	52.4%	74.6%	81.2%	88.0%	91.8%	93.1%
Chimera _{TB} (NeuralLoc)*	53.3%	74.1%	80.7%	87.1%	91.6%	93.8%
RetroKNN	<u>55.3%</u>	<u>77.9%</u>	<u>85.0%</u>	<u>91.5%</u>	94.8%	96.6%
MEGAN	48.7%	72.3%	79.5%	86.7%	90.9%	<u>93.5%</u>
● Graph2Edits	54.6%	76.6%	82.8%	88.7%	<u>91.1%</u>	91.7%
RetroExplainer [†]	<u>57.7%</u>	<u>79.2%</u>	<u>84.8%</u>	<u>91.4%</u>	-	-
Chemformer	55.0%	70.9%	73.7%	75.4%	75.9%	76.0%
○ R-SMILES	56.0%	79.1%	86.1%	91.0%	93.3%	94.2%
Chimera _{TF} (R-SMILES 2)*	<u>56.9%</u>	<u>79.9%</u>	<u>86.9%</u>	<u>92.3%</u>	<u>95.5%</u>	<u>96.4%</u>
Chimera*	56.7%	80.7%	87.6%	93.2%	96.3%	97.9%
⊙ Ensemble of baselines*	59.3%	82.3%	89.0%	94.1%	97.0%	98.6%
Chimera++*	59.6%	82.8%	89.2%	94.2%	97.2%	98.6%


Extended Data Table 1: Results on the USPTO-50K dataset with reaction type not given. Models are grouped by type denoted via the icon on the left: template-based (●), semi-template (●), template-free (○) and ensemble (⊙). Within groups models are sorted by top-1 accuracy. Best result for each top-k accuracy is shown in bold; results that are best within a model type but not best overall are underlined. Results marked with * utilize techniques proposed in this paper, those marked with † are taken from prior work, and others were computed using synthesus.⁴⁵

Model	top-1	top-3	top-5	top-10	top-20	top-50
LocalRetro [†]	39.1%	53.3%	58.4%	63.7%	67.5%	70.7%
● NeuralSym	44.1%	61.4%	66.6%	<u>71.5%</u>	74.6%	77.1%
Chimera _{TB} (NeuralLoc)*	<u>46.2%</u>	<u>62.0%</u>	<u>66.7%</u>	71.2%	<u>74.7%</u>	<u>77.7%</u>
R-SMILES [†]	48.9%	66.6%	72.0%	76.4%	80.4%	83.1%
○ Chimera _{TF} (R-SMILES 2)*	51.1%	68.1%	73.3%	<u>78.2%</u>	<u>81.6%</u>	<u>84.8%</u>
RetroWISE [†]	52.3%	<u>68.7%</u>	<u>73.5%</u>	77.9%	80.9%	83.6%
⊙ Chimera*	51.4%	69.5%	74.6%	79.5%	82.8%	85.6%


Extended Data Table 2: Results on the USPTO-FULL dataset, following the same format as Extended Data Table 1 above. Note that RetroWISE was pretrained on additional synthetic data; our understanding of the original work of Zhang et al.³³ is that this data was created based on USPTO, thus it may be fair to compare RetroWISE with other models trained on USPTO-FULL. We were not able to confirm this due to the exact code and data not being open-source.




Extended Data Figure 9: **a**, Accuracy on USPTO-50K (left) and USPTO-FULL (right), shown as improvement over the best baseline result (selected for each k separately). Chimera++ is an ensemble of both our models and baselines ($m = 10$). **b**, Accuracy on the random split test set of Pistachio proposed by Maziarz et al.⁴⁵ Some performance differences are accentuated compared to our time-split test set, but the model ranking is largely preserved.




Extended Data Figure 10: Pairwise win rates predicted by ELO ratings shown in Figure 3e. Models are ordered by decreasing rating. Range below each value corresponds to 95% confidence interval estimated by 100 000 bootstrap resamples of pairwise comparison results. Color palette blue-to-yellow corresponds to low-to-high win rate.



Extended Data Figure 11: Extended examples of ensembling improving over individual models. Similarly to Figure 5, we see R-SMILES 2 can fail to correctly reproduce the right bond pattern in a ring copied from the input product.



Extended Data Figure 12: For certain inputs, the R-SMILES 2 model might predict bond-breaking reactions which are chemically implausible (ranks 4 and 5 in the top example; rank 5 in the bottom one). These cases are downweighted during model ensembling as they are not predicted by NeuralLoc. In contrast, NeuralLoc can fail due to noise in the underlying data and incorrect template extraction (ranks 3 and 4 in the bottom example), which is in turn down-ranked by R-SMILES 2, highlighting the power of the ensembling approach.



Extended Data Figure 13: In certain cases, the R-SMILES 2 model appears to produce the same reactant twice, either as an exact copy or with minor variation.

	Parameter	USPTO-50K	USPTO-FULL	Pistachio
	d_{clf}	256	256	256
	d_{free}	0	32	32
	Number of templates	9735	228 127	146 256
GNN ⁱⁿ	Layer type	GPS + PNA	PNA	PNA
	Number of layers	3	5	5
	Hidden dim	64	768	1024
	Output dim (node-level)	256	128	128
	Output dim (graph-level)	512	1024	1024
	Aggregation heads	8	8	8
	Dropout (inter-layer)	0.1	0.0	0.05
	Dropout (post aggregation)	0.4	0.4	0.4
GNN ^{tpl}	Layer type	GPS + PNA	PNA	PNA
	Number of layers	4	5	5
	Hidden dim	64	192	192
	Output dim (node-level)	256	128	128
	Output dim (graph-level)	512	512	512
	Aggregation heads	8	8	8
	Dropout (inter-layer)	0.1	0.0	0.0
	Dropout (post aggregation)	0.4	0.4	0.4
	Batch size	128	256	512
	Number of epochs	600	130	85
	Initial learning rate	10^{-3}	10^{-3}	10^{-3}
	Loss type	softmax	sigmoid	sigmoid
	r^{clf}	-	30	18
	r^{loc}	1	4	4
	r^{app}	100	10	10
	Total parameter count	1.9M	103M	165M

Extended Data Table 3: Architectural, training and inference hyperparameters of the NeuralLoc model across the datasets investigated in this work.

Parameter	USPTO-50K	USPTO-FULL	Pistachio
Vocab size	72	235	346
Number of layers	6	6	8
Hidden dim	256	512	512
Feedforward dim	512	2048	2048
Number of heads	8	8	8
Number of KV heads	8	2	2
Batch size	128	128	512
Number of epochs	30	60	30
Learning rate scheduler	Noam	Noam	Noam
Learning rate	1.0	1.0	1.0
Warmup steps	8000	8000	8000
Dropout	0.3	0.1	0.1
Number of augmentations	20	5	10
Beam size	10	50	20
Total parameter count	17.4M	44.5M	66.7M

Extended Data Table 4: Architectural, training, and inference hyperparameters of the R-SMILES 2 model across the datasets investigated in this work.