
Learning to Extend Molecular Scaffolds with Structural Motifs

Krzysztof Maziarz
Microsoft Research
United Kingdom

Henry Jackson-Flux
Microsoft Research
United Kingdom

Pashmina Cameron
Microsoft Research
United Kingdom

Finton Sirockin
Novartis
Switzerland

Nadine Schneider
Novartis
Switzerland

Nikolaus Stiefl
Novartis
Switzerland

Marwin Segler
Microsoft Research
United Kingdom

Marc Brockschmidt
Microsoft Research
United Kingdom

Abstract

Recent advancements in deep learning-based modeling of molecules promise to accelerate *in silico* drug discovery. A plethora of generative models is available, building molecules either atom-by-atom and bond-by-bond or fragment-by-fragment. However, many drug discovery projects require a fixed scaffold to be present in the generated molecule, and incorporating that constraint has only recently been explored. In this work, we propose a new graph-based model that naturally supports scaffolds as initial seed of the generative procedure, which is possible because our model is not conditioned on the generation history. At the same time, our generation procedure can flexibly choose between adding individual atoms and entire fragments. We show that training using a randomized generation order is necessary for good performance when extending scaffolds, and that the results are further improved by increasing the fragment vocabulary size. Our model pushes the state-of-the-art of graph-based molecule generation, while being an order of magnitude faster to train and sample from than existing approaches.

1 Introduction

The problem of *in silico drug discovery* requires navigating a vast chemical space in order to find molecules of interest that satisfy various constraints on their properties and structure. This poses challenges well beyond those solvable by brute-force search, leading to the development of more sophisticated approaches. Recently, deep learning models are becoming an increasingly popular choice, because they can *learn* a distribution over drug-like molecules from raw data.

While early generative models of molecules relied on the textual SMILES representation and reused architectures from natural language processing [2, 15, 44, 46], many recent approaches are built around molecular graphs [4, 7, 12, 16, 17, 27, 29, 45]. Compared to SMILES-based methods, graph-based models that employ a sequential generator enjoy perfect validity of generated molecules, as they can enforce hard chemical constraints such as valence during generation.

However, even if a molecule does not violate valence constraints, it is merely a sign of syntactic validity; the molecule can still be semantically incorrect by containing unstable or unsynthesisable substructures. Intermediate states during atom-by-atom generation may contain atypical chemical fragments, such as alternating bond patterns corresponding to unfinished aromatic rings [16]. Therefore, some works [16, 17, 38] propose data-driven methods to mine common molecular fragments – referred to as *motifs* – which can be used to build molecules fragment-by-fragment instead of atom-by-atom. When motifs are employed, most partial molecules during generation are semantically sensible, since they do not contain half-built structures such as partial rings.

A common additional constraint in drug discovery projects is the inclusion of a predefined subgraph, called a *scaffold* [42, 43]. Generating molecules that contain a given scaffold can be approached by drawing many samples and discarding those that do not contain it – while simple, this method is not scalable, as the number of samples required may grow exponentially with scaffold size. Instead, recent models can generate molecules that are bound to contain a given scaffold [3, 22, 24, 28].

Extending a generative model to perform scaffold-based generation is often non-trivial. Ideally, one would train the model without explicitly considering scaffolds, and then constrain the decoding to contain the scaffold with certainty. This is possible for models equipped with a sequential graph decoder, which can be initialized with a scaffold as the starting partial graph. For this to be feasible, the model (a) should be trained with a broad range of generation orders, so that possible scaffolds naturally occur as partial graphs encountered during training, and (b) cannot be fully autoregressive by depending on generation history, for example by passing along recurrent state, as such state is not available if generation is initialized with a scaffold¹. Current state-of-the-art fragment-based models [16, 17] cannot be initialized with a scaffold, as they violate (a) by relying on a deterministic generation order; some [16] also break (b) by using gated recurrent units (GRUs) [10] which contain recurrent state.




Figure 1: Overview of how an example molecule (top left) is processed, conditioned on the motif vocabulary (bottom left) to make the motif information readily available at the atom level (right). Each atom is associated with a feature vector, which consists of atom features (bottom part) and a motif embedding (top part).

In this work we make the following contributions:

- In Section 3, we present MoLeR, a new graph-based generative model that can start from arbitrary scaffolds and utilizes motifs. In contrast to prior work [16, 17], our model can generate arbitrary structures atom-by-atom, removing the need for a motif vocabulary covering all useful rings.
- We show experimentally in Section 4 that MoLeR (a) is able learn to generate molecules matching the distribution of the training data (b) can be constrained to generate only molecules that contain a given fixed scaffold, matching the training data distribution otherwise (c) is faster in training and inference than baseline methods (d) together with an off-the-shelf optimization method (MSO [47]) can be used for molecular optimization tasks, matching the state of the art methods in unconstrained optimization, and out-performing them on scaffold-constrained tasks.
- We also perform experiments in Section 4 to analyze two design decisions that are understudied in the literature: the choice of the generation order and the size of the motif vocabulary. Our results show how varying these two parameters affects model performance.

We refer to the family of proposed models as the MoLeR models, since in contrast to HierVAE [17] the next decoding step is conditioned on the current partial graph through a single Molecule-Level Representation. The motif information is made available at the atom level, and can inform all message passing steps; we schematically show this in Figure 1 and explain in detail in Section 3.1.

2 Background: Graph Neural Networks

We represent a molecule as a graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where vertices \mathcal{V} are atoms, and edges \mathcal{E} are bonds. Each node $v \in \mathcal{V}$ is associated with an initial node feature vector $h_v^{(i)}$. Each edge may also be annotated with extra features such as the bond type. Models acting on molecular graphs often propagate information using a Graph Neural Network (GNN) [20, 26]. The network is initialized with starting node representations $\{h_v^0 : v \in \mathcal{V}\}$; in our case, we set these to linear projections of $h_v^{(i)}$.

¹One could side-step (b) by running through a teacher-forced order to obtain the recurrent state, but the exact way the scaffold is traversed may bias subsequent generation.

Each GNN layer propagates node representations $\{h_v^t : v \in \mathcal{V}\}$ to compute $\{h_v^{t+1} : v \in \mathcal{V}\}$ using message passing [14]:

$$h_v^{t+1} = f(h_v^t, a(\{m_l(h_v^t, h_u^t) : (v, l, u) \in \mathcal{E}\}))$$

where m_l computes the message between two nodes connected by an edge of type l , a aggregates the messages received by a given node, and f computes the new node representation. A common choice is to use a linear layer for m_l , a pointwise sum for a , and a GRU update for f [26], but many other variants exist [11]. After L layers of message passing we obtain final representations $\{h_v^L : v \in \mathcal{V}\}$, with h_v^L summarizing the L -hop neighborhood of v . These representations can be pooled to form a graph-level representation by using any permutation-invariant aggregator, such as a weighted sum.

3 Our Approach

3.1 Molecule Representation

Motifs Training our model relies on a set of fragments \mathcal{M} – called the *motif vocabulary* – which we infer directly from data. For each training molecule, we decompose it into fragments by breaking some of the bonds; as breaking rings is chemically challenging, we only consider *acyclic bonds*, i.e. bonds that do not lie on a cycle. We break all acyclic bonds adjacent to a cycle (i.e. at least one endpoint lies on a cycle), as that separates the molecule into cyclic substructures, such as ring systems, and acyclic substructures, such as functional groups. We then aggregate the resulting fragments over the entire training set, and define \mathcal{M} as the n most common motifs, where n is a hyperparameter. Having selected \mathcal{M} , we pre-process molecules (both for training and inference) by noting which atoms are covered by motifs belonging to the vocabulary. This is done by applying the same bond breaking procedure as used for motif vocabulary extraction. During generation, each group of atoms that make up a motif is generated in one step, while remaining atoms and bonds are generated one-by-one. This means that MoLeR has the flexibility to generate an arbitrary structure, such as an unusual ring, even if it does not commonly appear in training data².

Finally, note that in contrast to HierVAE [17], we do not decompose ring systems into individual rings. This means that our motifs are atom-disjoint, while HierVAE allows them to intersect. Consequently, we do not need to model a motif-specific attachment point vocabulary, as attaching a motif to a partial graph requires adding only a single bond, and thus there is only one attachment point.

Atom Features Initial node representations $h_v^{(i)}$ are chosen as chemically relevant features [33], both describing the atom (type, charge, mass, valence, and isotope information) and its local neighborhood (aromaticity and presence of rings). These features can be readily extracted using the RDKit library [21]. Additionally, for atoms that are part of a motif, we concatenate $h_v^{(i)}$ with the motif embedding; for the other atoms we use a special embedding vector to signify the lack of a motif. We show this in Figure 1. Motif embeddings are learned end-to-end with the rest of the model.

3.2 Molecule Generation Orders

Our model generates molecules by alternating between adding motifs or single atoms and creating bonds. A single molecule may be generated in a variety of different orders. To define a concrete generation sequence, we first choose a starting atom, and then for every partial molecule choose the next atom from its *frontier*, i.e. atoms adjacent to already generated atoms. After each choice, if the currently selected atom is part of a motif, we add the entire motif into the partial graph at once. We formalize this concept as pseudocode in Algorithm 1.

Our formalism permits a variety of orders; in this work, we evaluate orders that are commonly used in the literature: *random*, where ValidFirstAtoms returns all atoms and ValidNextAtoms all atoms on the frontier on the current partial graph, which covers all valid generation orders; *canonical*, which is fully deterministic and follows a canonical ordering [41] of the atoms computed using RDKit; and two variants of *breadth-first search (BFS)*, where we choose the first atom either randomly or as the first atom in canonical order, and then explore the remaining atoms in BFS order, breaking ties between equidistant next nodes randomly.

²In contrast to Jin et al. [16, 17] we do not assume \mathcal{M} covers all useful cycles, so setting $\mathcal{M} = \emptyset$ is valid.

3.3 The MoLeR Decoder

We model the generation of a target molecule x given a conditioning input vector z in a partially auto-regressive manner. The current state of generation is characterized by a pair (g_i, v_i) , where $g_i \subseteq x$ is a partial graph of nodes $\mathcal{V}_i \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, and $v_i \in \mathcal{V}_i \cup \{\perp\}$ is either a *focus node* selected in g_i or a symbol \perp to signal the lack of focus node. If the state has a focus node v_i , it means we are currently generating new edges from v_i to the rest of g_i . Once the network predicts that no more edges should be added, we move to a state with $v_{i+1} = \perp$, where either a new node is added or generation halts.

At each step i , our decoder first processes (g_i, v_i) using a GNN to obtain high-level features h_v for each atom in \mathcal{V}_i and an aggregated graph-level feature vector h_{mol} . It can then take one of three actions to transition to the next generation state.

Node Prediction If $v_i = \perp$, the decoder chooses the next atom or motif to add to g_i (or that no more nodes should be added) using a learnable subnetwork $f_{node}(z, h_{mol})$ that predicts logits over the vocabulary of atoms and motifs.

Motif Attachment Prediction If next node prediction adds a motif \mathcal{A} , the decoder next predicts one of the atoms in the motif as the next focus node. For this we use a learnable scoring subnetwork $f_{att}(z, h_{mol}, h_a)$ on each newly added $a \in \mathcal{A}$. As motifs are often highly symmetric, we determine the symmetries using RDKit and only consider one atom per equivalence class.

Bond Prediction If $v_i \neq \perp$, the decoder predicts new bonds from v_i using a scoring subnetwork $f_{bond}(z, h_{mol}, h_{v_i}, h_u)$ on all potential neighbors $u \in \mathcal{V}_i$ of v_i . Similarly to Liu et al. [29], we employ valence checks to mask out bonds that would lead to chemically invalid molecules. Moreover, if v_i was selected as an attachment point in a motif, we mask out edges to other atoms in the same motif; for example, if the motif is a ring, we disallow extending it with extra chords.

We implement f_{node} , f_{att} and f_{bond} as MLPs. For more details about the architecture see Appendix A. During training, we use a softmax over the candidates considered by each subnetwork to obtain a probability distribution. As for many generation orders there are several correct next actions (e.g., many atoms could be added next), during training, we use a multi-hot objective that encourages the model to learn a uniform distribution over all correct choices.

Finally, using $p(a_i | z, s_i)$ to denote the probability of choosing an action a_i at step i of a generation sequence $(\emptyset, \perp) = s_0, s_1, \dots, s_k = (x, \perp)$ of a molecule x using actions a_0, \dots, a_k , the probability of generating x is decomposed as $p_\phi(x | z) = \prod_i p(a_i | z, s_i)$. Note that the distribution over next actions a_i is conditioned only on the input z and the current partial graph g_i . Our decoding is therefore not fully auto-regressive, as there is no direct dependence of a_i on $a_{<i}$ (in particular, this marginalizes over all different generation sequences yielding the partial graph g_i).

3.4 Training MoLeR

MoLeR is trained in the autoencoder paradigm, and so we extend our decoder from above with an encoder that computes a single representation for the entire molecule. This encoder GNN operates directly on the full molecular graph, but is motif-aware through the motif annotations included in the atom features. These annotations are deterministic functions of the input molecule, and thus in principle could be learned by the GNN itself, but we found them to be crucial to achieve good performance. Our model is agnostic to the concrete GNN type; in practice, we use a simple yet expressive GNN-MLP layer, which computes messages for each edge by passing the states of its endpoints through an MLP. Similar to Brockschmidt [8], we found that this approach outperforms commonly used GNN layers such as GCN [20] or GIN [49].

Algorithm 1 Determining a generation order

Input: Target molecule x , partial mapping \mathcal{A} from atoms to motifs that cover them
 $t \leftarrow 0, V_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$
while $|V_t| < |x|$ **do** \triangleright Not all atoms visited
 if $t = 0$ **then**
 $c_t \leftarrow \text{ValidFirstAtoms}(x)$
 else
 $c_t \leftarrow \text{ValidNextAtoms}(V_t, x)$
 $a_t \sim \mathcal{U}(c_t)$ \triangleright Sample a_t uniformly
 if a_t is covered by \mathcal{A} **then**
 $V_+ \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(a_t)$ \triangleright Add an entire motif
 else
 $V_+ \leftarrow \{a_t\}$ \triangleright Add a single atom
 $V_{t+1} \leftarrow V_t \cup V_+$
 $t \leftarrow t + 1$

We train our overall model to optimize a standard VAE loss [19] with several minor modifications, resulting in the linear combination $\lambda_{prior} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{prior}(x) + \mathcal{L}_{rec}(x) + \lambda_{prop} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{prop}(x)$. The weights λ_{prior} and λ_{prop} are hyperparameters that we tuned empirically. We now elaborate on each of these loss components.

We define $\mathcal{L}_{prior}(x) = -\mathcal{D}_{KL}(q_{\theta}(z | x) || p(z))$, where $p(z)$ is a multivariate Gaussian; as discussed above, the encoder q_{θ} is implemented as a GNN followed by two heads used to parameterize the mean and the standard deviation of the latent code z . We found that choosing $\lambda_{prior} < 1$ and using a sigmoid annealing schedule [6] was required to make the training stable.

Following our decoder definition above, the reconstruction term \mathcal{L}_{rec} could be written as a sum over the log probabilities of each action. However, we instead rewrite this term as an expectation with the step chosen uniformly over the entire generation:

$$\mathcal{L}_{rec}(x) = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\theta}(z|x)} \mathbb{E}_{i \sim \mathcal{U}} \log p(a_i | z, s_i) \quad (1)$$

This rewriting makes it explicit that different generation steps for a fixed input molecule do not depend on each other. This enables two improvements: parallel training on all generation steps at once, and subsampling the generation steps (i.e. using only a subset of steps per input molecule) to get a wider variety of molecules within each batch. These enhancements improve training speed and robustness, and are feasible precisely because our model does not depend on history.

Finally, following prior works [15, 25, 46], we use $\mathcal{L}_{prop}(x)$ to ensure that chemical properties can be accurately predicted from the latent encoding of a molecule. Concretely, we use an MLP regressor on top of the sampled latent code z to predict molecular weight, synthetic accessibility (SA) score, and octanol-water partition coefficient (logP), using MSE on these values as objective. We found that choosing the weight λ_{prop} of this objective to be smaller than 0.1 was necessary to avoid the decoder ignoring the latent code z . All of these properties can be readily computed from the input molecule x using the RDKit library, and hence do not require additional annotations in the training data. Note that due to the inherent stochasticity in the VAE encoding process, obtaining a low value of \mathcal{L}_{prop} is only possible if the latent space learned by q_{θ} is smooth with respect to the predicted properties.

4 Experiments

Setup We use training data from GuacaMol [9], which released a curated set of $\approx 1.5\text{M}$ drug-like molecules, divided into train, validation and test sets. We train MoLeR on the GuacaMol training set, using the validation set loss as the criterion for early stopping. We construct graph batches so that the total number of nodes per batch does not exceed 25k. After early stopping is triggered, we use the single best checkpoint selected based on validation loss to evaluate on downstream tasks. Moreover, as discussed above, we found that subsampling generation sequence steps to use only half of the steps per molecule tends to speed up convergence and leads to a lower final loss, as it yields more variety within each batch. Therefore, we subsample generation steps for all MoLeR experiments unless noted otherwise. For molecular optimization, we pair MoLeR with Molecular Swarm Optimization (MSO) [47], which is a black-box latent space optimization method that was shown to achieve state-of-the-art performance. For more details on the training routine, experimental setup, and hyperparameters, see Appendix B. We show samples from the model’s prior in Appendix C.

Baselines As baselines, we consider three established graph-based generative models: CGVAE [29], JT-VAE [16], and HierVAE [17]. Since the publicly released code of Liu et al. [29] does not scale to datasets as large as GuacaMol, for the sake of a fair comparison we re-implemented CGVAE following the released code to make it more efficient. For JT-VAE, we used the open-source code, but implemented multithreaded decoding, which made sampling 8x faster. For HierVAE, we used the released code with no changes. Due to the high cost of training JT-VAE and HierVAE, we did not tune their hyperparameters and instead used the default values.

4.1 Quantitative Results

Efficiency We measure how efficient our architecture is, both in terms of training and inference, quantified by the number of molecules processed per second. Note that we do *not* subsample generation steps for this comparison, so that every model processes all the steps, even though MoLeR




Figure 2: Frechet ChemNet Distance (lower is better) for different generation orders and vocabulary sizes. We consider generation from scratch (left), and generation starting from a scaffold (right).

can learn from only a subset of them. We compare these results in Table 1. We see that, thanks to a simpler formulation and parallel training on all generation steps, MoLeR is much faster than all baselines for both training and inference.

Unconstrained Generation Similarly to Brown et al. [9], we use Frechet ChemNet Distance (FCD) [34] to measure how well the molecules sampled from a trained model resemble those in the training data. We first consider sampling molecules from the prior, where we decode random latent samples from the VAE prior and compare them to a random sample from the data. We show the results in

Figure 2 (left). We see that random order performs poorly, as it models a much harder problem of generation under a wide range of orders, and this does not seem to benefit the downstream sampling task. We get the best results with orders that choose the starting point deterministically. Moreover, all orders improve when the vocabulary size is increased, showing that motif-based generation is widely beneficial. Finally, MoLeR with a large vocabulary size outperforms all baselines, despite being much faster to train and sample from, and having support for scaffold-constrained generation.

Unlike some prior work [9, 12], we do not compare validity, uniqueness and novelty, as our models get near-perfect results on these metrics, making comparison meaningless. Concretely, we obtain 100% validity by design (due to the use of valence checks), uniqueness above 99%, and novelty above 97%.

Scaffold-constrained Generation Next, we consider scaffold-constrained sampling and check if the model can recover the subspace of the training distribution consisting of molecules that contain a particular scaffold. We first choose a chemically relevant scaffold Σ [35] that commonly appears in GuacaMol training data. We then estimate the posterior distribution on latent codes induced by Σ by encoding all training molecules that contain it and approximating the result with a Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) with 50 mixture components. Finally, we draw latent codes from the GMM, decode them starting the generation process from Σ , and compare the resulting molecules with molecules from the data that contain Σ . By using samples from the GMM-approximated posterior, as opposed to samples from the prior, we ensure that we use latent codes which are *compatible* with the scaffold Σ , which we found to dramatically improve the downstream metrics. Intuitively, constraining the decoding restricts the latent codes of output molecules to a manifold defined by the scaffold constraint; using an approximate posterior ensures that the projected samples lie close to that manifold.

In Figure 2 (right) we show the resulting FCD. We find that the relative performance of different generation orders is largely *reversed*: since the models trained with canonical order can only complete prefixes of that order, they are not well equipped to complete arbitrary scaffolds. On the other hand, models trained with randomized orders are more flexible and handle the task well. As with generation from scratch, using a larger motif vocabulary tends to help, especially if motifs happen to decompose the scaffold into smaller fragments (or even the entire scaffold may appear in the vocabulary). Finally,

Table 1: Training and sampling speed for our model and the baselines, all measured on a single Tesla K80 GPU.

Model	Train (mol/sec)	Sample (mol/sec)
CGVAE	57.0	1.4
JT-VAE	3.2	3.4
HierVAE	17.0	12.3
MoLeR	95.2	34.2

Table 2: Optimization results on 20 original Guacamol tasks (left) and 4 additional scaffold-based tasks (right).

Method	Guacamol		Scaffolds	
	Score	Quality	Score	Quality
Best of dataset [9]	0.61	0.77	0.17	0.94
SMILES LSTM [9]	0.87	0.77	0.24	0.80
SMILES GA [9]	0.72	0.36	0.45	0.22
GRAPH MCTS [9]	0.45	0.22	0.20	0.64
GRAPH GA [9]	0.90	0.40	0.79	0.64
CDDD + MSO [47]	0.90	0.58	0.92	0.59
MNCE-RL [48]	0.92	0.54	-	-
MoLeR + MSO	0.82	0.75	0.93	0.61




Figure 3: Scaffold from a Guacamol benchmark (top) and a scaffold from our additional benchmark (bottom).

we note that BFS order using a random starting point gives the best results for this task, while still showing good performance for unconstrained sampling.

Unconstrained Optimization As a sanity check, we first test on Guacamol optimization benchmarks [9]. Following [9], we investigate two metrics: raw performance score, and quality, defined as absence of undesirable substructures. We show the results in Table 2 (left), comparing with various results published in the literature. We find that MoLeR achieves good results in terms of raw score, while also producing molecules of high quality. Note that the quality filters are not directly available to the models during optimization, and rather are evaluated post-hoc on the optimized molecules. This ensures that the high quality rate is caused by the model being biased towards reasonable molecules, and not by optimization learning to exploit and "slip through" the quality filters, similarly to what has been shown for property predictors [39]. We see that the best performing models often produce unreasonable molecules [47, 48]. While the SMILES LSTM baseline of Brown et al. [9] also gets good results on both score and quality, as we will see below, it struggles to complete arbitrary scaffolds. Note that, out of 20 tasks in this suite, only one tests optimization from a scaffold, and that task uses a small scaffold (Figure 3 (top)), making it relatively easy (even simple models get near-perfect results). In contrast, scaffolds typically used in drug discovery are much more complex [42, 43]. We conclude that while MoLeR shows good performance on Guacamol tasks, these tasks do not properly evaluate the ability to complete realistic scaffolds.

Scaffold-constrained Optimization To evaluate scaffold-constrained optimization, we extend the Guacamol benchmarks with 4 new scaffold-based tasks, using larger scaffolds extracted from or inspired by clinical candidate molecules or marketed drugs, which are more representative of real-world drug discovery (e.g. Figure 3 (bottom)). The task is then to perform exploration around a scaffold to reach a target property profile; since the different components of the scoring functions are aggregated via the geometric mean, and presence of the scaffold is binary, molecules that do not contain the scaffold receive a total score of 0. We show the results in Table 2 (right). We see that on these tasks MoLeR performs best, while most baseline approaches struggle to maintain the scaffold.

Finally, we run the tasks of [28], where the aim is to generate 100 distinct decorations of large scaffolds to match one or several property targets: molecular weight, logp and TPSA. While the model of Lim et al. [28] is specially designed to produce samples conditioned on the values of these three properties in one-shot, we convert the target property values into a single objective that we can optimize with MSO. Concretely, for each property we compute the absolute difference to the target value, which we divide by the result of Lim et al. [28] for a given task, and then average over all properties of interest; under the resulting metric, the model of Lim et al. [28] gets a score of 1.0 by design. We show the results in Figure 4. Despite not seeing this task during training, MoLeR outperforms the baseline on all benchmarks. These results show that MoLeR can match the capabilities of existing scaffold-based models out-of-the-box. To verify that the scaffolds used in these tasks are indeed challenging for unconstrained models, we also benchmark CDDD. We find that CDDD often produces invalid molecules or molecules that do not contain the scaffold; MoLeR avoids both of these problems thanks to valence constraints and scaffold-constrained generation. As a result,




Figure 4: Comparison on tasks from Lim et al. [28]. We run both the single-property control tasks as well as a task where all properties must be optimized for simultaneously. We plot an average over 20 runs for each of the four tasks; each run uses a different scaffold and property targets. Shaded area shows standard error of the mean.




Figure 5: Interpolation between latent encodings of two molecules; unconstrained decoding (top), constrained with scaffold (bottom). The scaffold is highlighted in each molecule that contains it.

for some runs CDDD discovers 100 different decorations only after many steps or does not discover them at all during the experiment; having 100 decorations is needed to compare the average result to Lim et al. [28]. For the sake of comparison, for CDDD we plot an *optimistic* score by duplicating the worst score an appropriate number of times; this was not needed for MoLeR, as it always finds enough decorations in the first few steps. Note that while MoLeR could also be extended to perform the generation in one-shot similarly to Lim et al. [28], in real-world drug discovery the properties of interest evolve over time and often are only known for very small subsets (tens to hundreds of molecules) of the training data.

4.2 Qualitative Results

Unconstrained and constrained interpolation To test the smoothness of our latent space and analyze how adding the scaffold constraint impacts decoding, we select a chemically relevant scaffold [37] and two dissimilar molecules m_1 and m_2 that contain it. We then linearly interpolate between the latent encodings of m_1 and m_2 , and select those intermediate points at which the corresponding decoded molecule changes. We show the result in Figure 5 (top). We see that MoLeR correctly identifies a smooth transition from m_1 to m_2 . Most of the differences between m_1 and m_2 stem from the latter containing two additional rings, and we see that rings are consistently added during the interpolation. For example, in the third step, the molecule grows by one extra ring, but of a type that does not appear in m_2 ; in the next step, this ring transforms into the correct type, and is then present in all subsequent steps (a similar pattern can be observed for the other ring). However, we see that some intermediate molecules do not contain the scaffold: although all of the scaffold’s building blocks are present, the interpolation goes through a region in which the model decides to move the NH group to a different location, thus breaking the integrity of the scaffold. This shows that while latent space distance strongly correlates with structural similarity, relying on latent space smoothness alone cannot guarantee the presence of a scaffold, which necessitates scaffold-based generation.

In contrast, in Figure 5 (bottom), we show the same sequence of latent codes decoded with a scaffold constraint. We see that the constraint keeps the NH group locked in place, so that all intermediate molecules contain the scaffold. The molecule decoded under a scaffold constraint is typically very similar to the one decoded without, showing that constrained decoding preserves chemical features that are not related to the presence of the scaffold. However, when trying to include the scaffold, our model does not have to resort to a simple rearrangement of existing building blocks: for example, in the 7th step, adding a constraint also modifies one of the ring types, which results in a smoother

interpolation in comparison to the unconstrained case. Finally, while the interpolation points were chosen to remove duplicates from the unconstrained path, we see that the last two latent points both get mapped to m_2 when the constraint is introduced. This is because the last step of the unconstrained interpolation merely rearranges the motifs, moving back the NH group to its initial location, and restoring the scaffold. This modification is not needed if the scaffold is already present, and therefore our model chooses to project both latent codes to the same point on the scaffold-constrained manifold.

Latent space neighborhood To analyze the structure of our scaffold-constrained latent space, we select another scaffold and perform scaffold-constrained decoding of a group of neighboring latent points. We find that close-by latent codes decode to related molecules, often using the same motifs but differing in their alignment, mirroring the observation of Jin et al. [16]. Moreover, we find that some latent space directions track simple chemical properties. For the decoded molecules together with further analysis of this result see Appendix D.

Learned motif representations To better understand how MoLeR uses motifs, we extract learned motif representations from a trained model. We found that, despite the weights having no *direct* access to molecular structure or features of motifs, nearest neighbors in the representation space correspond to pairs of nearly identical motifs. See Appendix E for visualization and further discussion.

5 Related Work

Our work naturally relates to the rich family of *in silico* drug discovery methods. However, it is most related to works that perform iterative generation of molecular graphs, works that employ fragments or motifs, and works that explicitly consider scaffolds.

Iterative generation of molecular graphs Many graph-based models for molecule generation employ some form of iterative decoding. Often a single arbitrary ordering is chosen: Liu et al. [29] first generate all atoms in a one-shot manner, and then generate bonds in BFS order; Jin et al. [16, 17] generate a coarsened tree-structured form of the molecular graph in a deterministic DFS order; finally, You et al. [50] use random order. Mercado et al. [31] try both random and canonical orders, and find the latter produces better samples, which is consistent with our unconstrained generation results. Sacha et al. [40] generate graph edits with the goal of modelling reactions, and evaluate a range of editing orders. Although the task in their work is different, the results are surprisingly close to ours: a fully random order performs badly, and the optimal amount of non-determinism is task-dependent.

Motif extraction Several other works make use of motif extraction approaches related to the one described in Section 3.1. Jin et al. [17] propose a very similar strategy, but additionally do not break *leaf bonds*, i.e. bonds incident to an atom of degree 1, which we found produces many motifs that are variations of the same underlying structure (e.g. ring) with different combinations of leaf atoms; for simplicity, we chose to omit that rule in our extraction strategy. More complex molecular fragmentation approaches also exist [13], and we plan to explore them in future work.

Motif-based generation Our work is closely related to the work of Jin et al. [16, 17], which also uses motifs to generate molecular graphs. However, these works cannot be easily extended to scaffold-based generation, and cannot generate molecules which use building blocks not covered by the motif vocabulary. While HierVAE [17] does include individual atoms and bonds in the vocabulary, their motifs are still assembled in a tree-like manner, meaning that their model cannot generate an arbitrary cyclic structure if its base cycles are not present in the vocabulary.

Scaffold-conditioned generation Several prior works can construct molecules under a hard scaffold constraint. Lim et al. [28] proposes a graph-based model that uses persistent state; scaffold-based generation is possible because the model is explicitly trained on (scaffold, molecule) pairs. In contrast, MoLeR treats *every* intermediate partial graph as if it were a scaffold to be completed. Li et al. [23] use a soft constraint, where the scaffold is part of the input, but is not guaranteed to be present in the generated molecule. Finally, Arús-Pous et al. [3], Langevin et al. [22] rely on SMILES-based models adapted to scaffolds, which cannot guarantee validity of generated molecules.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we presented a novel graph-based model for molecular generation. As our model does not depend on history, it can complete arbitrary scaffolds, while still outperforming state-of-the-art graph-based generative models in unconstrained generation. Our quantitative and qualitative results show that our model retains desirable properties of generative models - such as smooth interpolation - while respecting the scaffold constraint. Finally, we show that our model exhibits good performance in unconstrained optimization, while excelling in scaffold-constrained optimization.

7 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Hubert Misztela, Michał Pikusa and William Jose Godinez Navarro for work on the JT-VAE baseline. Moreover, we want to acknowledge the larger team (Ashok Thillaisundaram, Jessica Lanini, Megan Stanley, Nikolas Fechner, Paweł Czyż, Richard Lewis and Qurrat Ul Ain) for engaging in helpful discussions.

References

- [1] Martín Abadi, Paul Barham, Jianmin Chen, Zhifeng Chen, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, Sanjay Ghemawat, Geoffrey Irving, Michael Isard, et al. Tensorflow: A system for large-scale machine learning. In *12th {USENIX} symposium on operating systems design and implementation ({OSDI} 16)*, pages 265–283, 2016.
- [2] Sungsoo Ahn, Junsu Kim, Hankook Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. Guiding deep molecular optimization with genetic exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.04897*, 2020.
- [3] Josep Arús-Pous, Atanas Patronov, Esben Jannik Bjerrum, Christian Tyrchan, Jean-Louis Reymond, Hongming Chen, and Ola Engkvist. Smiles-based deep generative scaffold decorator for de-novo drug design. *Journal of cheminformatics*, 12:1–18, 2020.
- [4] Rim Assouel, Mohamed Ahmed, Marwin H Segler, Amir Saffari, and Yoshua Bengio. Defactor: Differentiable edge factorization-based probabilistic graph generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.09766*, 2018.
- [5] Jimmy Lei Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Layer normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06450*, 2016.
- [6] Samuel R. Bowman, Luke Vilnis, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Dai, Rafal Jozefowicz, and Samy Bengio. Generating sentences from a continuous space. In *Proceedings of The 20th SIGNLL Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 10–21, 2016.
- [7] John Bradshaw, Brooks Paige, Matt J Kusner, Marwin HS Segler, and José Miguel Hernández-Lobato. Barking up the right tree: an approach to search over molecule synthesis dags. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.11522*, 2020.
- [8] Marc Brockschmidt. GNN-film: Graph neural networks with feature-wise linear modulation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1144–1152. PMLR, 2020.
- [9] Nathan Brown, Marco Fiscato, Marwin HS Segler, and Alain C Vaucher. Guacamol: benchmarking models for de novo molecular design. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 59(3):1096–1108, 2019.
- [10] Kyunghyun Cho, Bart Van Merriënboer, Caglar Gulcehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. Learning phrase representations using rnn encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1078*, 2014.
- [11] Gabriele Corso, Luca Cavalleri, Dominique Beaini, Pietro Liò, and Petar Veličković. Principal neighbourhood aggregation for graph nets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05718*, 2020.
- [12] Nicola De Cao and Thomas Kipf. Molgan: An implicit generative model for small molecular graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.11973*, 2018.

- [13] Jörg Degen, Christof Wegscheid-Gerlach, Andrea Zaliani, and Matthias Rarey. On the art of compiling and using 'drug-like' chemical fragment spaces. *ChemMedChem: Chemistry Enabling Drug Discovery*, 3(10):1503–1507, 2008.
- [14] Justin Gilmer, Samuel S Schoenholz, Patrick F Riley, Oriol Vinyals, and George E Dahl. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.01212*, 2017.
- [15] Rafael Gómez-Bombarelli, Jennifer N Wei, David Duvenaud, José Miguel Hernández-Lobato, Benjamín Sánchez-Lengeling, Dennis Sheberla, Jorge Aguilera-Iparraguirre, Timothy D Hirzel, Ryan P Adams, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Automatic chemical design using a data-driven continuous representation of molecules. *ACS central science*, 4(2):268–276, 2018.
- [16] Wengong Jin, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. Junction tree variational autoencoder for molecular graph generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04364*, 2018.
- [17] Wengong Jin, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. Hierarchical generation of molecular graphs using structural motifs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03230*, 2020.
- [18] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [19] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [20] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907*, 2016.
- [21] Greg Landrum et al. Rdkit: Open-source cheminformatics. 2006. URL <http://www.rdkit.org>.
- [22] Maxime Langevin, Hervé Minoux, Maximilien Levesque, and Marc Bianciotto. Scaffold-constrained molecular generation. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 2020.
- [23] Yibo Li, Liangren Zhang, and Zhenming Liu. Multi-objective de novo drug design with conditional graph generative model. *Journal of cheminformatics*, 10(1):1–24, 2018.
- [24] Yibo Li, Jianxing Hu, Yanxing Wang, Jielong Zhou, Liangren Zhang, and Zhenming Liu. Deepscaffold: A comprehensive tool for scaffold-based de novo drug discovery using deep learning. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 60(1):77–91, 2019.
- [25] Yifeng Li, Hsu Kiang Ooi, and Alain Tchagang. Deep evolutionary learning for molecular design, 2021. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=Fo6S5-3Dx_.
- [26] Yujia Li, Daniel Tarlow, Marc Brockschmidt, and Richard Zemel. Gated graph sequence neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05493*, 2015.
- [27] Yujia Li, Oriol Vinyals, Chris Dyer, Razvan Pascanu, and Peter Battaglia. Learning deep generative models of graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.03324*, 2018.
- [28] Jaechang Lim, Sang-Yeon Hwang, Seungsu Kim, Seokhyun Moon, and Woo Youn Kim. Scaffold-based molecular design using graph generative model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13639*, 2019.
- [29] Qi Liu, Miltiadis Allamanis, Marc Brockschmidt, and Alexander Gaunt. Constrained graph variational autoencoders for molecule design. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31:7795–7804, 2018.
- [30] Andrew L Maas, Awni Y Hannun, and Andrew Y Ng. Rectifier nonlinearities improve neural network acoustic models. In *Proc. icml*, volume 30, page 3. Citeseer, 2013.
- [31] Rocío Mercado, Tobias Rastemo, Edvard Lindelöf, Günter Klambauer, Ola Engkvist, Hongming Chen, and Esben Jannik Bjerrum. Graph networks for molecular design. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 2020.

- [32] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [33] Agnieszka Pocha, Tomasz Danel, and Łukasz Maziarka. Comparison of atom representations in graph neural networks for molecular property prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.04444*, 2020.
- [34] Kristina Preuer, Philipp Renz, Thomas Unterthiner, Sepp Hochreiter, and Günter Klambauer. Frechet chemnet distance: a metric for generative models for molecules in drug discovery. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 58(9):1736–1741, 2018.
- [35] PubChem CID 12658820. Pubchem compound summary for cid 12658820 1,4-Dihydroquinoline. January, 2021. URL https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/1_4-Dihydroquinoline.
- [36] PubChem CID 57732551. Pubchem compound summary for cid 57732551 1,3-Dimethylquinolin-4(1H)-one. January, 2021. URL https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/1_3-Dimethylquinolin-4_1H-one.
- [37] PubChem CID 7375. Pubchem compound summary for cid 7375, 3-(trifluoromethyl)aniline. January, 2021. URL https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/3-Trifluoromethyl_aniline.
- [38] Matthias Rarey and J Scott Dixon. Feature trees: a new molecular similarity measure based on tree matching. *Journal of computer-aided molecular design*, 12(5):471–490, 1998.
- [39] Philipp Renz, Dries Van Rompaey, Jörg Kurt Wegner, Sepp Hochreiter, and Günter Klambauer. On failure modes of molecule generators and optimizers. 2020.
- [40] Mikołaj Sacha, Mikołaj Błaż, Piotr Byrski, Paweł Włodarczyk-Pruszyński, and Stanisław Jastrzębski. Molecule edit graph attention network: Modeling chemical reactions as sequences of graph edits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.15426*, 2020.
- [41] Nadine Schneider, Roger A Sayle, and Gregory A Landrum. Get your atoms in order - an open-source implementation of a novel and robust molecular canonicalization algorithm. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 55(10):2111–2120, 2015.
- [42] Ansgar Schuffenhauer. Computational methods for scaffold hopping. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science*, 2(6):842–867, 2012.
- [43] Ansgar Schuffenhauer, Peter Ertl, Silvio Roggo, Stefan Wetzel, Marcus A Koch, and Herbert Waldmann. The scaffold tree- visualization of the scaffold universe by hierarchical scaffold classification. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 47(1):47–58, 2007.
- [44] Marwin HS Segler, Thierry Kogej, Christian Tyrchan, and Mark P Waller. Generating focused molecule libraries for drug discovery with recurrent neural networks. *ACS central science*, 4(1):120–131, 2018.
- [45] Martin Simonovsky and Nikos Komodakis. Graphvae: Towards generation of small graphs using variational autoencoders. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 412–422. Springer, 2018.
- [46] Robin Winter, Floriane Montanari, Frank Noé, and Djork-Arné Clevert. Learning continuous and data-driven molecular descriptors by translating equivalent chemical representations. *Chemical science*, 10(6):1692–1701, 2019.
- [47] Robin Winter, Floriane Montanari, Andreas Steffen, Hans Briem, Frank Noé, and Djork-Arné Clevert. Efficient multi-objective molecular optimization in a continuous latent space. *Chem. Sci.*, 10:8016–8024, 2019. doi: 10.1039/C9SC01928F. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C9SC01928F>.

- [48] Chencheng Xu, Qiao Liu, Minlie Huang, and Tao Jiang. Reinforced molecular optimization with neighborhood-controlled grammars. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.07225*, 2020.
- [49] Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. How powerful are graph neural networks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00826*, 2018.
- [50] Jiaxuan You, Bowen Liu, Rex Ying, Vijay Pande, and Jure Leskovec. Graph convolutional policy network for goal-directed molecular graph generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.02473*, 2018.

A Architecture

The backbone of our architecture consists of two GNNs: one used to encode the input molecule, and the other used to encode the current partial graph. Both GNNs have the same architecture, but are otherwise completely separate i.e. they do not share any parameters.

To implement our GNNs, we employ the GNN-MLP layer [8]. We use 12 layers with separate parameters, Leaky ReLU non-linearities [30], and LayerNorm [5] after every GNN layer. After featurizing the atoms, we concatenate the atom features with a motif embedding of size 64, and then linearly project the result back into 64 dimensions, which we maintain as the hidden dimension throughout all GNN layers. Moreover, to improve the flow of gradients in the GNNs, we produce the final node-level feature vectors by concatenating both initial and intermediate node representations across all layers, resulting in feature vectors of size $64 \cdot 13 = 832$. Intuitively, this concatenation serves as a skip connection that shortens the path from the node features to the final representation.

To pool node-level representations into a graph-level representation, we use an expressive multi-headed aggregation scheme. Each aggregation head consists of two MLPs that compute (for each node) a scalar score and a transformed version of the node representation:

$$H_i = \{(s_i(f_v), t_i(f_v)) : v \in \mathcal{V}\} \quad (2)$$

We then normalize all scores across the graph, and use them to construct a weighted sum of the transformed representations. To normalize the scores, we consider either passing them through a softmax (which results in a head that implements a weighted mean) or a sigmoid (weighted sum). We use 32 heads for the encoder GNN, and 16 heads for the partial graphs GNN. In both cases, half of the heads use a softmax normalization, while the other half uses sigmoid.

Our node aggregation layer allows to construct a powerful graph-level representation; its dimensionality can be adjusted by varying the number of heads and the output dimension of the transformations t_i . For input graphs we use a 512-dimensional graph-level representation (which is then transformed to produce the mean and standard deviation of a 512-dimensional latent code z), and for partial graphs we use 256 dimensions.

For f_{node} , f_{att} and f_{bond} we use simple multilayer perceptrons (MLPs). As f_{node} has to output a distribution over all atom and motif types, we use hidden layers which maintain high dimensionality (two hidden layers with dimension 256). In contrast, f_{att} and f_{bond} are used as scorers (i.e. need to output a single value), therefore we use hidden layers that gradually reduce dimensionality (concretely, three hidden layers with dimension 128, 64, 32, respectively). Predicting the first node type would require encoding an empty partial graph to obtain h_{mol} ; to side-step this technicality, we simply use a separate MLP f'_{node} to predict the first node type, which takes as input the latent encoding z alone. Finally, after predicting the existence of a bond, we also need to predict one of three bond types; for that we use an additional MLP $f_{bondtype}$ with the same architecture as f_{bond} .

B Training and Inference

We train our model using the Adam optimizer [18]. We found that adding an initial warm-up phase for the β coefficient (i.e. increasing it from 0 to a target value over the course of training) helps to stabilize the model. However, our warm-up phase is relatively short: we reach the target β in 5000 training steps, whereas full convergence requires around 200 000 steps. This is in contrast to Jin et al. [16], which varies β uniformly over the entire training. A short warm-up phase is beneficial, as it allows to perform early stopping based on reaching a plateau in validation loss; this cannot be done while β is being varied, as there is no clear notion of improvement if the training objective is changing.

B.1 Hyperparameter Tuning

Due to a very large design space of GNNs, we performed only limited hyperparameter tuning during preliminary experiments. In our experience, improving the modeling (e.g. changing the motif vocabulary or generation order) tends to have a larger impact than tuning low-level GNN architectural choices. For hyperparameters describing the expressiveness of the model, such as the number of

layers or hidden representation size, we set them to reasonably high values, which is feasible as our model is very efficient to train. We did not make an attempt to reduce model size; it is likely that a smaller model would give equivalent downstream performance.

One parameter that we found to be tricky to tune is the β coefficient that weighs the \mathcal{L}_{prior} term of the VAE loss. An additional complication stems from the fact that we compute \mathcal{L}_{rec} as an average over the generation steps, instead of a sum. While we made this design choice to make the loss scaling robust to training steps subsampling (i.e. β does not have to be adjusted if we use only a subset of steps at training time), it led to decreased robustness when *the difficulty of an average step* varies between experiments. Concretely, when a larger motif vocabulary is used, generating a molecule entails fewer steps, but those steps are harder on average, since the underlying classification tasks need to distinguish between more classes. In preliminary experiments, we noticed the optimal value of β increased with vocabulary size, very closely following a logarithmic trend: doubling the motif vocabulary size translated to the optimum β increasing by 0.005. For the smallest vocabulary sizes (up to 32) we used $\beta = 0.01$, and then followed the logarithmic trend described here. Note that, due to the differences in the loss definitions, our value of β is not directly comparable to other β -VAE works.

B.2 Software and Hardware

We performed all experiments on a single GPU. For all measurements in Table 1, we used a machine with a single Tesla K80 GPU. Our own implementations (MoLeR, CGVAE) are based on TensorFlow 2 [1], while the models of Jin et al. [16, 17] (JT-VAE, HierVAE) use PyTorch [32].

Training MoLeR requires first preprocessing the data, which takes up to one CPU day for Guacamol, followed by training itself, which takes up to a few GPU days. While the generation benchmarks are cheap to run, optimization benchmarks are typically expensive. Each individual optimization benchmark takes between 6 and 80 hours of GPU time, depending on the details of the scoring function and size of the molecules that the algorithm ends up exploring.

B.3 Optimization

To perform optimization we used the original MSO code of Winter et al. [47]; we found that the default hyperparameters already resulted in good performance. However, we made two modifications to the algorithms to make the interplay of MSO and MoLeR smoother.

Deterministic encoding Despite being a black-box optimization method, MSO does use the *encoder* part of the generative model: first, to encode the seed molecules, but more interestingly, to re-encode molecules found in each step of optimization, adjusting the particle positions as $x \leftarrow \text{encode}(\text{decode}(x))$; we hypothesise that the latter was introduced to "snap back" the particles to the latent space region "preferred" by the encoder. Unlike CDDD, MoLeR is a *variational* autoencoder, thus by design the encoding is non-deterministic; this randomness interacts badly with MSO's re-encoding. Therefore, for all of our optimization experiments we made the MoLeR encoder deterministic by always returning the maximum likelihood latent code z (which coincides with the mean of the predicted Gaussian).

Latent code clipping One detail of MSO that we adapted to MoLeR is clipping of the particles' latent coordinates. Winter et al. [47] clip to a hypercube $[-1, 1]^D$ where $D = 512$ is the latent space dimension; while this makes sense for an unregularized autoencoder such as CDDD, the output from the MoLeR's encoder is regularized through the \mathcal{L}_{prior} loss term. Concretely, the mean of the distribution predicted by the encoder is penalized proportionally to its *norm*. This suggests that a ball may better approximate the encoder's distribution than a hypercube, which we indeed found to hold in practice. Therefore, for MoLeR we clip to a ball of fixed radius $R = 10$; on the Guacamol benchmarks [9] this modification alone improved MoLeR's score from 0.77 to 0.82, while also improving quality from 0.74 to 0.76. We chose the radius R so that *almost all* encodings of training set molecules land within the corresponding ball.

C Samples from the Prior




Figure 6: Samples from the prior of a trained MoLeR model.

D Latent Space Neighborhood

In this section, we present more details on the latent space neighborhood learned by MoLeR. For the purpose of this analysis we fixed a scaffold [36], and chose an arbitrary molecule m that contains it. In order to visualize the neighborhood of m , we encode it, and then decode a 5×5 grid of neighboring latent codes centered at the encoding of m . To produce the grid, we choose two random orthogonal directions in the latent space, and then use binary search to select the smallest step size which results in all 25 latent points decoding to distinct molecules. We show the resulting latent neighborhood in Figure 7, where the scaffold is highlighted in each molecule. We see that the model is able to produce reasonable variations of m , while maintaining local smoothness, as most adjacent pairs of molecules are very similar. Moreover, we notice that the left-to-right direction is correlated with size, showing that the latent space respects basic chemical properties. If the same 25 latent codes are decoded without the scaffold constraint, only 9 of them end up containing the scaffold, while the other 16 contain similar but different substructures.




Figure 7: Latent space neighborhood of a fixed molecule containing a chemically relevant scaffold. Each latent code is decoded under a scaffold constraint, so that the desired scaffold (highlighted in red) is present in each molecule.

E Learned Motif Representations

To extract learned motif representations from a trained MoLeR model, we could use any of its weights that are motif-specific. We start with the embedding layer in the *encoder*, which is used to construct atom features. Interestingly, we find that these embeddings do not cluster in any way, and even very similar motifs are assigned distant embeddings. We hypothesize that this is due to the use of a simple classification loss function used for reconstruction, which asks to recover the exact motif type, and does not give a smaller penalty for predicting an incorrect but similar motif. Therefore, for two motifs that are similar on the atom level, it may be beneficial to place their embeddings further apart, since otherwise it would be hard for the GNN to differentiate them at all. We hope this observation can




Figure 8: Six pairs of similar motifs (one per column), as extracted from weights of a trained MoLeR model.

inspire future work to scale to very large motif vocabularies, but use domain knowledge to craft a soft reconstruction loss that respects motif similarity.

Now, we turn to a different set of motif embeddings, which we extract from the last layer of the next node prediction MLP in the *decoder*. This results in one weight vector per every output class (i.e. atom and motif types); in contrast to the encoder-side embeddings, the role of these weight vectors is *prediction* rather than *encoding*. We find that pairs of motif embeddings that have high cosine similarity indeed correspond to very similar motifs, which often differ in very subtle details of the molecular graph. We show some of the closest pairs in Figure 8.

Finally, note that the motif embeddings discussed here (both encoder side and decoder side) were trained end-to-end with the rest of the model, and did not have direct access to graph structure or chemical features of motifs. Therefore, there is no bias that would make embeddings of similar motifs close, and this can only arise as a consequence of training.