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ABSTRACT

The enormous structural and chemical diversity of metal–organic frameworks (MOFs) forces researchers to actively use simulation techniques on an equal footing with experiments. MOFs are widely known for outstanding adsorption properties, so precise description of host-guest interactions is essential for high-throughput screening aimed at ranking the most promising candidates. However, highly accurate \textit{ab initio} calculations cannot be routinely applied to model thousands of structures due to the demanding computational costs. On the other side, methods based on force field (FF) parametrization suffer from low transferability. To resolve this accuracy-efficiency dilemma, we apply the machine learning (ML) approach. The trained models reproduce atom-in-material quantities, including partial charges, polarizabilities, dispersion coefficients, quantum Drude oscillator and electron cloud parameters within the accuracy of underlying density functional theory method. The aforementioned FF precursors make it possible to thoroughly describe non-covalent interactions typical for MOF–adsorbate systems: electrostatic, dispersion, polarization, and short-range repulsion. The presented approach can also significantly facilitate hybrid atomistic simulations/ML workflows.
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1 Introduction

Metal–organic frameworks (MOFs) are soft solids that form the most extensive subspace of the nanoporous materials genome.\textsuperscript{[1]} Their building blocks—metal ions/clusters and organic linkers—are assembled into edge-transitive nets, governed by reticular chemistry rules.\textsuperscript{[2, 3, 4]} The structural variety of MOFs gives rise to diverse physical behavior.\textsuperscript{[5]} Some structures exhibit unconventional for soft matter high electrical conductivity,\textsuperscript{[6, 7]} superconductivity,\textsuperscript{[8, 9]} and exotic topological bands.\textsuperscript{[10]} However, a keen interest in MOFs is mainly due to outstanding adsorption properties. In particular, ultrahigh porosity ensures record-breaking volumetric and gravimetric uptakes,\textsuperscript{[11]} whereas specific adsorption sites help to capture the target molecule selectively.\textsuperscript{[12]} MOFs look promising to storage and separate a wide range of gases and their mixtures, including hydrogen,\textsuperscript{[13]} methane,\textsuperscript{[14, 15]} carbon dioxide,\textsuperscript{[16, 17]} and noble gases.\textsuperscript{[18, 19]} Unfortunately, complete experimental characterization of a representative candidate set is technically
infeasible \cite{20} since the number of synthesized MOFs has reached one hundred thousand to date. \cite{21} The hypothetical structures generated \textit{in silico} are even more numerous. \cite{22, 23} For this reason, computational studies are carried out to reveal structure-property relationships in MOFs on an equal footing with experiments.

The accuracy-efficiency dilemma is especially acute for MOFs due to the hybrid organic-inorganic nature and relatively large size of unit cells (the typical number of atoms is hundreds or even thousands). The level of theory used to describe host-guest interactions depends on the specific task faced by researchers; a broad set of approximations, differing in electronic coarse graining, have been applied.\cite{24, 25} \textit{Ab initio} methods based on Møller-Plesset second-order perturbation theory (MP2) and coupled cluster (CC) approach provide accurate binding energies.\cite{26, 27, 28, 29, 30} Due to the high computational demands, MOF–adsorbate systems are represented as cluster models that contain adsorption sites and gas molecules, resulting in a loss of reliable description of dispersion interaction. The hybrid quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics (QM/MM) approach has been successfully adopted to solve the issue.\cite{28} Density functional theory (DFT), being a working horse of computational materials science, has been intensively used to model the adsorption properties of MOFs as well. However, most of the popular exchange-correlation (XC) functionals based on local density approximation (LDA) and generalized gradient approximation (GGA) do not account for intermolecular interactions properly. Therefore, long-range dispersion correction plays a critical role in the modeling of MOFs within the DFT framework. There are several generations of the empirical scheme proposed by Grimme and coworkers, usually labeled as D1, \cite{31} D2,\cite{32} D3,\cite{33} and D4.\cite{34} The van der Waals density functional (vdW-DF) method\cite{35} implemented in the growing set of XC functionals\cite{36} captures vdW forces via a nonlocal correlation component. General trends in adsorption of carbon dioxide,\cite{37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46} methane,\cite{41, 42, 43, 45, 46} water,\cite{42, 43, 44} and noble gases\cite{48, 49} in series of isostructural MOFs have been revealed employing DFT-based studies.

\textit{Ab initio} and DFT methods cannot provide the scalability required for screening large MOF subsets. A few exceptions are related to calculations of the intrinsic properties of structures.\cite{50, 51, 52} regardless of their interactions with adsorbates. Thus, classical simulation techniques, such as grand canonical Monte Carlo (GCMC), provide a theoretical basis for high-throughput screening (HTS) of small-molecule adsorption in MOFs.\cite{12, 22, 23, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57} In these studies, host-guest interactions are described via non-bonded terms of force fields (FFs),\cite{58} i.e., interaction potentials. Universal Force Field (UFF)\cite{59} and DREIDING\cite{60} are the most popular generic FFs in MOFs studies, but they have several well-known drawbacks. In particular, the polarization effects of adsorbate molecules induced by open metal sites present a severe challenge for conventional FFs.\cite{61, 62, 63} Extended versions of UFF\cite{64, 65} and more specialized FFs\cite{66, 67} have also been proposed. \textit{Ab initio} derived\cite{68, 69, 70} and explicitly polarizable\cite{71, 72, 73} FFs help to significantly improve the description of intermolecular interactions only for small series of isoreticular structures, leaving the aforementioned dilemma largely unaddressed. Therefore, to facilitate HTS adsorption studies, it is necessary to develop a fast automatized procedure for the generation of FF components, which will be suitable for various atomic types presented in MOFs. In rigid framework approximation, only non-bonded FF terms are needed.

Recently, Chen and Manz\cite{74} have presented a collection of non-bonded FF precursors that can be implemented to fully describe non-covalent interactions typical for MOF–adsorbate systems: electrostatic, dispersion, polarization, and short-range repulsion. Within this framework, partial charges calculated by the Density Derived Electrostatic and Chemical (DDEC)\cite{75, 76, 77, 78} approach are used to define Coulombic interactions. Dispersion in the dipole approximation is described via fluctuating polarizabilities and dispersion coefficients $C_{6}$.\cite{79} Non-directionally screened polarizabilities are intended for incorporating interactions between induced dipoles and external electric field, charged atoms, permanent multipoles, or other induced dipoles into polarizable FFs.\cite{79} In the quantum Drude oscillator (QDO) parametrization scheme,\cite{80, 81, 82} (many-body) multipole dispersion and polarization interactions are set through the corresponding QDO parameters: mass, frequency, and charge. The electron cloud parameters\cite{83} are applicable to describe short-range exchange repulsion.

Several recent studies\cite{84, 85, 86, 87} have partially solved the fast generation of FF components using a computational approach beyond atomistic simulations. Thus, machine learning (ML) algorithms make it possible to predict partial charges in MOFs within the accuracy of the underlying DDEC approach. At the same time, ML techniques are comparable to empirical charge equilibration (Qeq)\cite{83} methods in terms of scalability.

In this study, we applied a data-driven approach to derive a full suite of atom-in-material quantities required for advanced FF parametrization. Taking a collection of high-quality FF precursors extracted for 3056 MOFs as initial data, we implemented gradient boosting models on top of a diverse set of features described local site environment. The combination of state-of-the-art approximation algorithm and data representation scheme has allowed outperforming previous approaches for partial charge assignment. The trained models for other FF precursors demonstrated high accuracy in terms of correlation coefficients. The relative contribution of features in model performance was estimated by means of two methods, including the game-theoretic approach. In addition, we outlined future opportunities for the presented ML approach and its alternative practical applications beyond FF parametrization.
2 Methods

2.1 Reference Database

We used a collection of 3056 MOFs\[74\] as a starting dataset. Each structure included the atomic coordinates and the corresponding FF precursors. For further consideration, nine FF precursors were selected: atomic partial charge, dispersion coefficient $C_6$, fluctuating and non-directionally screened (FF) polarizabilities, three parameters described QDO model (reduced mass, effective frequency, and pseudoelectron effective charge), and two electron cloud parameters. Manz and Chen\[74\] extracted partial charges and electron cloud parameters using the DDEC6 partitioning scheme.\[75, 76, 77, 78\] The dispersion coefficients, polarizabilities, and QDO parameters were calculated using the MCLF method.\[79, 89\] The selected FF precursors represent the minimum set required to describe all non-bonded interaction terms thoroughly.

2.2 Featurization Scheme

The properties of an atomic site, beginning with forces\[90\] and including atom-in-material parameters, are a function of its local environment. In this study, the following diverse set of chemical and structural features was used as input data for the approximation algorithm (ML model):

- Set of descriptors inspired by the electronegativity equalization principle was originally implemented by Kancharlapalli et al.\[87\] Here, we used its extended version (referred to as ENFingerprint) that included electronegativity and first ionization energy of the considered atomic site, averaged electronegativity, first ionization energy, and distance between target atomic site and sites in its first and second coordination sphere, and the corresponding numbers of sites. The first and second coordination shell included sites that formed a bond with the considered site directly and through one of its nearest neighbors, respectively. Two sites were considered bonded if the interatomic distance did not exceed the sum of the corresponding Cordero covalent radii\[91\] within a penalty distance of 0.5 Å. The thermochemical scale\[92\] of dimensionless electronegativities was used.

- Adaptive generalizable neighborhood informed (AGNI)\[93, 94\] fingerprints are integrals of the product of the radial distribution function and the damping function $f_d$:

$$V_i(\eta) = \sum_{i \neq j} e^{-(r_{ij}/\eta)^2} f_d(r_{ij})$$

$$f_d(r_{ij}) = 0.5 \left[ \frac{\cos(\pi r_{ij})}{Rc} + 1 \right]$$

where $r_{ij}$ is the distance between sites $i$ and $j$, $R_c$ is the cutoff distance, and $\eta$ is the Gaussian function width.

- Voronoi tessellation-based\[95, 96, 97\] fingerprints are summarized features of Voronoi cells, including Voronoi indices, (weighted) $i$-fold symmetry indices, Voronoi volume, area, and nearest-neighbor distance statistics (mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum values).

- CrystalNNFingerprint\[98, 99\] and OPSiteFingerprint\[98, 99\] are described a site environment via the coordination likelihoods and specific local structure order parameters (LoStOPs). CrystalNN\[99\] and minimum distance\[98\] neighbor-finding algorithms were used, respectively.

All aforementioned fingerprints were concatenated into a 109-dimensional vector (the full list of fingerprints is provided in the Supporting Information). Crystal structure processing routines were carried out using the Python Materials Genomics (pymatgen)\[100\] and Atomic Simulation Environment (ASE)\[101\] modules. AGNI, Voronoi, CrystalNN, and OPSite fingerprints were calculated by the matminer\[102\] library.

Some structures failed to assign one of two (or both) subsets of features during the featurization: Voronoi and ENFingerprint. The issue related to Voronoi tessellation can be resolved by increasing the cutoff radius in determining Voronoi neighbors (a default value of 6.5 Å was applied). Whereas ENFingerprint cannot be calculated for structures containing small (with the longest path in molecular graph no more than three) ions, such as $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$, $\text{NH}_3^+$, $\text{NO}_3^-$, etc. That is because there is no second coordination sphere for non-central atoms in such ions. Thus, charged MOFs were naturally excluded from further analysis as well. Finally, unique sites from 2946 structures were used to train/validate ML models.
2.3 ML Algorithm

Within local approximation, FF precursors are defined by the site’s fingerprints. These generally unknown functions are approximated by the refined implementation of gradient boosting algorithm, eXtreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost).[103] The tree ensemble model $\phi$ as a superposition of $K$ additive functions $f$, Classification And Regression Trees (CARTs), represents the true value of target property $y$ for the $i$-th site in the following form:

$$\hat{y}_i = \phi(x_i) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} f_k(x_i) \quad (3)$$

where $x$ is the site’s representation. The parameters of CARTs (tree structure and leaf weights) are fitted during the iterative minimization of regularized objective $\mathcal{L}$:

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi) = \sum_i l(\hat{y}_i, y_i) + \sum_k \Omega(f_k) \quad (4)$$

where $l$ is the differentiable loss function, $\Omega$ is the penalty term designed to avoid over-fitting via regularization of model’s weights. The XGBoost models were trained to predict each FF precursor independently. Preliminarily, calculated fingerprints were scaled using MinMaxScaler and rounded jointly with target values to the fourth decimal; duplicated data were excluded from consideration. We tested models on an external test set (10% of points from the initial set) with the 5-fold cross-validation. The optimal values of hyperparameters (the number of gradient boosted trees, maximum tree depth, boosting learning rate, etc.) were determined using the Tree-structured Parzen Estimator (TPE)[104] algorithm implemented in the Hyperopt[105, 106] library.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Performance of ML Models

The parity plots of calculated by Chen and Manz[74] and ML predicted FF precursors are reported in Figure 1; the corresponding histograms of the deviation of predicted values from reference ones are presented in Figure S1. Table 1 summarizes the performance of trained ML models intended for FF precursors prediction. Most commonly used regression metrics, including mean absolute error (MAE), root mean square error (RMSE), and coefficient of determination ($R^2$), are shown here. Pearson and Spearman coefficients, which measure linear and rank correlation, respectively, are also provided. In general, the high density of points within a diagonal of parity plots and high values (>0.96) of three coefficients ($R^2$, Pearson, and Spearman) indicate the superior predictive capability of the presented models. However, these metrics do not per se provide insights into efficiency for specific modeling tasks. In other words, it is unclear whether the presented models sufficiently accurate to simulate the adsorption properties of MOFs.

Table 1: Summary of performance of presented ML models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FF precursor</th>
<th>MAE</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
<th>Spearman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>partial charge $q$</td>
<td>0.0113</td>
<td>0.0216</td>
<td>0.9970</td>
<td>0.9985</td>
<td>0.9960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluctuating polarizability $log_{10}(\alpha_{fluc})$</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
<td>0.9977</td>
<td>0.9989</td>
<td>0.9905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF polarizability $log_{10}(\alpha_{FF})$</td>
<td>0.0070</td>
<td>0.0126</td>
<td>0.9982</td>
<td>0.9991</td>
<td>0.9917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dispersion coefficient $log_{10}(C_6)$</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td>0.0217</td>
<td>0.9990</td>
<td>0.9995</td>
<td>0.9923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDO mass $m_{QDO}$</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
<td>0.0196</td>
<td>0.9976</td>
<td>0.9988</td>
<td>0.9918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDO charge $q_{QDO}$</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
<td>0.9985</td>
<td>0.9993</td>
<td>0.9928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDO frequency $\omega_{QDO}$</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.0129</td>
<td>0.9794</td>
<td>0.9897</td>
<td>0.9863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electron cloud parameter $a$</td>
<td>0.0554</td>
<td>0.0871</td>
<td>0.9816</td>
<td>0.9908</td>
<td>0.9828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electron cloud parameter $b$</td>
<td>0.0225</td>
<td>0.0358</td>
<td>0.9627</td>
<td>0.9814</td>
<td>0.9785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This difficulty can be partially resolved by comparing our models with those available in the literature. The following ML approaches have been tried to predict partial charges in MOFs: multilayer connectivity-based atom contribution (m-CBAC) method developed by Zou et al.,[85] message passing neural networks (MPNNs) implemented by Raza et al.[86] random forest models in conjunction with features inspired by the electronegativity equalization principle (PACMOF[87] package), and our implementation[84] included local structural features as inputs to the XGBoost models. The direct comparison of listed approaches is hindered by differences in the used partitioning scheme (DDEC3[107] versus DDEC6[75, 76, 77, 78]) and sets of MOFs. In addition, although in all these studies, the number of structures
under consideration is about three thousand, the data size differs significantly. It is well known that the availability of materials data has a significant impact on the predictive precision of ML models. Therefore, the following estimates are general and are not in the strict sense of benchmarking. The presented partial charge predictor slightly outperforms PACMOF\cite{87} and MPNNs\cite{86} in MAE: 0.0113, 0.0192, and 0.025 e\textsuperscript{–} respectively. Less representative Pearson and Spearman coefficients are given for the m-CBAC\cite{85} approach. Their values (0.997 and 0.984, respectively) are lower than those presented in this study (0.9985 and 0.9960). The only competitor is our previous implementation,\cite{84} which shows an even smaller MAE of 0.0096 e\textsuperscript{–}. The insignificant difference may be due to distinction in featurization schemas, and more importantly, the removal of duplicate data in this study.

The aforementioned approaches\cite{84, 85, 86, 87} have been validated by comparing values of adsorption properties calculated using ML derived and DDEC charges. Thus, Spearman rank coefficient between the CO\textsubscript{2} Henry coefficients computed using DDEC and ML derived charges (obtained by the m-CBAC\cite{85} approach and MPNNs\cite{86}) equals 0.939 and 0.96, respectively. Spearman rank coefficient between CO\textsubscript{2} volumetric uptakes computed using DDEC and ML derived charges presented in our previous study\cite{84} equals 0.991. PACMOF\cite{87} can reproduce CO\textsubscript{2} loading, N\textsubscript{2} loading, and CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} selectivity with a mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) of 18.9, 28.3, and 33.9, respectively. It can be concluded that models that demonstrated MAE of 0.01–0.02 e\textsuperscript{–} are sufficiently accurate to reproduce values of adsorption properties obtained using DDEC charges. In this context, Spearman rank correlation coefficient is much more representative than in the case of partial charge prediction since ranking promising candidates for a specific application can be seen as a primary goal of HTS studies. Similar estimates for other FF precursors are not available.

Figure 1: Parity plots between calculated by Chen and Manz\cite{74} and ML predicted FF precursors: (a) partial charge, (b) fluctuating polarizability, (c) FF polarizability, (d) dispersion coefficient C\textsubscript{6}, (e) QDO mass, (f) QDO charge, (g) QDO frequency, (h) electron cloud parameter a, and (i) electron cloud parameter b.
Another aspect of the ML model’s efficiency concerns how its accuracy relates to the reference method. In computational chemistry, so-called “chemical accuracy” (~1 kcal/mole) usually serves as a desirable level of precision in reproducing potential energy surface (PES) by ab initio methods. Recently, the same can be said about ML models trained on calculated data.\cite{109,110} From a more general perspective, the following guiding principle can be formulated: the accuracy of approximation model relied on quantum-chemical inputs should be at least comparable to that of underlying computational method relative to experimentally derived quantities. As for FF precursors, extracting experimental values is quite complex and not straightforward, so such an analysis can be carried out for a very limited set of available data. Thus, deviation of DDEC6 charges from charges derived via kappa refinement\cite{111,112,113} for natrolite and formamide in terms of MAE equals 0.1174 and 0.0570 e\textsuperscript{−}, respectively.\cite{76} MCLF method yields the static polarizability tensor eigenvalues for 6 small organic molecules and dispersion coefficients \(C_b\) for pairs formed from 49 atoms/molecules within mean absolute relative error (MARE) of 8.10 and 4.45% correspondingly.\cite{89} The static polarizabilities and dispersion coefficients \(C_b\) for 12 polyacenes are defined by this method within MARE of 8.75 and 7.77%, respectively; the same quantities for 6 fullerenes equals 5.92 and 6.84%.\cite{89} At the same time, our XGBoost models reproduce reference dispersion coefficients \(C_b\) and fluctuating polarizabilities extracted using the MCLF method within the following MAREs: 3.07 and 2.18%. We can speculate that the accuracy of presented approximation algorithms is comparable to the precision of reference methods, DDEC6 and MCLF.

### 3.2 ML Model Interpretability

The selection of reliable materials representation is an essential step in constructing a precise predictive model.\cite{114,115,116} The initial choice of descriptors is usually based on domain expertise. For instance, previous studies aimed at functionalizing properties\cite{85} or a collection of atomic connectivity-based patterns.\cite{87} Here we operate differently, applying a diverse suite of heterogeneous fingerprints. The validity of this approach, i.e., non-redundancy of chosen features, can be confirmed by conducting feature importance analysis. As a result, the revealed input parameters that do not contribute to the model’s output can be reasonably excluded from consideration. First, we calculated analog of one of the most popular feature importance measures applicable to ensemble learners, also known as Gini importance (“gain” in XGBoost implementation).\cite{117} This quantity is defined as the mean decrease in impurity (MDI) that is the sum of all decreases in Gini impurity over all trees in the ensemble. The normalized values of gain-based importance for 5 feature subsets are shown in Figures 2a, 2c, and 2e. ENFingerprint makes a decisive contribution: its importance varies from 83.5 to 95.9% for electron cloud parameters \(a\) and \(b\), respectively. Based on these data, it can be concluded that all other subsets have a negligible impact on the performance of ML models. To confirm this, we re-trained models to predict partial charges using only ENFingerprint as input (importance equals 95.2%). Surprisingly, MAE increased from 0.0113 (see Table 1) to 0.0185 e\textsuperscript{−}, i.e., it grew by 63%. Such a dramatic decrease in model accuracy is inconsistent with the minor importance of four other fingerprint subsets determined by a gain-based method and is probably due to its intrinsic shortcomings, including sampling bias.\cite{118} Then, we calculated the SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations) values using the TreeExplainer\cite{119} algorithm to get a more reliable estimate of feature importances. These quantities represent an extended version of classical Shapley values,\cite{120} which originate from game theory. Explanations of predictions expressed using SHAP values are guaranteed to satisfy the following properties: local accuracy, monotonicty, and missingness. Global feature attribution was carried out by averaging magnitudes of SHAP values over all testing set points since TreeExplainer provides local object-wise explanations. Mean SHAP values normalized to unity over all features are provided in Figures 2b, 2d, and 2f. The impact of ENFingerprint is significantly decreased compared to gain-based feature importances and varies in the range from 48.0 (electron cloud parameter \(b\)) to 78.6% (partial charge). Cumulative importances for each of the other fingerprint subsets reach 10% for at least one FF precursor. Thus, the used suite of features should be considered non-redundant and reasonable.

### 3.3 Future Opportunities

Besides feature representation and approximation algorithm, training data availability also determines the accuracy of ML predictors.\cite{108} We trained a series of models on datasets that differ in size (from one to three hundred thousand atomic sites) to extract this dependency for three low-correlated targets: partial charge, fluctuating polarizability, and QDO frequency. The corresponding dataset size vs. scaled error dependencies are presented in Figure 3. The power law \(SE = m \times DS^{-n}\) almost perfectly describes all three sets of points, where \(SE\) is the scaled error (MAE normalized by the range of the corresponding FF precursor), \(DS\) is the training data size, \(m\) and \(n\) are empirical parameters. It should be noted that coefficient \(n\) (the slope of a line in logarithmic coordinates) differs in each case: 0.27±0.03, 0.20±0.03, and 0.17±0.04 for the partial charge, fluctuating polarizability, and QDO frequency, respectively. The given values are significantly lower than those obtained for a diverse set of properties\cite{108} (0.372) and formation energy of perovskites\cite{121} (0.297). Therefore, the universal dependency derived by Zhang and Ling\cite{108} is not observed, at
Figure 2: Cumulative feature importances corresponding to fingerprint subsets. The reported values are obtained by (a, c, and e) gain-based method and (b, d, and f) SHAP analysis.

least for considered in this study atom-in-material quantities. Nevertheless, the revealed power law suggests that FF precursors’ accuracy can be improved extensively by increasing training data size.

As indicated in the Methods section, ML models for each FF precursor were trained independently. However, due to the use of a common representation of atomic sites multi-task learning (MTL)\textsuperscript{[122]} framework can be efficiently applied here. The performance of primary method for MTL, deep neural networks (DNNs), improves in the presence of highly correlated targets.\textsuperscript{[123]} To assess the potential of MTL for FF precursors prediction, we calculated Pearson coefficients for all pairs of the considered atom-in-material quantities. The correlation matrix in the form of the heatmap is shown in Figure 4. One can distinguish two groups of highly correlated FF precursors. The first group includes fluctuating polarizability, FF polarizability, dispersion coefficient $C_6$, and electron cloud parameter $a$. The second group contains QDO mass, QDO charge, and electron cloud parameter $b$. Therefore, MTL predictors for the listed endpoints can potentially outperform the corresponding single-task models.

The presented models can also be helpful to facilitate ML prediction of adsorption properties. Obviously, data-driven approximations are at best able to reproduce quantitative structure-property relationships hidden in input data but

Figure 3: Scaled error as a function of training data size.
still inheriting errors specific to the underlying computational approach. Thus, most ML models (as opposed to atom-wise predictors) aimed at predicting macroscopic adsorption properties\[124,125\] were trained at results of GCMC simulations, for which UFF is almost no alternative choice for describing non-covalent interactions. Therefore, the outputs of those ML models suffer from issues mentioned in the Introduction section, such as lacking a description of polarization effects. The following hybrid workflow can improve the reliability of predicted targets without losing scalability: advanced parametrization using a full suite of FF precursors (main scope of this study) → HTS adsorption modeling in rigid framework approximation → construction of ML predictors of macroscopic properties.

4 Conclusions

In summary, we presented the ML workflow to reproduce atom-in-material quantities useful for parametrization of FFs. Its modular structure, typical for data-driven approaches, rests on the three pillars: input data, feature representation, and approximation algorithm. Each of the parts can be modified depending on the specific task. In principle, our approach is also applicable for other subclasses of nanoporous materials, including covalent organic frameworks (COFs) and hydrogen-bonded organic frameworks (HOFs). Since the transferability of presented models to structures beyond MOFs is in question, reliable results can be obtained using reference DDEC and MCLF data derived for a specific subclass of materials under consideration. The set of local features, i.e., input for ML algorithm, is modifiable as well. However, it is highly desirable to confirm the validity of the new set based on feature importance, as was demonstrated in this study. Finally, a reasonable choice of approximation algorithm requires full-fledged benchmarking that takes into account accuracy and time efficiency.
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