



Supporting information for

Similarity-based methods and machine learning approaches for target prediction in early drug discovery: performance and scope

Neann Mathai¹ and Johannes Kirchmair^{1,2,*}

¹ Department of Chemistry and Computational Biology Unit (CBU), University of Bergen, N-5020 Bergen, Norway

² Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Vienna, 1090 Vienna, Austria

* Correspondence: johannes.kirchmair@univie.ac.at

The data of success and recovery rates presented in the graphs of the paper are reported below. The percentage indicates the success and recovery rates, while the numbers in the brackets show how many queries (success rate) or bioactivities (recovery rate) within the TC interval had a hit.

Similarity-based approach

Standard testing scenario with external data

Table S1. Success rates under the standard testing scenario with external data by the similarity approach

median maxTC	[0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8]	[0.4, 0.6]	[0.2, 0.4]	[0.0, 0.2]	overall
top-1	97.85% (17560/ 17946)	88.29% (15486/ 17539)	32.94% (1973/ 5989)	6.98% (208/ 2982)	5.19% (8/ 154)	78.98% (35235/ 44610)
top-3	99.74% (17899/ 17946)	96.61% (16945/ 17539)	50.63% (3032/ 5989)	12.17% (363/ 2982)	7.79% (12/ 154)	85.75% (38251/ 44610)
top-5	99.96% (17939/ 17946)	98.66% (17304/ 17539)	60.96% (3651/ 5989)	15.19% (453/ 2982)	8.44% (13/ 154)	88.23% (39360/ 44610)
top-10	99.98% (17943/ 17946)	99.70% (17486/ 17539)	77.63% (4649/ 5989)	21.09% (629/ 2982)	9.09% (14/ 154)	91.28% (40721/ 44610)
top-15	99.98% (17943/ 17946)	99.88% (17518/ 17539)	85.72% (5134/ 5989)	27.80% (829/ 2982)	10.39% (16/ 154)	92.89% (41440/ 44610)

Table S2. Recovery rates under the standard testing scenario with external data by the similarity approach

maxTC	[0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8)	[0.4, 0.6)	[0.2, 0.4)	[0.0, 0.2)	overall
top-1	67.82% (18368/ 27084)	55.34% (15480/ 27972)	12.65% (1341/ 10603)	0.66% (45/ 6767)	0.15% (1/ 677)	48.20% (35235/ 73103)
top-3	94.73% (25658/ 27084)	85.51% (23919/ 27972)	29.05% (3080/ 10603)	1.86% (126/ 6767)	0.15% (1/ 677)	72.20% (52784/ 73103)
top-5	98.91% (26788/ 27084)	93.59% (26179/ 27972)	40.48% (4292/ 10603)	3.16% (214/ 6767)	0.30% (2/ 677)	78.62% (57475/ 73103)
top-10	99.87% (27049/ 27084)	98.39% (27523/ 27972)	60.95% (6463/ 10603)	6.34% (429/ 6767)	0.44% (3/ 677)	84.08% (61467/ 73103)
top-15	99.96% (27074/ 27084)	99.32% (27782/ 27972)	72.76% (7715/ 10603)	10.64% (720/ 6767)	0.59% (4/ 677)	86.58% (63295/ 73103)

Standard time-split and close-to-real world testing scenarios

Table S3. Success rates under the time-split and close-to-real-world testing scenarios by the similarity approach

median maxTC	time-split scenario						close-to- real-world scenario
	[0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8)	[0.4, 0.6)	[0.2, 0.4)	[0.0, 0.2)	overall	
top-1	95.59% (1518/ 1588)	88.61% (4147/ 4680)	57.81% (3055/ 5285)	8.68% (565/ 6510)	0.69% (8/ 1160)	48.34% (9293/ 19223)	46.32% (9293/ 20061)
top-3	98.74% (1568/ 1588)	95.62% (4475/ 4680)	76.31% (4033/ 5285)	15.44% (1005/ 6510)	1.03% (12/ 1160)	57.71% (11093/ 19223)	55.30% (11093/ 20061)
top-5	99.75% (1584/ 1588)	97.37% (4557/ 4680)	82.65% (4368/ 5285)	19.43% (1265/ 6510)	1.38% (16/ 1160)	61.33% (11790/ 19223)	58.77% (11790/ 20061)
top-10	99.87% (1586/ 1588)	99.08% (4637/ 4680)	90.26% (4770/ 5285)	26.31% (1713/ 6510)	1.81% (21/ 1160)	66.21% (12727/ 19223)	63.44% (12727/ 20061)
top-15	99.87% (1586/ 1588)	99.62% (4662/ 4680)	93.72% (4953/ 5285)	31.08% (2023/ 6510)	1.98% (23/ 1160)	68.91% (13247/ 19223)	66.03% (13247/ 20061)

Table S4. Recovery rates under the time-split and close-to-real-world testing scenarios with by the similarity approach

maxTC	time-split scenario					close-to-real-world scenario	
	[0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8]	[0.4, 0.6]	[0.2, 0.4]	[0.0, 0.2]	overall	
top-1	70.10% (1611/ 2298)	62.63% (4426/ 7067)	35.74% (2983/ 8346)	2.61% (273/ 10462)	0.00% (0/ 2029)	30.77% (9293/ 30202)	29.50% (9293/ 31498)
top-3	94.04% (2161/ 2298)	88.67% (6266/ 7067)	61.71% (5150/ 8346)	6.88% (720/ 10462)	0.00% (0/ 2029)	47.34% (14297/ 30202)	45.39% (14297/ 31498)
top-5	98.69% (2268/ 2298)	95.39% (6741/ 7067)	72.12% (6019/ 8346)	10.31% (1079/ 10462)	0.00% (0/ 2029)	53.33% (16107/ 30202)	51.14% (16107/ 31498)
top-10	99.70% (2291/ 2298)	98.40% (6954/ 7067)	85.15% (7107/ 8346)	16.93% (1771/ 10462)	0.00% (0/ 2029)	60.01% (18123/ 30202)	57.54% (18123/ 31498)
top-15	99.74% (2292/ 2298)	99.19% (7010/ 7067)	90.47% (7551/ 8346)	21.62% (2262/ 10462)	0.00% (0/ 2029)	63.29% (19115/ 30202)	60.69% (19115/ 31498)

Similarity-based approach - reduced scope

Standard testing scenario with external data

Table S5. Success rates under the standard testing scenario with external data by the similarity approach with a reduced target scope

median maxTC	[0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8)	[0.4, 0.6)	[0.2, 0.4)	[0.0, 0.2)	overall
top-1	97.81% (17307/ 17695)	88.21% (15177/ 17205)	32.28% (1904/ 5899)	6.43% (188/ 2923)	4.42% (5/ 113)	78.89% (34581/ 43835)
top-3	99.76% (17652/ 17695)	96.65% (16629/ 17205)	50.18% (2960/ 5899)	11.56% (338/ 2923)	7.08% (8/ 113)	85.75% (37587/ 43835)
top-5	99.96% (17688/ 17695)	98.70% (16981/ 17205)	60.54% (3571/ 5899)	14.64% (428/ 2923)	7.96% (9/ 113)	88.23% (38677/ 43835)
top-10	99.98% (17692/ 17695)	99.72% (17157/ 17205)	77.37% (4564/ 5899)	20.56% (601/ 2923)	7.96% (9/ 113)	91.30% (40023/ 43835)
top-15	99.98% (17692/ 17695)	99.88% (17185/ 17205)	85.61% (5050/ 5899)	27.10% (792/ 2923)	8.85% (10/ 113)	92.91% (40729/ 43835)

Table S6. Recovery rates under the standard testing scenario with external data by the similarity approach with a reduced target scope

maxTC	[0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8)	[0.4, 0.6)	[0.2, 0.4)	[0.0, 0.2)	overall
top-1	68.08% (18074/ 26550)	55.61% (15174/ 27287)	12.59% (1292/ 10265)	0.61% (40/ 6528)	0.23% (1/ 433)	48.66% (34581/ 71063)
top-3	94.92% (25201/ 26550)	85.72% (23391/ 27287)	29.00% (2977/ 10265)	1.81% (118/ 6528)	0.23% (1/ 433)	72.74% (51688/ 71063)
top-5	98.96% (26275/ 26550)	93.73% (25576/ 27287)	40.52% (4159/ 10265)	3.12% (204/ 6528)	0.46% (2/ 433)	79.11% (56216/ 71063)
top-10	99.87% (26516/ 26550)	98.48% (26872/ 27287)	61.27% (6289/ 10265)	6.31% (412/ 6528)	0.69% (3/ 433)	84.56% (60092/ 71063)
top-15	99.96% (26540/ 26550)	99.37% (27114/ 27287)	73.27% (7521/ 10265)	10.65% (695/ 6528)	0.92% (4/ 433)	87.07% (61874/ 71063)

Standard time-split and close-to-real world testing scenarios

Table S7. Success rates under the time-split and close-to-real-world testing scenarios by the similarity approach with a reduced target scope

median maxTC	time-split scenario					overall	close-to- real-world scenario
	[0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8)	[0.4, 0.6)	[0.2, 0.4)	[0.0, 0.2)		
top-1	95.84% (1496/ 1561)	88.91% (4122/ 4636)	58.04% (2971/ 5119)	8.51% (532/ 6251)	0.70% (5/ 716)	49.92% (9126/ 18283)	45.49% (9126/ 20061)
top-3	98.78% (1542/ 1561)	96.23% (4461/ 4636)	76.75% (3929/ 5119)	15.37% (961/ 6251)	0.84% (6/ 716)	59.61% (10899/ 18283)	54.33% (10899/ 20061)
top-5	99.74% (1557/ 1561)	97.58% (4524/ 4636)	82.77% (4237/ 5119)	19.53% (1221/ 6251)	1.54% (11/ 716)	63.17% (11550/ 18283)	57.57% (11550/ 20061)
top-10	99.87% (1559/ 1561)	99.29% (4603/ 4636)	90.56% (4636/ 5119)	26.25% (1641/ 6251)	1.96% (14/ 716)	68.11% (12453/ 18283)	62.08% (12453/ 20061)
top-15	99.87% (1559/ 1561)	99.72% (4623/ 4636)	94.30% (4827/ 5119)	31.04% (1940/ 6251)	2.23% (16/ 716)	70.91% (12965/ 18283)	64.63% (12965/ 20061)

Table S8. Recovery rates under the time-split and close-to-real-world testing scenarios with by the similarity approach with a reduced target scope

maxTC	time-split scenario						close-to-real-world scenario
	[0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8]	[0.4, 0.6]	[0.2, 0.4]	[0.0, 0.2]	overall	
top-1	71.53% (1583/ 2213)	63.97% (4368/ 6828)	36.22% (2904/ 8018)	2.75% (271/ 9860)	0.00% (0/ 1198)	32.46% (9126/ 28117)	28.97% (9126/ 31498)
top-3	94.62% (2094/ 2213)	89.81% (6132/ 6828)	62.91% (5044/ 8018)	7.22% (712/ 9860)	0.00% (0/ 1198)	49.73% (13982/ 28117)	44.39% (13982/ 31498)
top-5	98.78% (2186/ 2213)	95.88% (6547/ 6828)	73.15% (5865/ 8018)	10.87% (1072/ 9860)	0.00% (0/ 1198)	55.73% (15670/ 28117)	49.75% (15670/ 31498)
top-10	99.77% (2208/ 2213)	98.68% (6738/ 6828)	85.88% (6886/ 8018)	17.58% (1733/ 9860)	0.00% (0/ 1198)	62.47% (17565/ 28117)	55.77% (17565/ 31498)
top-15	99.77% (2208/ 2213)	99.36% (6784/ 6828)	91.16% (7309/ 8018)	22.28% (2197/ 9860)	0.00% (0/ 1198)	65.79% (18498/ 28117)	58.73% (18498/ 31498)

ML approach

Standard testing scenario with external data

Table S9. Success rates under the standard testing scenario with external data by the ML approach

median maxTC	[0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8)	[0.4, 0.6)	[0.2, 0.4)	[0.0, 0.2)	overall
top-1	94.93% (16797/ 17695)	80.73% (13889/ 17205)	28.16% (1661/ 5899)	6.47% (189/ 2923)	2.65% (3/ 113)	74.23% (32539/ 43835)
top-3	98.82% (17487/ 17695)	90.32% (15540/ 17205)	44.96% (2652/ 5899)	14.47% (423/ 2923)	4.42% (5/ 113)	82.37% (36107/ 43835)
top-5	99.38% (17586/ 17695)	93.57% (16098/ 17205)	54.08% (3190/ 5899)	21.28% (622/ 2923)	6.19% (7/ 113)	85.55% (37503/ 43835)
top-10	99.73% (17648/ 17695)	96.30% (16569/ 17205)	66.86% (3944/ 5899)	31.06% (908/ 2923)	12.39% (14/ 113)	89.16% (39083/ 43835)
top-15	99.84% (17667/ 17695)	97.49% (16773/ 17205)	74.47% (4393/ 5899)	37.46% (1095/ 2923)	15.93% (18/ 113)	91.13% (39946/ 43835)

Table S10. Recovery rates under the standard testing scenario with external data by the ML approach

maxTC	[0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8)	[0.4, 0.6)	[0.2, 0.4)	[0.0, 0.2)	overall
top-1	65.62% (17423/ 26550)	50.49% (13777/ 27287)	12.06% (1238/ 10265)	1.53% (100/ 6528)	0.23% (1/ 433)	45.79% (32539/ 71063)
top-3	92.63% (24594/ 26550)	77.73% (21209/ 27287)	25.54% (2622/ 10265)	5.02% (328/ 6528)	0.69% (3/ 433)	68.61% (48756/ 71063)
top-5	97.65% (25927/ 26550)	85.82% (23418/ 27287)	34.60% (3552/ 10265)	8.53% (557/ 6528)	1.39% (6/ 433)	75.23% (53460/ 71063)
top-10	99.30% (26364/ 26550)	92.33% (25193/ 27287)	48.76% (5005/ 10265)	14.81% (967/ 6528)	3.70% (16/ 433)	80.98% (57545/ 71063)
top-15	99.66% (26461/ 26550)	94.86% (25885/ 27287)	57.99% (5953/ 10265)	19.87% (1297/ 6528)	4.85% (21/ 433)	83.89% (59617/ 71063)

Standard time-split and close-to-real world testing scenarios

Table S11. Success rates under the time-split and close-to-real-world testing scenarios by the ML approach

	time-split scenario						close-to-real-world scenario
	median [0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8]	[0.4, 0.6]	[0.2, 0.4]	[0.0, 0.2]	overall	
maxTC							
top-1	90.01% (1405/ 1561)	80.20% (3718/ 4636)	47.86% (2450/ 5119)	7.04% (440/ 6251)	0.42% (3/ 716)	43.84% (8016/ 18283)	39.96% (8016/ 20061)
top-3	96.28% (1503/ 1561)	90.55% (4198/ 4636)	64.43% (3298/ 5119)	12.01% (751/ 6251)	0.42% (3/ 716)	53.34% (9753/ 18283)	48.62% (9753/ 20061)
top-5	98.40% (1536/ 1561)	93.21% (4321/ 4636)	70.38% (3603/ 5119)	15.95% (997/ 6251)	0.70% (5/ 716)	57.22% (10462/ 18283)	52.15% (10462/ 20061)
top-10	99.30% (1550/ 1561)	96.05% (4453/ 4636)	77.93% (3989/ 5119)	21.52% (1345/ 6251)	1.12% (8/ 716)	62.05% (11345/ 18283)	56.55% (11345/ 20061)
top-15	99.62% (1555/ 1561)	97.43% (4517/ 4636)	81.46% (4170/ 5119)	25.05% (1566/ 6251)	1.26% (9/ 716)	64.63% (11817/ 18283)	58.91% (11817/ 20061)

Table S12. Recovery rates under the time-split and close-to-real-world testing scenarios with by the ML approach

	time-split scenario						close-to-real-world scenario
	maxTC [0.8, 1]	[0.6, 0.8)	[0.4, 0.6)	[0.2, 0.4)	[0.0, 0.2)	overall	
top-1	67.06% (1484/ 2213)	57.45% (3923/ 6828)	29.13% (2336/ 8018)	2.77% (273/ 9860)	0.00% (0/ 1198)	28.51% (8016/ 28117)	25.45% (8016/ 31498)
top-3	91.55% (2026/ 2213)	82.70% (5647/ 6828)	50.86% (4078/ 8018)	7.03% (693/ 9860)	0.00% (0/ 1198)	44.26% (12444/ 28117)	39.51% (12444/ 31498)
top-5	95.39% (2111/ 2213)	89.22% (6092/ 6828)	60.50% (4851/ 8018)	10.75% (1060/ 9860)	0.00% (0/ 1198)	50.20% (14114/ 28117)	44.81% (14114/ 31498)
top-10	98.73% (2185/ 2213)	93.85% (6408/ 6828)	72.11% (5782/ 8018)	16.33% (1610/ 9860)	0.08% (1/ 1198)	56.86% (15986/ 28117)	50.75% (15986/ 31498)
top-15	99.14% (2194/ 2213)	96.28% (6574/ 6828)	76.93% (6168/ 8018)	20.23% (1995/ 9860)	0.17% (2/ 1198)	60.22% (16933/ 28117)	53.76% (16933/ 31498)