



OPEN

AI is a viable alternative to high throughput screening: a 318-target study

The Atomwise AIMS Program^{1✉*}

High throughput screening (HTS) is routinely used to identify bioactive small molecules. This requires physical compounds, which limits coverage of accessible chemical space. Computational approaches combined with vast on-demand chemical libraries can access far greater chemical space, provided that the predictive accuracy is sufficient to identify useful molecules. Through the largest and most diverse virtual HTS campaign reported to date, comprising 318 individual projects, we demonstrate that our AtomNet[®] convolutional neural network successfully finds novel hits across every major therapeutic area and protein class. We address historical limitations of computational screening by demonstrating success for target proteins without known binders, high-quality X-ray crystal structures, or manual cherry-picking of compounds. We show that the molecules selected by the AtomNet[®] model are novel drug-like scaffolds rather than minor modifications to known bioactive compounds. Our empirical results suggest that computational methods can substantially replace HTS as the first step of small-molecule drug discovery.

Despite present interest in AI/ML and thirty years of case studies^{1–4}, computational screening techniques have achieved limited adoption within the pharmaceutical industry. A recent investigation into the origins of 156 clinical candidates⁵ found that only 1% came from virtual screening; in contrast, over 90% of clinical candidates were derived from patent busting or high throughput screening (HTS). Unfortunately, these sources are increasingly challenged, given the pharmaceutical industry's shift to novel target classes, such as proximity-induced protein degradation⁶, protein–protein interactions⁷, and RNA targeting⁸.

Currently, HTS is the critical tool in drug discovery, providing most novel scaffolds of recent clinical candidates^{5,9,10}. These initial starting points crucially shape the course of downstream medicinal chemistry efforts, as most drugs preserve at least 80% of the scaffold of the initially identified lead¹¹. Despite these foundational contributions, HTS suffers from practical limitations. Principally, HTS, like all physical experiments, requires that the compounds exist. However, with the advent of synthesis-on-demand libraries, most commercially-available molecules have yet to be synthesized. Still, they can be made and delivered for testing in a matter of weeks^{12–14}. These libraries comprise trillions of molecules^{14,15} that exemplify millions of otherwise-unavailable scaffolds¹², providing an opportunity to substantially expand the scope and diversity of available chemical space explored in the standard drug discovery process.

Computational approaches unlock this opportunity by reversing the requirement to make molecules before testing them. When computational experiments replace HTS as the primary screen, molecules are tested *before* they are made, and the results from these experiments can inform which molecules are worth synthesizing. Computational experiments further promise to improve upon HTS in terms of cost, speed, need to produce significant quantities of protein¹⁶, effort of miniaturizing assay formats while maintaining experimental integrity^{17–19}, and reducing false-positive and false-negative rates^{16,20–23} including artifacts from aggregation, covalent modification of the target, autofluorescence, or interactions with the reporter rather than the target^{20,24,25}. Historical computational techniques such as ligand-based QSAR^{26–28}, structure-based docking^{29,30}, and machine learning^{31,32} purport to address these limitations of physical screening methods. Unfortunately, these techniques have not replaced HTS; in fact, despite increasing interest in ML, the proportion of drugs discovered with computational techniques has remained steady over the past decades^{5,10}.

Because there will always be individual targets for which one screening technique can identify more hits than another, the key question governing if computation is ready to be the default hit discovery technique is whether computational screens can identify hits successfully across a broad range of diverse targets. Unfortunately, despite excellent benchmark accuracies^{33–35}, prospective discovery accuracy remains modest^{33,36,37}. For example, Cerón-Carrasco³⁸ reported over 700 virtual screens against the SARS-CoV-2 main protease. However, when the author

*A list of authors and their affiliations appears at the end of the paper. ✉email: izhar@atomwise.com

sought to validate the computational predictions via physical experiments, the identified compounds were barely active (800uM). Computational approaches have also been limited by a need for extensive target-specific training data^{31,39–41}, a requirement for high-quality X-ray crystal structures^{42,43}, dependence on human adjudication (so-called ‘cherry-picking’)¹², or a limited domain of applicability^{44–48}. Even recent systems have demonstrated utility only in identifying minor variants of known molecules for well-studied proteins with tens of thousands of known binders in their training data^{49,50}. Figure 1 exemplifies the striking similarities between recently ML-developed compounds and their preceding published chemical matter. This is particularly concerning, as a myopic focus on well-studied proteins has been identified as a cause of low productivity in pharmaceutical discovery⁵¹.

Nevertheless, we have observed that deep learning approaches are not as limited as these historical examples would imply. Using our AtomNet^{52–54} screening system, we have previously reported success in finding novel scaffolds for targets without known ligands^{55–57}, X-ray crystal structures^{56–60}, or both^{56,57}, as well as challenging modulation via protein–protein interaction^{59,61} or allosteric binding⁶⁰ (see Supplementary Table S1 for examples). However, individual examples do not demonstrate the overall success of such deep learning systems. We therefore report our internal discovery efforts against 22 targets of pharmaceutical interest. We then attempted to further assess the generalizability and robustness of deep learning predictive systems by identifying bioactive molecules for a diverse set of targets. We partnered with 482 academic labs and screening centers, from 257 different academic institutions across 30 countries, through our academic collaboration program, the Artificial Intelligence Molecular Screen (AIMS). This collaboration afforded an opportunity to prospectively evaluate the utility of the AtomNet model as a primary screen across a broad range of diverse, challenging, and realistic targets. In aggregate, we report successes and failures from 318 prospective experiments and evaluate our AtomNet machine-learning technology’s ability to serve as a viable alternative to physical HTS campaigns.

Results

We investigated the ability of deep learning-based methods to identify novel bioactive chemotypes by applying the AtomNet model to identify hits for 22 internal targets of pharmaceutical interest. We also explored the breadth of applicability of this approach by attempting to identify drug-like hits in single-dose screens for 296 academic targets, of which 49 were followed up with dose–response experiments, and 21 were further validated by exploring analogs of the initial hits. The average hit rate for our internal projects (6.7%) was comparable to the hit rate for our academic collaborations (7.6%).

Internal portfolio validation

As part of Atomwise’s internal drug discovery efforts, we used the AtomNet model instead of high-throughput or DNA-encoded library (DEL) screening. We screened a 16-billion synthesis-on-demand chemical space⁶², which




Figure 1. Pairs of representative compounds extracted from AI patents (right) and corresponding prior patents (left) for clinical-stage programs (CDK7^{92,93}, A2Ar-antagonist^{94,95}, MALT1^{96,97}, QPCTL^{98,99}, USP1^{100,101}, and 3CLpro^{102,103}). The identical atoms between the chemical structures are highlighted in red.

is several thousand times larger than HTS libraries and even exceeds the size of most DELs without suffering limitations of DNA-compatible chemistry^{16,23}. Each screen requires over 40,000 CPUs, 3,500 GPUs, 150 TB of main memory, and 55 TB of data transfers. We describe the protocol in detail in the Methods section; briefly, we computationally scored each catalog compound after removing molecules that were prone to interfere with the assays or were too similar to known binders of the target or its homologs. The neural network analyzes and scores the 3D coordinates of each generated protein–ligand co-complex, producing a list of ligands ranked by their predicted binding probability. Our workflow then clusters the top-ranked molecules to ensure diversity and algorithmically selects the highest-scoring exemplars from each cluster. At no point are compounds manually cherry-picked. The molecules were synthesized at Enamine (<https://enamine.net>) and quality controlled by LC–MS to purity > 90%, in agreement with HTS standards⁶³. Hits were further validated using NMR. We then physically tested, on average, 440 compounds per target at reputable contract research organizations (CROs), while attempting to mitigate assay interferences such as aggregation and oxidation with standard additives (e.g., Tween-20, Triton-X 100, and dithiothreitol (DTT)). We describe the assay protocols in detail in the Supplementary Data S1.

We describe the results of the 22 experiments in Table 1. In 91% of the experiments, we identified single-dose (SD) hits that were reconfirmed in dose–response (DR) experiments. The average target DR hit rate was 6.7% compared to 8.8% from the SD screens. Only 16 of the 22 projects were structurally enabled with X-ray crystallography; one used a cryo-EM structure, while five used homology models with an average sequence identity of 42% to their template protein. The DR hit rate for the cryo-EM project was 10.56%, while the average hit rate for the homology models was a similar 10.8%.

We then advanced 14 projects with at least one dose-responsive scaffold to a round of analog expansion. We found new bioactive analogs in the SD screen for all projects, with an average hit rate of 29.8%. Further validation with DR resulted in an average hit rate of 26% per project, which compares favorably with typical HTS hit rates ranging from 0.151 to 0.001%^{64,65}. We note that the size and chemical diversity within and between physical⁶⁶ and virtual¹⁴ HTS libraries prevent an explicit evaluation of the methods over the same chemical space. The most potent analogs ranged from single-digit nanomolar, against a kinase, to double-digit micromolar, against a transcription factor (Supplementary Table S2). Additionally, we present two internal studies in detail. For Large Tumor Suppressor Kinase 1 (LATS1), we identified potent compounds despite the lack of a crystal structure or known active compounds. For ATP-driven chaperone Valosin Containing Protein (VCP) we identified novel allosteric and orthosteric modulators.

Gene name	# of compounds tested	SD hit rate (%)	DR hit rate (%)	Potency range (IC50/Ki, uM)	# of analog tested	SD analog hit rate (%)	DR analog hit rate (%)	Analog potency range (IC50/Ki, uM)
ASAH1	376	10.64	7.71	0.3–102	–	–	–	–
AXL	597	12.06	8.21	0.181–71	3200	35.59	33.56	0.079–86
BCL2	422	3.08	0.00	–	–	–	–	–
CBLB	422	1.66	0.00	–	–	–	–	–
CDK5	786	10.69	10.43	0.049–79	587	47.53	43.61	0.43–76
CDK7	786	10.69	10.56	0.099–60	735	28.44	27.35	0.191–10
GFPT1	384	6.51	2.34	31–86	734	24.93	24.11	1–194
KCNT1	416	9.62	7.69	1.1–30	–	–	–	–
KDM6A	356	3.93	1.12	24–58	–	–	–	–
LATS1	418	18.18	17.94	0.077–82	841	51.72	45.78	0.034–98
MC2R	208	11.54	9.62	16–68	419	39.38	38.42	2.4–97
MDM4	422	2.37	0.47	5.9–29.8	192	18.23	18.23	4.4–90
NT5E	335	1.49	0.30	176	221	9.95	1.81	8.3–65
PARG	334	7.78	7.78	15–250	–	–	–	–
PARP14	576	5.38	2.95	3–96	616	26.46	26.30	0.2–95
POLQ	330	11.82	11.52	1.2–49	559	11.27	8.77	1.5–42
PPARA	422	4.03	0.24	131	211	14.22	3.79	59–95
PPM1D	530	11.89	6.98	4.5–98	–	–	–	–
PRMT5	422	4.03	0.95	7.2–79	415	7.95	5.54	19–114
PRODH2	542	2.77	1.11	15–84	–	–	–	–
TYK2	189	38.10	34.39	0.016–9	457	71.33	60.39	0.006–10
VCP	416	4.81	4.81	2.4–64	738	–	–	–

Table 1. Results from 22 Atomwise internal programs. SD and DR denote single-dose and dose–response, respectively.

Academic validation

In addition to our internal discovery efforts, we performed virtual screens for 296 targets, comprising more than 20 billion individual neural network scores of generated protein–ligand co-complexes. We purchased, on average, 85 off-the-shelf commercially available compounds, quality controlled by NMR and LC–MS to >90% purity⁶³, and plated in a single 96-well plate. The compounds were then physically screened for activity against the target of interest in single-dose assays (see Supplemental Data S1 for assay protocols). As with HTS primary screens, additional characterization studies are required to validate the initially identified hits so, in 49 projects, we performed dose–response studies and analog expansion. We present a summary of our results in Supplementary Table S3.

Figure 2 illustrates the distributions of projects across therapeutic areas, protein families, and assay types. Every major therapeutic area is represented, with the most frequent area being oncology, comprising 35% of projects, followed by infectious diseases and neurology, comprising 27% and 9% of projects, respectively. Breaking down the projects by protein families reveals that all major enzyme classes are represented, with enzymes comprising 59% of the targets and membrane proteins such as GPCR, transporters, and ion channels, representing 12% of the targets. Working on a large and diverse set of therapeutic targets requires a heterogeneous collection of biological assays; 20% of the assays measured direct binding, whereas 56% and 20% were functional and phenotypic.

In 215 projects, we identified at least one bioactive compound for the target in a biochemical or cell-based assay. This 73% success rate substantially improves over the ~50% success rate for HTS^{21,67}. On average, we screened 85 compounds per project and discovered 4.6 active hits, with an average hit rate of 5.5%. For the subset of targets where we found any hits, the average was 6.4 hits per project. Thus, we achieved an average hit rate of 7.6%, which again compares favorably with typical HTS hit rates. See Supplementary Material S1 for all assay definitions and conditions. Supplementary Table S4 shows a representative bioactive compound from each of the 215 successful projects, and Supplementary Fig. S2 shows that the physicochemical properties of the identified hits are largely druglike and Lipinski-compliant.

The AtomNet technology robustly identified active molecules, even for targets that lacked prior on-target bioactivity data. This ability to identify hits for previously undrugged targets is critical if machine learning-based approaches are to replace HTS as the default primary screening approach. For 207 out of the 296 targets (70%), the training data available for AtomNet models lacked a single active molecule for that target or any closely related protein (i.e., proteins with sequence identity greater than 70%). We interpret this as evidence of the ability of properly-architected machine learning systems to extrapolate to novel biological space. Figure 3A illustrates




Figure 2. The distributions of 296 AIMS projects across assay types used in the primary screen, research areas, target classes, and further breakdown to enzyme classes when applicable.




Figure 3. (A) An illustration of the hit rate versus the number of training examples available to our model. Each point represents a project, with the x-axis denoting the number of active molecules in our training for the target protein or homologs and the y-axis denoting the hit rate of the project (the percentage of molecules tested in the project that were active). The model shows no dependence on the availability of on-target training examples. For 70% of the targets, the AtomNet model training data lacked any active molecules for that target or any similar targets with greater than 70% sequence identity, yet the model achieved a hit rate of 5.3% compared to 6.1% when on-target data was available. (B) The distribution of similarities between hits and their most-similar bioactive compounds in our training data. Our screening protocol ensures that the compounds subjected to physical testing are not similar to known active compounds or close homologs (<0.5 Tanimoto similarity using ECFP4, 1024 bits). Because 70% of the AIMS targets had no annotated bioactivities in our training dataset, hits identified in these projects have a similarity value of zero.

the hit rate versus the number of training examples available to our model. Although previous computational approaches typically require thousands of on-target training examples^{31,39,42}, the lack of correlation between training examples and hit rate ($R^2 = 0.0021$, $p\text{-value} = 0.43$) shows that our ML algorithm is agnostic to the availability of such data. We achieved an average success rate of 75% and hit rates of 5.3% when no training data was available, comparable to the 67% and 6.1% success and hit rates achieved when binding data was available in the training set. Interestingly, we also do not see a significant increase in hit rate attributable to the proportion of binding data available for a target ($R^2 = 0.008$, $p\text{-value} = 0.39$). This reflects the robustness of the screening protocol and the chemical dissimilarity of scaffolds identified by AtomNet models to previously known bioactive compounds.

Next, we assessed the ability of the AtomNet models to identify novel scaffolds. This is a critical capability for primary screens, as follow-up assays tend to work within the chemical space uncovered in the initial screen. The task of novel scaffold identification appears in two distinct scenarios: (1) when no scaffold is known for the target and we wish to identify the first scaffold, and (2) when some scaffolds are known but we wish to identify dissimilar scaffolds because novel chemical matter can yield improved selectivity, toxicity, pharmacokinetics, or patentability. Performance of AtomNet models for the first scenario, when no scaffolds for the target existed in the AtomNet model training data, was evaluated on 70% of the targets, where the training data contained no active molecules for the target or its homologs (vide supra). We achieved an average hit rate of 5.3% for targets with no training data. For the second scenario, we analyzed the similarity of the identified hits to known bioactive compounds in our training data (Fig. 3B). Our screening protocol ensures that the compounds subjected to physical testing are not similar to known active compounds or close homologs (<0.5 Tanimoto similarity using ECFP4⁶⁸, 1024 bits). We interpret this as evidence of the ability of properly-architected machine learning systems to extrapolate to novel chemical space as well. For cases where training data was available (i.e., the Tanimoto similarity is above zero), the similarity distribution is close to the one expected by random compound pairs⁶⁹. The novelty of the small-molecule structures is striking because target-specific machine-learning algorithms tend to uncover highly similar analogs for known bioactive molecules^{50,70,71}. The superior performance of the AtomNet model is expected, considering the bias-variance tradeoff⁷² in machine learning algorithms. Because the AtomNet convolutional neural network is a global model, concurrently trained on millions of bioactivities, hundreds of thousands of small molecules, and thousands of protein binding sites, it can reduce both bias and variance of the model compared to target-specific ones³³. Specifically, our global model can benefit from multiple levels of information captured in the structures of the small molecules, the sequences of the target proteins, and the three-dimensional interactions between the two.

AtomNet also successfully identified active molecules when there was no X-ray crystal structure of the receptor. Figure 4A compares the hit rates obtained with 3-dimensional crystal structures, cryo-EM, and homology modeling. We did not attempt to select targets based on the similarity to the template but rather used the best template available. We observe no substantial difference in success rate between the three, in




Figure 4. Hit rates obtained for the 296 AIMS projects. **(A)** A comparison of hit rates using X-ray crystallography, NMR, Cryo-EM, and homology for modeling the structure of the proteins. Each point represents a project with the x-axis denoting the hit rate of the project (the percentage of molecules tested in the project that were active). The number of projects of each type is given in parentheses. We observed no substantial difference in success rate between the physical and the computationally inferred models. We achieved average hit rates of 5.6%, 5.5%, and 5.1% for crystal structures, cryo-EM, and homology modeling, respectively. The number of projects using NMR structures is too small to make statistically-robust claims. **(B)** A comparison of hit rates observed for traditionally challenging target classes such as protein–protein interactions (PPI) and allosteric binding. Of the 296 projects, 72 targeted PPIs and 58 allosteric binding sites. The average hit rates were 6.4% and 5.8% for PPIs and allosteric binding, respectively. **(C)** Comparison of hit rates observed for different target classes and **(D)** enzyme classes. No protein or enzyme class falls outside the domain of applicability of the algorithm.

contrast to the common challenges in using homology models or low-precision structures for structure-based discovery^{42,43,73}. We achieved average hit rates of 5.6%, 5.5%, and 5.1% for crystal structures, cryo-EM, and homology modeling. We also successfully identified active compounds in projects with NMR structures, but the number of such targets is too small to make statistically-robust claims.

An interesting demonstration of the robustness of the AtomNet model to low data and poorly characterized protein structure is its ability to identify novel hits for traditionally challenging target classes such as protein–protein interaction (PPI) sites and allosteric binding sites (Fig. 3B). Of the 296 projects, 72 targeted PPIs and 58 allosteric binding sites. We identified hits for 53 (74%) PPI sites and 46 (79%) allosteric sites, with 13 projects representing allosteric sites at PPI interfaces. The average hit rate was 6.4% and 5.8% for PPIs and allosteric binding sites, respectively. The algorithm's success in these target classes, which often suffer from poorly characterized binding sites and a lack of bioactivity training data, is not surprising because Fig. 2A shows that our model is largely not dependent on the availability of on-target training data.

Finally, we investigated whether the algorithm exhibits domain of applicability limitations regarding different protein classes. Figures 4C and 3D illustrate the hit rate observed for each protein and enzyme class. No protein or enzyme class falls outside the domain of applicability of the algorithm, demonstrating that machine learning-based approaches are well-suited as a default technology for new scaffold identification. The hit rate for nuclear receptors is an outlier, with seemingly better accuracy than other classes, but a single data point is not statistically meaningful.

Dose–response validation studies

We performed additional validation studies for 49 AIMS projects with at least one reported hit. The objective of the validation studies was to establish dose–response (DR) relationships for the single-dose (SD) hits. We describe the protocol of the DR experiments in the Methods section. Briefly, we performed dose–response measurements for the reported hits from the single-dose primary screens. DR was determined using the same assay and screening protocol as the single-dose screens, at the same lab, and with the same personnel. Full dose response curves were obtained in most cases, however in some instances a full curve was not obtained, or

concentration dependent activity was qualitatively determined by testing at concentrations other than that for the primary screen. The distribution of assay types and target classes for the projects selected for DR validation also was similar to that of the AIMS projects (Supplementary Fig. S3).

We describe the results of the DR experiments in Supplementary Table S5. In 84% of the experiments, we validated at least one SD hit and got a DR readout. The median activity for the total of 144 DR measurements was 15.4 μM (which compares favorably with HTS^{25,74}), of which 13% showed sub- μM potency. Overall, we achieved an average of 2.8 hits per validation study, resulting in a hit rate of 51%. The false positive rate of 49% observed in these experiments is favorably compared to HTS' which can be as high as 95%^{20,75}. This difference in false positive rates may stem from the comparative ease and robustness of the low-throughput assay format we employed versus high-throughput assay. Representative dose–response curves for each of the 49 projects are shown in Supplementary Table S6.

Analog validation studies

For a subset of 21 projects, we further validated hits with DR activity by testing analogs of the active compounds. In those cases, we used the AtomNet platform to search a purchasable space for additional bioactive compounds chemically analogous to the SD hits. We selected up to 35 additional compounds for testing, including the active compounds from the SD screens.

We describe the results of the analoging experiments in Supplementary Table S7. We identified additional analogs with DR readouts for 16 projects (76%). The median DR activity of the 154 validated analogs was 7.4 μM compared to the median of 15.4 μM of the parent compound (Supplementary Fig. S4).

Methods

Screening protocols

AIMS screening protocol

We began by evaluating screening libraries of millions of catalog compounds from commercial vendors MCule (10 M)⁷⁶ and Enamine in-stock (2.5 M)⁷⁷. We then selected a drug-like subset via algorithmic filtering by applying Eli Lilly medicinal chemistry filters⁷⁸ and removing likely false positives, such as aggregators, autofluorescers, and PAINS⁷⁹ (see Fig. 2 for the distributions of drug-like properties of the SD hits). The resulting library was virtually screened against the target of interest, removing any molecules with greater than 0.5 Tanimoto similarity in ECFP4 space to any known binders of the target and its homologs within 70% sequence identity. For kinase targets, we extend the exclusion to the whole kinome. The binding site was defined using co-complexes, mutagenesis studies, co-complexes of homologs, or by identifying potential sites using ICM Pocket Finder⁸⁰ or Fpocket⁸¹. Some were orthosteric, while others were allosteric, or as yet unestablished biological functions. In 64 cases, we built homology models using the closest sequence, with an average sequence similarity of 54%. We clustered the top 30,000 molecules using the Butina⁸² algorithm with a Tanimoto similarity cutoff of 0.35 in ECFP4 space, selecting the highest-scoring exemplars. Additional computed physico-chemical property filters were applied as needed. At no point were compounds cherry-picked. We purchased, on average, 85 compounds, quality controlled by LC–MS to > 90% purity, generally dispensed as 10 mM DMSO stocks plated in a single 96-well plate. In addition, two vials of DMSO-only negative controls were included before scrambling the compound locations on the plate, by the supplier, for blinded experimental testing. To further control for potential artifacts, we removed compounds that showed measurable activity toward more than one target from the analysis.

Dose–response and analoging validation screening protocol

We considered advancing AIMS projects to additional validation studies based on the ability to reorder at least some of the initial SD hits, the availability of chemical analogs in the screening library to the initial hits, the capability to perform dose–response experiments, and the ability of the collaborators to perform additional screens and return results promptly.

We performed two sets of experiments: DR validation of the SD hits from AIMS and analoging with DR readouts. We performed DR measurements using the same assays and protocols as SD.

We performed an analoging round by identifying, for each AIMS hit, its 1000 nearest neighbors from the Mcule library⁷⁶, using molecular fingerprints similarity⁶⁸. We augmented the set with additional analogs using substructure⁸³ or FTrees⁸⁴ searches, if needed. We used an AtomNet regression model, trained to predict quantitative bioactivities (e.g., IC50 or Ki), to score and rank the analogs. A set of 20–35 compounds from the analogs space of an initial hit were then obtained based on similarity and top scores from the AtomNet model for testing.

Internal portfolio screening protocol

We followed a protocol similar to the AIMS screen with a few deviations. First, we used the Enamine REAL library of over 16 billion compounds⁶². Second, we used an ensemble of six AtomNet models for the screens. Last, on average, we selected a set of 440 compounds for testing.

The analoging protocol is similar to the AIMS validation studies, with the following deviations. First, we used the Enamine REAL library for analog search. Second, we selected an average of 676 analogs per project. Third, the analog search protocol was more complex, pulling nearest neighbors based on maximum common substructure and graph edit distance in addition to the ECFP4-based one.

AtomNet® model architecture

We previously published in detail^{52,53,55,58,59,61,85,86} during the course of the AIMS program, and we described the most recent version of the AtomNet model architecture in detail elsewhere⁵³. We provide a brief description below.

The AtomNet model is a Graph Convolution Network architecture with atoms represented as vertices and pair-wise, distance-dependent, edges representing atom proximities. The input is a graph network of features characterizing the atom types and topologies of an ensemble of protein–ligand complexes. Receptor atoms more than 7 Å away from any ligand atom are excluded from the complexes, and each node in the graph is associated with a feature vector representing the atom type using Sybyl typing⁸⁷.

The network has five graph convolutional blocks. In the first two graph convolution blocks, all ligand and receptor atoms 5 Å apart from each other are considered, and 64 filters per block are used. In the third block, the cutoff radius and filters are increased to 7 Å and 128, respectively. Only ligand features in the last two blocks are considered without changing the threshold cutoff or the number of filters. Finally, the sum-pool of the ligand-only layer creates a 3-task layer on top of the network. That multi-task layer predicts three endpoints: bioactivity, pose quality, and a physics-based docking score⁸⁸.

We trained an ensemble of 6 models, splitting the training data into sixfold cross-validation sets based on a protein sequence similarity cutoff of 70%. Then, each model in the ensemble was trained on a different fold for 10 epochs, using the ADAM optimizer⁸⁹ with a learning rate of 0.001, and targets were sampled with replacement, proportional to the number of active compounds associated with that target.

Data

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article (and its supplementary information S1 files). Boxplots illustrations show the quartiles (Q1 and Q3) of the dataset while the whiskers extend to show the rest of the distribution, except for points that are determined to be “outliers” (1.5 × of the inter-quartile range, as implemented in the Seaborn and Matplotlib toolboxes^{90,91}).

Conclusion

HTS is the most widely-used tool for hit discovery for new targets. Unfortunately, all physical screening methods share the critical limitation that a molecule must exist to be screened. Computational methods enable a fundamental shift to a test-then-make paradigm. In this work, we report on 318 projects (22 internal projects and 296 collaborations) where we used the AtomNet platform as the primary screening tool coupled with low-throughput physical screens as validation. The AtomNet technology can identify bioactive scaffolds across a wide range of proteins, even without known binders, X-ray structures, or manual cherry-picking of compounds. Our empirical results suggest that machine learning approaches have reached a computational accuracy that can replace HTS as the first step of small-molecule drug discovery.

Data availability

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files.

Received: 15 September 2023; Accepted: 15 February 2024

Published online: 02 April 2024

References

- Kuntz, I. D. Structure-based strategies for drug design and discovery. *Science* **257**, 1078–1082 (1992).
- Bajorath, J. Integration of virtual and high-throughput screening. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **1**, 882–894 (2002).
- Walters, W. P., Stahl, M. T. & Murcko, M. A. Virtual screening—an overview. *Drug Discov. Today* **3**, 160–178 (1998).
- Ring, C. S. *et al.* Structure-based inhibitor design by using protein models for the development of antiparasitic agents. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. **90**, 3583–3587 (1993).
- Brown, D. G. An analysis of successful hit-to-clinical candidate pairs. *J. Med. Chem.* <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jmedchem.3c00521> (2023).
- Békés, M., Langley, D. R. & Crews, C. M. PROTAC targeted protein degraders: The past is prologue. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **21**, 181–200 (2022).
- Lu, H. *et al.* Recent advances in the development of protein–protein interactions modulators: Mechanisms and clinical trials. *Signal Transduct. Target. Ther.* **5**, 1–23 (2020).
- Childs-Disney, J. L. *et al.* Targeting RNA structures with small molecules. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **21**, 736–762 (2022).
- Brown, D. G. & Boström, J. Where do recent small molecule clinical development candidates come from?. *J. Med. Chem.* **61**, 9442–9468 (2018).
- Dragovich, P. S., Haap, W., Mulvihill, M. M., Plancher, J.-M. & Stepan, A. F. Small-molecule lead-finding trends across the roche and genentech research organizations. *J. Med. Chem.* **65**, 3606–3615 (2022).
- Perola, E. An analysis of the binding efficiencies of drugs and their leads in successful drug discovery programs. *J. Med. Chem.* **53**, 2986–2997 (2010).
- Lyu, J. *et al.* Ultra-large library docking for discovering new chemotypes. *Nature* **566**, 224 (2019).
- Sadybekov, A. A. *et al.* Synthon-based ligand discovery in virtual libraries of over 11 billion compounds. *Nature* **601**, 452–459 (2022).
- Bellmann, L., Penner, P., Gastreich, M. & Rarey, M. Comparison of combinatorial fragment spaces and its application to ultralarge make-on-demand compound catalogs. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **62**, 553–566 (2022).
- Neumann, A., Marrison, L. & Klein, R. Relevance of the trillion-sized chemical space “explore” as a source for drug discovery. *ACS Med. Chem. Lett.* **14**, 466–472 (2023).
- Sunkari, Y. K., Siripuram, V. K., Nguyen, T.-L. & Flajolet, M. High-power screening (HPS) empowered by DNA-encoded libraries. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* **43**, 4–15 (2022).

17. Malo, N., Hanley, J. A., Cerquozzi, S., Pelletier, J. & Nadon, R. Statistical practice in high-throughput screening data analysis. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **24**, 167–175 (2006).
18. Iversen, P. W., Eastwood, B. J., Sittampalam, G. S. & Cox, K. L. A comparison of assay performance measures in screening assays: Signal window, Z' factor, and assay variability ratio. *J. Biomol. Screen.* **11**, 247–252 (2006).
19. Zhang, J.-H., Chung, T. D. Y. & Oldenburg, K. R. A simple statistical parameter for use in evaluation and validation of high throughput screening assays. *J. Biomol. Screen.* **4**, 67–73 (1999).
20. Jadhav, A. *et al.* Quantitative analyses of aggregation, autofluorescence, and reactivity artifacts in a screen for inhibitors of a thiol protease. *J. Med. Chem.* **53**, 37–51 (2010).
21. Fox, S. *et al.* High-throughput screening: Update on practices and success. *J. Biomol. Screen.* **11**, 864–869 (2006).
22. Owen, S. C., Doak, A. K., Wassam, P., Shoichet, M. S. & Shoichet, B. K. Colloidal aggregation affects the efficacy of anticancer drugs in cell culture. *ACS Chem. Biol.* **7**, 1429–1435 (2012).
23. Rössler, S. L., Grob, N. M., Buchwald, S. L. & Pentelute, B. L. Abiotic peptides as carriers of information for the encoding of small-molecule library synthesis. *Science* **379**, 939–945 (2023).
24. McGovern, S. L., Caselli, E., Grigorieff, N. & Shoichet, B. K. A Common mechanism underlying promiscuous inhibitors from virtual and high-throughput screening. *J. Med. Chem.* **45**, 1712–1722 (2002).
25. Feng, B. Y., Shelat, A., Doman, T. N., Guy, R. K. & Shoichet, B. K. High-throughput assays for promiscuous inhibitors. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* **1**, 146–148 (2005).
26. Martin, E. J., Polyakov, V. R., Tian, L. & Perez, R. C. Profile-QSAR 2.0: Kinase virtual screening accuracy comparable to four-concentration IC50s for realistically novel compounds. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **57**, 2077–2088 (2017).
27. Keiser, M. J. *et al.* Predicting new molecular targets for known drugs. *Nature* **462**, 175–181 (2009).
28. Svetnik, V. *et al.* Random forest: A classification and regression tool for compound classification and QSAR modeling. *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.* **43**, 1947–1958 (2003).
29. Kitchen, D. B., Decornez, H., Furr, J. R. & Bajorath, J. Docking and scoring in virtual screening for drug discovery: methods and applications. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **3**, 935–949 (2004).
30. Shoichet, B. K. Virtual screening of chemical libraries. *Nature* **432**, 862–865 (2004).
31. Ma, J., Sheridan, R. P., Liaw, A., Dahl, G. E. & Svetnik, V. Deep neural nets as a method for quantitative structure-activity relationships. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **55**, 263–274 (2015).
32. Sheridan, R. P. *et al.* Machine Learning and Deep Learning Experimental error, kurtosis, activity cliffs, and methodology: What limits the predictivity of QSAR models?. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jcim.9b01067> (2020).
33. Wallach, I. & Heifets, A. Most ligand-based classification benchmarks reward memorization rather than generalization. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **58**, 916–932 (2018).
34. Chen, L. *et al.* Hidden bias in the DUD-E dataset leads to misleading performance of deep learning in structure-based virtual screening. *PLOS ONE* **14**, e0220113 (2019).
35. Chuang, K. V. & Keiser, M. J. Comment on “Predicting reaction performance in C–N cross-coupling using machine learning”. *Science* **362**, eaat8603 (2018).
36. Gaieb, Z. *et al.* D3R Grand Challenge 3: Blind prediction of protein–ligand poses and affinity rankings. *J. Comput. Aided Mol. Des.* **33**, 1–18 (2019).
37. Gabel, J., Desaphy, J. & Rognan, D. Beware of machine learning-based scoring functions on the danger of developing black boxes. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **54**, 2807–2815 (2014).
38. Cerón-Carrasco, J. P. When virtual screening yields inactive drugs: dealing with false theoretical friends. *ChemMedChem* **17**, e202200278 (2022).
39. McCloskey, K. *et al.* Machine learning on DNA-encoded libraries: A new paradigm for hit-finding. *J. Med. Chem.* **63**, 8857–8866 (2020).
40. Wenzel, J., Matter, H. & Schmidt, F. Predictive multitask deep neural network models for ADME-Tox properties: Learning from large data sets. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **59**, 1253–1268 (2019).
41. Feinberg, E. N. *et al.* PotentialNet for molecular property prediction. *ACS Cent. Sci.* **4**, 1520–1530 (2018).
42. Schindler, C. E. M. *et al.* Large-scale assessment of binding free energy calculations in active drug discovery projects. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **60**, 5457–5474 (2020).
43. Bordogna, A., Pandini, A. & Bonati, L. Predicting the accuracy of protein–ligand docking on homology models. *J. Comput. Chem.* **32**, 81–98 (2011).
44. Stokes, J. M. *et al.* A deep learning approach to antibiotic discovery. *Cell* **180**, 688–702.e13 (2020).
45. Melo, M. C. R., Maasch, J. R. M. A. & de la Fuente-Nunez, C. Accelerating antibiotic discovery through artificial intelligence. *Commun. Biol.* **4**, 1–13 (2021).
46. Skinnider, M. A. *et al.* A deep generative model enables automated structure elucidation of novel psychoactive substances. *Nat. Mach. Intell.* **3**, 973–984 (2021).
47. Muegge, I. & Oloff, S. Advances in virtual screening. *Drug Discov. Today Technol.* **3**, 405–411 (2006).
48. N. Muratov, E. *et al.* QSAR without borders. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **49**, 3525–3564 (2020).
49. Zhavoronkov, A. *et al.* Deep learning enables rapid identification of potent DDR1 kinase inhibitors. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **37**, 1038–1040 (2019).
50. Walters, W. P. & Murcko, M. Assessing the impact of generative AI on medicinal chemistry. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **38**, 143–145 (2020).
51. Scannell, J. W., Blanckley, A., Boldon, H. & Warrington, B. Diagnosing the decline in pharmaceutical R&D efficiency. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **11**, 191 (2012).
52. Wallach, I., Dzamba, M. & Heifets, A. AtomNet: A Deep Convolutional Neural Network for Bioactivity Prediction in Structure-based Drug Discovery. *ArXiv Prepr. ArXiv151002855* 1–11 (2015).
53. Gniewek, P., Worley, B., Stafford, K., van den Bedem, H. & Anderson, B. *Learning physics confers pose-sensitivity in structure-based virtual screening.* <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2110.15459> (2021).
54. Stafford, K. A., Anderson, B. M., Sorenson, J. & van den Bedem, H. AtomNet PoseRanker: Enriching ligand pose quality for dynamic proteins in virtual high-throughput screens. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **62**, 1178–1189 (2022).
55. Hsieh, C.-H. *et al.* Miro1 marks parkinson's disease subset and miro1 reducer rescues neuron loss in Parkinson's models. *Cell Metab.* **30**, 1131–1140.e7 (2019).
56. Reidenbach, A. G. *et al.* Multimodal small-molecule screening for human prion protein binders. *J. Biol. Chem.* **295**, 13516–13531 (2020).
57. Bon, C. *et al.* Discovery of novel trace amine-associated receptor 5 (TAAR5) antagonists using a deep convolutional neural network. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **23**, 3127 (2022).
58. Stecula, A., Hussain, M. S. & Viola, R. E. Discovery of novel inhibitors of a critical brain enzyme using a homology model and a deep convolutional neural network. *J. Med. Chem.* **63**, 8867–8875 (2020).
59. Su, S. *et al.* SPOP and OTUD7A Control EWS–FLI1 protein stability to govern ewing sarcoma growth. *Adv. Sci.* **8**, 2004846 (2021).
60. Pedicone, C. *et al.* Discovery of a novel SHIP1 agonist that promotes degradation of lipid-laden phagocytic cargo by microglia. *iScience* **25**, 104170 (2022).

61. Huang, C. *et al.* Small molecules block the interaction between porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus and CD163 receptor and the infection of pig cells. *Virology* **17**, 116 (2020).
62. Grygorenko, O. O. *et al.* Generating multibillion chemical space of readily accessible screening compounds. *iScience* **23**, 101681 (2020).
63. Dandapani, S., Rosse, G., Southall, N., Salvino, J. M. & Thomas, C. J. Selecting, acquiring, and using small molecule libraries for high-throughput screening. *Curr. Protoc. Chem. Biol.* **4**, 177–191 (2012).
64. Schuffenhauer, A. *et al.* Library design for fragment based screening. *Curr. Top. Med. Chem.* **5**, 751–762 (2005).
65. Jacoby, E. *et al.* Key aspects of the novartis compound collection enhancement project for the compilation of a comprehensive Chemogenomics drug discovery screening collection. *Curr. Top. Med. Chem.* **5**, 397–411 (2005).
66. Petrova, T., Chuprina, A., Parkesh, R. & Pushechnikov, A. Structural enrichment of HTS compounds from available commercial libraries. *MedChemComm* **3**, 571–579 (2012).
67. Macarron, R. *et al.* Impact of high-throughput screening in biomedical research. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **10**, 188–195 (2011).
68. Rogers, D. & Hahn, M. Extended-connectivity fingerprints. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **50**, 742–754 (2010).
69. Riniker, S. & Landrum, G. A. Open-source platform to benchmark fingerprints for ligand-based virtual screening. *J. Cheminformatics* **5**, 26 (2013).
70. Ren, F. *et al.* AlphaFold accelerates artificial intelligence powered drug discovery: Efficient discovery of a novel cyclin-dependent kinase 20 (CDK20) Small Molecule Inhibitor (2022).
71. Assessing structural novelty of the first AI-designed drug candidates to go into human clinical trials. CAS <https://www.cas.org/resources/blog/ai-drug-candidates>.
72. Kohavi, R. & Wolpert, D. Bias plus variance decomposition for zero-one loss functions. in *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Machine Learning* 275–283 (Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA, 1996).
73. Ferrara, P. & Jacoby, E. Evaluation of the utility of homology models in high throughput docking. *J. Mol. Model.* **13**, 897–905 (2007).
74. Walters, W. P. & Namchuk, M. Designing screens: How to make your hits a hit. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **2**, 259–266 (2003).
75. Inglese, J. *et al.* High-throughput screening assays for the identification of chemical probes. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* **3**, 466–479 (2007).
76. mcule database. <https://mculc.com/database/>.
77. Screening Collections - Enamine. <https://enamine.net/compound-collections/screening-collection>.
78. Bruns, R. F. & Watson, I. A. Rules for identifying potentially reactive or promiscuous compounds. *J. Med. Chem.* **55**, 9763–9772 (2012).
79. Baell, J. B. & Holloway, G. A. New substructure filters for removal of pan assay interference compounds (PAINS) from screening libraries and for their exclusion in bioassays. *J. Med. Chem.* **53**, 2719–2740 (2010).
80. Abagyan, R. & Kufareva, I. The flexible pocketome engine for structural chemogenomics. *Methods Mol. Biol. Clifton NJ* **575**, 249–279 (2009).
81. Le Guilloux, V., Schmidtke, P. & Tuffery, P. Fpocket: An open source platform for ligand pocket detection. *BMC Bioinformatics* **10**, 168 (2009).
82. Butina, D. Unsupervised data base clustering based on daylight's fingerprint and tanimoto similarity: A fast and automated way to cluster small and large data sets. *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.* **39**, 747–750 (1999).
83. RDKit: Open-Source Cheminformatics.
84. Rarey, M. & Dixon, J. S. Feature trees: A new molecular similarity measure based on tree matching. *J. Comput. Aided Mol. Des.* **12**, 471–490 (1998).
85. Stafford, K., Anderson, B. M., Sorenson, J. & van den Bedem, H. AtomNet PoseRanker: Enriching Ligand Pose Quality for Dynamic Proteins in Virtual High Throughput Screens. <https://doi.org/10.26434/chemrxiv-2021-t6xkj> (2021).
86. Schroedl, S. Current methods and challenges for deep learning in drug discovery. *Drug Discov. Today Technol.* **32–33**, 9–17 (2019).
87. Bender, A., Mussa, H. Y., Glen, R. C. & Reiling, S. Molecular similarity searching using atom environments, information-based feature selection, and a Naïve Bayesian classifier. *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.* **44**, 170–178 (2004).
88. Trott, O. & Olson, A. J. AutoDock Vina: Improving the speed and accuracy of docking with a new scoring function, efficient optimization, and multithreading. *J. Comput. Chem.* **31**, 455–461 (2010).
89. Kingma, D. P. & Ba, J. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. *ArXiv1412.6980 Cs* (2017).
90. Waskom, M. L. seaborn: Statistical data visualization. *J. Open Source Softw.* **6**, 3021 (2021).
91. Hunter, J. D. Matplotlib: A 2D graphics environment. *Comput. Sci. Eng.* **9**, 90–95 (2007).
92. Marineau, J. J. *et al.* Discovery of SY-5609: A selective, noncovalent inhibitor of CDK7. *J. Med. Chem.* **65**, 1458–1480 (2022).
93. Gu, X., BAI, H., Barbeau, O. R. & Besnard, J. Aromatic heterocyclic compound, and pharmaceutical composition and application thereof. (2022).
94. Barbay, J. K., Chakravarty, D., Leonard, K., Shook, B. C. & Wang, A. Phenyl and heteroaryl substituted thieno[2,3-d]Pyrimidines and their use as adenosine A2a receptor antagonists (2010).
95. Bell, A. S., Schreyer, A. M. & Versluys, S. Pyrazolopyrimidine compounds as adenosine receptor antagonists (2019).
96. Soldermann, C. P. *et al.* Pyrazolo pyrimidine derivatives and their use as MALT1 inhibitors (2019).
97. Feng, S. *et al.* Tricyclic compounds useful in the treatment of cancer, autoimmune and inflammatory disorders (2023).
98. Heiser, U. & Sommer, R. Inhibitors of glutamyl cyclase (2020).
99. Cheng, X., Liu, Y., Qin, L., Ren, F. & Wu, J. Beta-lactam derivatives for the treatment of diseases (2023).
100. Wylie, A. A. *et al.* Therapeutic combinations comprising ubiquitin-specific-processing protease 1 (usp1) inhibitors and poly (adp-ribose) polymerase (parp) inhibitors (2021).
101. Wu, J., Qin, L. & Liu, J. Small molecule inhibitors of ubiquitin specific protease 1 (usp1) and uses thereof (2023).
102. John, S. E. S. & Mesecar, A. D. Broad-spectrum non-covalent coronavirus protease inhibitors (2017).
103. Zavoronkovs, A., Ivanenkov, Y. A. & Zagribelnyy, B. Sars-cov-2 inhibitors having covalent modifications for treating coronavirus infections. (2021).

Acknowledgements

See Supplementary section S2.

Author contributions

All authors have contributed to the publication, being variously involved in technology development, experimental protocol designs, experimental performance, data acquisition, statistical analysis, and manuscript writing.

Competing interests

The authors affiliated with Atomwise declare the existence of a financial competing interest.

Additional information

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-54655-z>.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2024, corrected publication 2024

The Atomwise AIMS Program

Izhar Wallach², Denzil Bernard², Kong Nguyen², Gregory Ho², Adrian Morrison², Adrian Stecula², Andreana Rosnik², Ann Marie O'Sullivan², Aram Davtyan², Ben Samudio², Bill Thomas², Brad Worley², Brittany Butler², Christian Laggner², Desiree Thayer², Ehsan Moharreri², Greg Friedland², Ha Truong², Henry van den Bedem², Ho Leung Ng², Kate Stafford², Krishna Sarangapani², Kyle Giesler², Lien Ngo², Michael Mysinger², Mostafa Ahmed², Nicholas J. Anthis², Niel Henriksen², Pawel Gniewek², Sam Eckert², Saulo de Oliveira², Shabbir Suterwala², Srimukh Veccham Krishna PrasadPrasad², Stefani Shek², Stephanie Contreras², Stephanie Hare², Teresa Palazzo², Terrence E. O'Brien², Tessa Van Grack², Tiffany Williams², Ting-Rong Chern², Victor Kenyon², Andraia H. Lee³, Andrew B. Cann⁴, Bastiaan Bergman⁵, Brandon M. Anderson⁶, Bryan D. Cox⁷, Jeffrey M. Warrington⁸, Jon M. Sorenson⁹, Joshua M. Goldenberg¹⁰, Matthew A. Young¹¹, Nicholas DeHaan¹², Ryan P. Pemberton¹³, Stefan Schroedl¹⁴, Tigran M. Abramyan^{11,15}, Tushita Gupta¹⁶, Venkatesh Mysore¹⁷, Adam G. Presser¹⁸, Adolfo A. Ferrando¹⁹, Adriano D. Andricopulo²⁰, Agnidipta Ghosh²¹, Aicha Gharbi Ayachi²², Aisha Mushtaq²³, Ala M. Shaqra²⁴, Alan Kie Leong Toh²⁵, Alan V. Smrcka²⁶, Alberto Ciccia²⁷, Aldo Sena de Oliveira²⁸, Aleksandr Sverzhinsky²⁹, Alessandra Mara de Sousa³⁰, Alexander I. Agoulnik³¹, Alexander Kushnir³², Alexander N. Freiberg³³, Alexander V. Statsyuk³⁴, Alexandre R. Gingras³⁵, Alexei Degterev³⁶, Alexey Tomilov³⁷, Alice Vrielin³⁸, Alisa A. Garaeva³⁹, Amanda Bryant-Friedrich⁴⁰, Amedeo Caffisch⁴¹, Amit K. Patel³⁵, Amith Vikram Rangarajan⁴², An Matheeussen⁴³, Andrea Battistoni⁴⁴, Andrea Caporali⁴⁵, Andrea Chini⁴⁶, Andrea Ilari⁴⁷, Andrea Mattevi⁴⁸, Andrea Talbot Foote⁴⁹, Andrea Trabocchi⁵⁰, Andreas Stahl⁵¹, Andrew B. Herr⁵², Andrew Berti⁴⁰, Andrew Freywald⁵³, Andrew G. Reidenbach⁵⁴, Andrew Lam⁵⁵, Andrew R. Cuddihy⁵⁶, Andrew White⁵⁷, Angelo Tagliatalata¹⁹, Anil K. Ojha⁵⁸, Ann M. Cathcart⁵⁹, Anna A. L. Motyl⁴⁵, Anna Borowska³⁹, Anna D'Antuono⁶⁰, Anna K. H. Hirsch⁶¹, Anna Maria Porcelli⁶², Anna Minakova⁴⁸, Anna Montanaro⁶⁰, Anna Müller⁴¹, Annarita Fiorillo⁶³, Anniina Virtanen⁶⁴, Anthony J. O'Donoghue³⁵, Antonio Del Rio Flores⁵¹, Antonio E. Garmendia⁶⁵, Antonio Pineda-Lucena⁶⁶, Antonito T. Panganiban⁶⁷, Ariela Samantha³⁸, Arnab K. Chatterjee⁶⁸, Arthur L. Haas⁶⁹, Ashleigh S. Paparella²¹, Ashley L. St. John⁷⁰, Ashutosh Prince⁷¹, Assmaa EISheikh⁷², Athena Marie Apfel⁵⁷, Audrey Colomba⁷³, Austin O'Dea⁷⁴, Bakary N'tji Diallo⁷⁵, Beatriz Murta Rezende Moraes Ribeiro⁷⁶, Ben A. Bailey-Elkin⁷⁷, Benjamin L. Edelman⁷⁸, Benjamin Liou⁵², Benjamin Perry⁷⁹, Benjamin Soon Kai Chua⁸⁰, Benjámín Kováts⁸¹, Bernhard Engliger⁵⁹, Bijina Balakrishnan⁸², Bin Gong³³, Bogos Agianian²¹, Brandon Pressly³⁷, Brenda P. Medellin Salas⁸³, Brendan M. Duggan³⁵, Brian V. Geisbrecht⁸⁴, Brian W. Dymock⁸⁵, Brianna C. Morten⁸⁵, Bruce D. Hammock³⁷, Bruno Eduardo Fernandes Mota⁷⁶, Bryan C. Dickinson⁸⁶, Cameron Fraser⁸⁷, Camille Lempicki⁸⁸, Carl D. Novina⁸⁹, Carles Torner⁹⁰, Carlo Ballatore³⁵,

Carlotta Bon⁹¹, Carly J. Chapman⁹², Carrie L. Partch⁹³, Catherine T. Chaton⁹⁴, Chang Huang⁶⁵,
 Chao-Yie Yang⁹⁵, Charlene M. Kahler³⁸, Charles Karan²⁷, Charles Keller⁹⁶, Chelsea L. Dieck⁹⁷,
 Chen Huimei⁷⁰, Chen Liu⁹⁸, Cheryl Peltier⁷⁷, Chinmay Kumar Mantri⁷⁰,
 Chinyere Maat Kemet⁵⁵, Christa E. Müller⁹⁹, Christian Weber¹⁰⁰, Christina M. Zeina⁵⁹,
 Christine S. Muli¹⁰¹, Christophe Morisseau³⁷, Cigdem Alkan³³, Clara Reglero¹⁹, Cody A. Loy¹⁰¹,
 Cornelia M. Wilson¹⁰², Courtney Myhr³¹, Cristina Arrigoni⁴⁸, Cristina Paulino³⁹,
 César Santiago¹⁰³, Dahai Luo²², Damon J. Tumes¹⁰⁴, Daniel A. Keedy¹⁰⁵, Daniel A. Lawrence⁵⁷,
 Daniel Chen¹⁰⁶, Danny Manor⁷¹, Darci J. Trader¹⁰¹, David A. Hildeman⁵², David H. Drewry¹⁰⁷,
 David J. Dowling¹⁰⁸, David J. Hosfield⁸⁶, David M. Smith¹⁰⁹, David Moreira¹¹⁰,
 David P. Siderovski¹¹¹, David Shum¹¹², David T. Krist¹¹³, David W. H. Riches⁷⁸,
 Davide Maria Ferraris¹¹⁴, Deborah H. Anderson¹¹⁵, Deirdre R. Coombe¹¹⁶, Derek S. Welsbie³⁵,
 Di Hu⁷¹, Diana Ortiz¹¹⁷, Dina Alramadhani¹¹⁸, Dingqiang Zhang¹¹⁹, Dipayan Chaudhuri⁸²,
 Dirk J. Slotboom³⁹, Donald R. Ronning¹²⁰, Donghan Lee¹²¹, Dorian Dirksen¹²²,
 Douglas A. Shoue¹²³, Douglas William Zochodne¹²⁴, Durga Krishnamurthy⁵²,
 Dustin Duncan¹²⁵, Dylan M. Glubb⁹², Edoardo Luigi Maria Gelardi¹²⁶, Edward C. Hsiao¹²⁷,
 Edward G. Lynn¹²⁸, Elany Barbosa Silva¹²⁹, Elena Aguilera¹³⁰, Elena Lenci⁵⁰,
 Elena Theres Abraham¹³¹, Eleonora Lama⁶², Eleonora Mamei⁴⁵, Elisa Leung¹²⁵, Ellie Giles¹⁰²,
 Emily M. Christensen¹³², Emily R. Mason¹³³, Enrico Petretto⁷⁰, Ephraim F. Trakhtenberg¹³⁴,
 Eric J. Rubin¹⁸, Erick Strauss¹³⁵, Erik W. Thompson²⁵, Erika Cione¹³⁶, Erika Mathes Lisabeth¹³⁷,
 Erkang Fan¹³⁸, Erna Geessien Kroon⁷⁶, Eunji Jo¹¹², Eva M. García-Cuesta¹⁰³,
 Evgenia Glukhov³⁵, Evripidis Gavathiotis²¹, Fang Yu¹³⁹, Fei Xiang¹⁴⁰, Fenfei Leng¹⁴¹,
 Feng Wang¹⁴², Filippo Ingoglia⁸², Focco van den Akker⁷¹, Francesco Borriello¹⁴³,
 Franco J. Vizeacoumar¹⁴⁴, Frank Luh¹⁴⁵, Frederick S. Buckner¹³⁸, Frederick S. Vizeacoumar⁵³,
 Fredj Ben Bdira¹⁴⁶, Fredrik Svensson⁷³, G. Marcela Rodriguez¹⁴⁷, Gabriella Bognár⁸¹,
 Gaia Lembo¹⁴⁸, Gang Zhang¹⁴⁹, Garrett Dempsey⁵¹, Gary Eitzen¹⁵⁰, Gaétan Mayer¹⁵¹,
 Geoffrey L. Greene⁸⁶, George A. Garcia⁵⁷, Gergely L. Lukacs¹⁵², Gergely Prikler⁸¹,
 Gian Carlo G. Parico⁹³, Gianni Colotti⁴⁷, Gilles De Keulenaer¹⁵³, Gino Cortopassi³⁷,
 Giovanni Roti⁶⁰, Giulia Girolimetti⁶², Giuseppe Fiermonte¹⁵⁴, Giuseppe Gasparre¹⁵⁵,
 Giuseppe Leuzzi¹⁹, Gopal Dahal¹⁵⁶, Gracjan Michlewski^{157,158}, Graeme L. Conn¹⁵⁹,
 Grant David Stuchbury⁸⁵, Gregory R. Bowman¹⁶⁰, Grzegorz Maria Popowicz¹⁶¹, Guido Veit¹⁵²,
 Guilherme Eduardo de Souza²⁰, Gustav Akk¹⁶², Guy Caljon⁴³, Guzmán Alvarez¹⁶³,
 Gwennan Rucinski¹⁶⁴, Gyeongun Lee¹¹², Gökhan Cildir¹⁶⁵, Hai Li²⁷, Hairol E. Breton¹⁶⁶,
 Hamed Jafar-Nejad¹⁶⁷, Han Zhou¹⁶⁸, Hannah P. Moore¹⁶⁹, Hannah Tilford¹⁶⁴, Haynes Yuan¹⁷⁰,
 Heesung Shim³⁷, Heike Wulff³⁷, Heinrich Hoppe⁷⁵, Helena Chaytow⁴⁵, Heng-Keat Tam¹⁷¹,
 Holly Van Remmen¹⁷², Hongyang Xu¹⁷³, Hosana Maria Debonsi¹⁷⁴, Howard B. Lieberman²⁷,
 Hoyoung Jung¹⁷⁵, Hua-Ying Fan¹⁷⁶, Hui Feng⁵⁵, Hui Zhou¹⁹, Hyeong Jun Kim¹⁷⁷,
 Iain R. Greig¹⁷⁸, Ileana Caliendo¹⁷⁹, Ileana Corvo¹⁸⁰, Imanol Arozarena¹⁸¹,
 Imran N. Mungrue¹⁸², Ingrid M. Verhamme¹⁸³, Insaf Ahmed Qureshi¹⁸⁴, Irina Lotsaris¹⁸⁵,
 Isin Cakir⁵⁷, J. Jefferson P. Perry¹⁹⁴, Jacek Kwiatkowski⁸⁵, Jacob Boorman⁷¹, Jacob Ferreira¹⁸⁷,
 Jacob Fries¹⁸⁸, Jadel Müller Kratz⁷⁹, Jaden Miner⁸², Jair L. Siqueira-Neto³⁵,
 James G. Granneman¹⁸⁹, James Ng¹⁶⁴, James Shorter¹⁶⁰, Jan Hendrik Voss⁹⁹,
 Jan M. Gebauer¹³¹, Janelle Chuah¹⁰⁹, Jarrod J. Mousa¹⁹⁰, Jason T. Maynes¹⁹¹, Jay D. Evans¹⁹²,
 Jeffrey Dickhout¹⁹³, Jeffrey P. MacKeigan¹³⁷, Jennifer N. Jossart¹⁹⁴, Jia Zhou³³, Jiabei Lin¹⁶⁰,
 Jiake Xu¹⁹⁵, Jianghai Wang¹⁴⁵, Jiaqi Zhu¹⁹⁶, Jiayu Liao¹⁹⁴, Jingyi Xu¹⁹⁴, Jinshi Zhao¹⁹⁷,
 Jiusheng Lin¹⁹⁸, Jiyoun Lee¹⁹⁹, Joana Reis⁴⁸, Joerg Stetefeld⁷⁷, John B. Bruning²⁰⁰,
 John Burt Bruning⁸⁰, John G. Coles²⁰¹, John J. Tanner¹⁶⁶, John M. Pascal²⁹, Jonathan So⁵⁹,
 Jordan L. Pederick⁸⁰, Jose A. Costoya¹¹⁰, Joseph B. Rayman¹⁹, Joseph J. Maciag⁵²,
 Joshua Alexander Nasburg³⁷, Joshua J. Gruber²⁰², Joshua M. Finkelstein⁵⁵, Joshua Watkins¹⁶⁴,
 José Miguel Rodríguez-Frade²⁰³, Juan Antonio Sanchez Arias²⁰⁴, Juan José Lasarte²⁰⁵,
 Julen Oyarzabal²⁰⁴, Julian Milosavljevic⁸⁸, Julie Cools¹⁵³, Julien Lescar²²,
 Julijus Bogomolovas³⁵, Jun Wang¹⁴⁷, Jung-Min Kee¹⁷⁵, Jung-Min Kee¹⁷⁷, Junzhuo Liao²⁰⁶,
 Jyothi C. Sistla¹¹⁸, Jônatas Santos Abrahão⁷⁶, Kamakshi Sishtla²⁰⁷, Karol R. Francisco³⁵,
 Kasper B. Hansen²⁰⁸, Kathleen A. Molyneaux⁷¹, Kathryn A. Cunningham³³, Katie R. Martin¹³⁷,
 Kavita Gadar²⁰⁹, Kayode K. Ojo¹³⁸, Keith S. Wong¹²⁵, Kelly L. Wentworth¹²⁷, Kent Lai⁸²,
 Kevin A. Lobb⁷⁵, Kevin M. Hopkins²⁷, Keykavous Parang²¹⁰, Khaled Machaca²¹¹, Kien Pham⁹⁸,
 Kim Ghilarducci²¹², Kim S. Sugamori¹²⁵, Kirk James McManus⁷⁷, Kirsikka Musta⁶⁴,
 Kiterie M. E. Faller⁴⁵, Kiyo Nagamori⁹⁶, Konrad J. Mostert¹³⁵, Konstantin V. Korotkov⁹⁴,

Koting Liu²¹³, Kristiana S. Smith²¹⁴, Kristopher Sarosiek²¹⁵, Kyle H. Rohde²¹⁶,
 Kyu Kwang Kim²¹⁷, Kyung Hyeon Lee²¹⁸, Lajos Pusztai⁹⁸, Lari Lehtio²¹⁹, Larisa M. Haupt²⁵,
 Leah E. Cowen¹²⁵, Lee J. Byrne¹⁰², Leila Su¹⁴⁵, Leon Wert-Lamas⁸⁹,
 Leonor Puchades-Carrasco²²⁰, Lifeng Chen⁸⁶, Linda H. Malkas¹⁸⁶, Ling Zhuo²²¹,
 Lizbeth Hedstrom²²², Loren D. Walensky⁵⁹, Lorenzo Antonelli⁶³,
 Luisa Iommarini⁶², Luke Whitesell¹²⁵, Lía M. Randall²²³, M. Dahmani Fathallah²²⁴,
 Maira Harume Nagai¹⁹⁷, Mairi Louise Kilkenny²²⁵, Manu Ben-Johny¹⁹, Marc P. Lussier²¹²,
 Marc P. Windisch¹¹², Marco Lolicato⁴⁸, Marco Lucio Lolli¹⁷⁹, Margot Vleminckx⁴³,
 Maria Cristina Caroleo²²⁶, Maria J. Macias⁹⁰, Marilia Valli²⁰, Marim M. Barghash¹²⁵,
 Mario Mellado²⁰³, Mark A. Tye²²⁷, Mark A. Wilson¹⁹⁸, Mark Hannink²²⁸, Mark R. Ashton⁸⁵,
 Mark Vincent C. dela Cerna¹²¹, Marta Giorgis¹⁷⁹, Martin K. Safo¹¹⁸, Martin St. Maurice²²⁹,
 Mary Ann McDowell¹²³, Marzia Pasquali⁸², Masfique Mehedi²³⁰,
 Mateus Sá Magalhães Serafim⁷⁶, Matthew B. Soellner⁵⁷, Matthew G. Alteen²³¹,
 Matthew M. Champion¹²³, Maxim Skorodinsky²³², Megan L. O'Mara²³³, Mel Bedi⁴⁰,
 Menico Rizzi¹¹⁴, Michael Levin¹¹⁹, Michael Mowat²³⁴, Michael R. Jackson²³⁵, Mikell Paige²¹⁸,
 Minnatallah Al-Yozbaki¹⁰², Miriam A. Giardini¹²⁹, Mirko M. Maksimainen²¹⁹,
 Monica De Luise⁶², Muhammad Saddam Hussain²⁰⁷, Myron Christodoulides¹⁶⁴,
 Natalia Stec¹⁵⁷, Natalia Zelinskaya¹⁵⁹, Natascha Van Pelt⁴³, Nathan M. Merrill⁵⁷,
 Nathanael Singh¹⁰⁵, Neeltje A. Kootstra²³⁶, Neeraj Singh²³⁷, Neha S. Gandhi²⁵, Nei-Li Chan²¹³,
 Nguyen Mai Trinh²², Nicholas O. Schneider²²⁹, Nick Matovic⁸⁵, Nicola Horstmann²³⁸,
 Nicola Longo⁸², Nikhil Bharambe²², Nirvan Rouzbeh²⁰⁸, Niusha Mahmoodi²¹,
 Njabulo Joyfull Gumed²³⁹, Noelle C. Anastasio³³, Nouredine Ben Khalaf²²⁴,
 Obdulia Rabal²⁰⁴, Olga Kandror²¹⁵, Olivier Escaffre³³, Olli Silvennoinen⁶⁴,
 Ozlem Tastan Bishop⁷⁵, Pablo Iglesias¹¹⁰, Pablo Sobrado²⁴⁰, Patrick Chuong²⁴¹,
 Patrick O'Connell¹³⁷, Pau Martin-Malpartida⁹⁰, Paul Mellor⁵³, Paul V. Fish⁷³,
 Paulo Otávio Lourenço Moreira³⁰, Pei Zhou¹⁹⁷, Pengda Liu¹⁰⁷, Pengda Liu¹⁰⁷, Pengpeng Wu²⁴²,
 Percy Agogo-Mawuli¹¹¹, Peter L. Jones²⁴³, Peter Ngoi⁹³, Peter Toogood⁵⁷, Philbert Ip¹²⁵,
 Philipp von Hundelshausen¹⁰⁰, Pil H. Lee⁵⁷, Rachael B. Rowswell-Turner²¹⁷,
 Rafael Balaña-Fouce²⁴⁴, Rafael Eduardo Oliveira Rocha⁷⁶, Rafael V. C. Guido²⁰,
 Rafaela Salgado Ferreira⁷⁶, Rajendra K. Agrawal⁵⁸, Rajesh K. Harijan²¹,
 Rajesh Ramachandran²⁴⁵, Rajkumar Verma²⁴⁶, Rakesh K. Singh²⁴⁷, Rakesh Kumar Tiwari²⁴⁸,
 Ralph Mazitschek²²⁷, Rama K. Koppiseti¹⁶⁶, Remus T. Dame¹⁴⁶, Renée N. Douville²⁴⁹,
 Richard C. Austin¹⁹³, Richard E. Taylor¹²³, Richard G. Moore²¹⁷, Richard H. Ebright¹⁴⁷,
 Richard M. Angell⁷³, Riqiang Yan²³⁷, Rishabh Kejriwal⁶⁵, Robert A. Batey¹²⁵,
 Robert Blelloch¹²⁷, Robert J. Vandenberg¹⁸⁵, Robert J. Hickey¹⁸⁶, Robert J. Kelm Jr.⁴⁹,
 Robert J. Lake¹⁷⁶, Robert K. Bradley²⁵⁰, Robert M. Blumenthal¹⁰⁶, Roberto Solano⁴⁶,
 Robin Matthias Gierse²⁵¹, Ronald E. Viola¹⁵⁶, Ronan R. McCarthy²⁰⁹, Rosa Maria Reguera²⁴⁴,
 Ruben Vazquez Uribe²⁵², Rubens Lima do Monte-Neto³⁰, Ruggiero Gorgoglione¹⁵⁴,
 Ryan T. Cullinane²²², Sachin Katyal¹⁷⁰, Sakib Hossain¹⁰⁵, Sameer Phadke⁵⁷,
 Samuel A. Shelburne²³⁸, Sandra E. Geden²¹⁶, Sandra Johannsen⁶¹, Sarah Wazir²¹⁹,
 Scott Legare⁷⁷, Scott M. Landfear¹¹⁷, Senthil K. Radhakrishnan¹¹⁸, Serena Ammendola⁴⁴,
 Sergei Dzhumaev²⁵³, Seung-Yong Seo¹⁴⁰, Shan Li¹⁴², Shan Zhou¹⁶⁷, Shaoyou Chu¹³³,
 Shefali Chauhan²⁵⁴, Shinsaku Maruta^{255,256}, Shireen R. Ashkar⁵⁷, Show-Ling Shyng¹¹⁷,
 Silvestro G. Conticello^{148,256}, Silvia Buroni⁴⁸, Silvia Garavaglia¹¹⁴, Simon J. White⁶⁵,
 Siran Zhu^{157,158}, Sofiya Tsimbalyuk²⁵⁷, Somaia Haque Chadni¹⁴¹, Soo Young Byun¹¹²,
 Soonju Park¹¹², Sophia Q. Xu²⁵⁸, Sourav Banerjee²⁵⁹, Stefan Zahler²²¹, Stefano Espinoza⁹¹,
 Stefano Gustinich⁹¹, Stefano Sainas¹⁷⁹, Stephanie L. Celano¹³⁷, Stephen J. Capuzzi¹⁰⁷,
 Stephen N. Waggoner⁵², Steve Poirier²⁶⁰, Steven H. Olson²³⁵, Steven O. Marx²⁶¹,
 Steven R. Van Doren¹⁶⁶, Suryakala Sarilla¹⁸³, Susann M. Brady-Kalnay⁷¹, Sydney Dallman²³⁰,
 Syeda Maryam Azeem¹⁰⁵, Tadahisa Teramoto²⁶², Tamar Mehlman¹⁰⁵, Tarryn Swart⁷⁵,
 Tatjana Abaffy²⁶³, Tatos Akopian²¹⁵, Teemu Haikarainen⁶⁴, Teresa Lozano Moreda²⁶⁴,
 Tetsuro Ikegami³³, Thaiz Rodrigues Teixeira¹⁷⁴, Thilina D. Jayasinghe¹²⁰,
 Thomas H. Gillingwater⁴⁵, Thomas Kampurakis²⁶⁵, Timothy I. Richardson²⁰⁷,
 Timothy J. Herdendorf⁸⁴, Timothy J. Kotzé¹³⁵, Timothy R. O'Meara²⁶⁶, Timothy W. Corson²⁰⁷,
 Tobias Hermle⁸⁸, Tomisin Happy Ogunwa²⁵⁵, Tong Lan⁸⁶, Tong Su²²⁸, Toshihiro Banjo²⁶⁷,
 Tracy A. O'Mara⁹², Tristan Chou⁴², Tsui-Fen Chou¹⁴², Ulrich Baumann¹³¹, Umesh R. Desai¹¹⁸,
 Vaibhav P. Pai¹¹⁹, Van Chi Thai³⁸, Vasudha Tandon²⁵⁹, Versha Banerji⁷⁷, Victoria L. Robinson⁶⁵,

Vignesh Gunasekharan¹⁶⁸, Vigneshwaran Namasivayam⁹⁹, Vincent F. M. Segers⁴³, Vincent Maranda⁵³, Vincenza Dolce¹³⁶, Vinícius Gonçalves Maltarollo⁷⁶, Viola Camilla Scoffone⁴⁸, Virgil A. Woods¹⁰⁵, Virginia Paola Ronchi²⁶⁸, Vuong Van Hung Le²⁶⁹, W. Brent Clayton¹⁰¹, W. Todd Lowther²⁷⁰, Walid A. Houry¹²⁵, Wei Li²⁷¹, Weiping Tang²⁰⁶, Wenjun Zhang⁵¹, Wesley C. Van Voorhis¹³⁸, William A. Donaldson²²⁹, William C. Hahn⁵⁹, William G. Kerr²⁷², William H. Gerwick¹²⁹, William J. Bradshaw²⁷³, Wuen Ee Foong²⁷⁴, Xavier Blanchet²⁷⁵, Xiaoyang Wu⁸⁶, Xin Lu¹²³, Xin Qi²⁴⁵, Xin Xu⁸⁴, Xinfang Yu¹⁶⁷, Xingping Qin²⁷⁶, Xingyou Wang²²², Xinrui Yuan⁹⁵, Xu Zhang²⁷⁷, Yan Jessie Zhang⁸³, Yanmei Hu¹⁴⁷, Yasser Ali Aldhamen¹³⁷, Yicheng Chen⁷¹, Yihe Li⁷¹, Ying Sun⁵², Yini Zhu¹²³, Yogesh K. Gupta²⁷⁸, Yolanda Pérez-Pertejo²⁴⁴, Yong Li¹⁶⁷, Young Tang⁶⁵, Yuan He⁴⁰, Yuk-Ching Tse-Dinh¹⁴¹, Yulia A. Sidorova²⁷⁹, Yun Yen¹⁴⁵, Yunlong Li²⁸⁰, Zachary J. Frangos²⁸¹, Zara Chung²², Zhengchen Su³³, Zhenghe Wang⁷¹, Zhiguo Zhang²⁷, Zhongle Liu¹²⁵, Zintis Inde²¹⁵, Zoraima Artía¹⁶³ & Abraham Heifets²

²Atomwise Inc., San Francisco, USA. ³Amgen, Thousand Oaks, USA. ⁴OpenAI, San Francisco, USA. ⁵Model Medicines, La Jolla, USA. ⁶Atomic.AI, San Francisco, USA. ⁷Edifice Health, Inc., San Mateo, USA. ⁸METIS Therapeutics, Cambridge, USA. ⁹Genentech, San Mateo, USA. ¹⁰US Navy Medical Service Corps Officer (2300/1810D), San Mateo, USA. ¹¹Totus Medicines, Inc., Emeryville, USA. ¹²Cytokinetics, Inc., South San Francisco, USA. ¹³Nurix Therapeutics, San Francisco, USA. ¹⁴Amazon Alexa, Suite, USA. ¹⁵The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Eshelman School of Pharmacy, Chapel Hill, USA. ¹⁶Refibered Inc., Cupertino, USA. ¹⁷NVIDIA, Santa Clara, USA. ¹⁸Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, Boston, USA. ¹⁹Columbia University, New York, USA. ²⁰University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil. ²¹Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, USA. ²²Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore. ²³University of Washington, Seattle, USA. ²⁴Chan Medical School, University of Massachusetts, Worcester, USA. ²⁵Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia. ²⁶University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, USA. ²⁷Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, USA. ²⁸Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Brazil. ²⁹Université de Montréal, Montreal, Canada. ³⁰Instituto René Rachou-Fundação Oswaldo Cruz/Fiocruz Minas, Belo Horizonte, Brazil. ³¹Herbert Wertheim College of Medicine, Biomolecular Science Institute, Florida International University, Miami, USA. ³²NYU Langone Health, New York, USA. ³³The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, Galveston, USA. ³⁴University of Houston, Galveston, USA. ³⁵University of California, San Diego, USA. ³⁶School of Medicine, Tufts University, Medford, USA. ³⁷University of California, Davis, Davis, USA. ³⁸University of Western Australia, Crawley, Australia. ³⁹University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands. ⁴⁰Wayne State University, Detroit, USA. ⁴¹University of Zurich, Zürich, Switzerland. ⁴²Stanford University, Stanford, USA. ⁴³University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium. ⁴⁴University of Rome Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy. ⁴⁵University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK. ⁴⁶Department of Plant Molecular Genetics, Centro Nacional de Biotecnología, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CNB-CSIC), Madrid, Spain. ⁴⁷CNR (Italian National Research Council), Rome, Italy. ⁴⁸University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy. ⁴⁹University of Vermont, Burlington, USA. ⁵⁰University of Florence, Florence, Italy. ⁵¹University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, USA. ⁵²Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, USA. ⁵³University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada. ⁵⁴Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, USA. ⁵⁵Boston University, Boston, USA. ⁵⁶CancerCare Manitoba Research Institute, Winnipeg, Canada. ⁵⁷University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA. ⁵⁸Wadsworth Center, New York State Department of Health and University at Albany, Albany, USA. ⁵⁹Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, USA. ⁶⁰University of Parma, Parma, Italy. ⁶¹Helmholtz Institute for Pharmaceutical Research Saarland, Saarbrücken, Germany. ⁶²University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy. ⁶³Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy. ⁶⁴Tampere University, Tampere, Finland. ⁶⁵University of Connecticut, Storrs, USA. ⁶⁶Centro de Investigación Médica Aplicada, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, Spain. ⁶⁷Tulane National Primate Research Center, Tulane University, Covington, USA. ⁶⁸Scripps Research, San Diego, USA. ⁶⁹Louisiana State University School of Medicine, New Orleans, USA. ⁷⁰Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore, Singapore. ⁷¹Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, USA. ⁷²Oregon Health and Science University and Tanta University in Tanta, Tanta, Egypt. ⁷³University College London, London, UK. ⁷⁴Saint Louis University, St. Louis, USA. ⁷⁵Rhodes University, Makhanda, South Africa. ⁷⁶Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, Brazil. ⁷⁷University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada. ⁷⁸National Jewish Health, Denver, USA. ⁷⁹Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative (DNDi), Geneva, Switzerland. ⁸⁰The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia. ⁸¹Mcule, Budapest, Hungary. ⁸²University of Utah, Salt Lake City, USA. ⁸³The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, USA. ⁸⁴Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA. ⁸⁵UniQuest Pty Ltd, St Lucia, Australia. ⁸⁶University of Chicago, Chicago, USA. ⁸⁷Harvard University, Cambridge, USA. ⁸⁸University of Freiburg, Freiburg Im Breisgau, Germany. ⁸⁹Dana-Farber Cancer Institute and Harvard Medical School, Boston, USA. ⁹⁰IRB Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain. ⁹¹Istituto Italiano Di Tecnologia, Genoa, Italy. ⁹²QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Herston, Australia. ⁹³University of California, Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, USA. ⁹⁴University of Kentucky, Lexington, USA. ⁹⁵University of Tennessee Health Science Center, Memphis, USA. ⁹⁶Children's Cancer Therapy Development Institute, Beaverton, USA. ⁹⁷Columbia University Medical Center, New York, USA. ⁹⁸Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, USA. ⁹⁹University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany. ¹⁰⁰Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, Germany. ¹⁰¹Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA. ¹⁰²Canterbury Christ Church University, Canterbury, UK. ¹⁰³National Centre for Biotechnology (CNB-CSIC), Madrid, Spain. ¹⁰⁴University of South Australia and SA Pathology, Adelaide, Australia. ¹⁰⁵CUNY Advanced Science Research Center, New York, USA. ¹⁰⁶The University of Toledo, Toledo, USA. ¹⁰⁷University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, USA. ¹⁰⁸Boston Children's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, USA. ¹⁰⁹West Virginia University, Morgantown, USA. ¹¹⁰Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago, Spain.

¹¹¹University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth, Fort Worth, USA. ¹¹²Institut Pasteur Korea, Seongnam, South Korea. ¹¹³Carle Illinois College of Medicine, Urbana, USA. ¹¹⁴Università del Piemonte Orientale, Vercelli, Italy. ¹¹⁵Saskatchewan Cancer Agency, Saskatoon, Canada. ¹¹⁶Curtin University, Bentley, Australia. ¹¹⁷Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, USA. ¹¹⁸Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, USA. ¹¹⁹Tufts University, Medford, USA. ¹²⁰University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, USA. ¹²¹University of Louisville, Louisville, USA. ¹²²Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, USA. ¹²³University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA. ¹²⁴University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada. ¹²⁵University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. ¹²⁶University of Piemonte Orientale, Vercelli, Italy. ¹²⁷University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, USA. ¹²⁸St. Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton, and Hamilton Center for Kidney Research, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada. ¹²⁹Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of California San Diego, San Diego, USA. ¹³⁰Universidad de La República, Montevideo, Uruguay. ¹³¹University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany. ¹³²Johnson University, Knoxville, USA. ¹³³Indiana University, Bloomington, USA. ¹³⁴School of Medicine, University of Connecticut, Farmington, USA. ¹³⁵Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa. ¹³⁶University of Calabria, Arcavacata, Italy. ¹³⁷Michigan State University, East Lansing, USA. ¹³⁸University of Washington, Washington, USA. ¹³⁹Weill Cornell Medicine-Qatar, Ar-Rayyan, Qatar. ¹⁴⁰Gachon University, Seongnam, South Korea. ¹⁴¹Florida International University, Miami, USA. ¹⁴²California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA. ¹⁴³Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, USA. ¹⁴⁴Saskatchewan Cancer Agency and University of Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan, Canada. ¹⁴⁵Sino-American Cancer Foundation, Covina, USA. ¹⁴⁶Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands. ¹⁴⁷Rutgers University, Newark, USA. ¹⁴⁸Core Research Laboratory, ISPRO, Florence, Italy. ¹⁴⁹Caltech, Pasadena, USA. ¹⁵⁰University of Alberta, Edmonton, USA. ¹⁵¹Montreal Heart Institute and Université de Montréal, Montreal, Canada. ¹⁵²McGill University, Montreal, Canada. ¹⁵³Antwerp University, Antwerp, Belgium. ¹⁵⁴University of Bari Aldo Moro, Bari, Italy. ¹⁵⁵Alma Mater Studiorum-University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy. ¹⁵⁶University of Toledo, Toledo, USA. ¹⁵⁷International Institute of Molecular and Cell Biology in Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland. ¹⁵⁸Infection Medicine, University of Edinburgh The Chancellor's Building, Edinburgh, UK. ¹⁵⁹Emory University, Atlanta, USA. ¹⁶⁰University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA. ¹⁶¹Helmholtz Zentrum München, Munich, Germany. ¹⁶²Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, USA. ¹⁶³CENUR Litoral Norte, Universidad de La República, Montevideo, Uruguay. ¹⁶⁴University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. ¹⁶⁵Centre for Cancer Biology, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia. ¹⁶⁶University of Missouri, Columbia, USA. ¹⁶⁷Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, USA. ¹⁶⁸Yale University, New Haven, USA. ¹⁶⁹Reno School of Medicine, University of Nevada, Reno, USA. ¹⁷⁰University of Manitoba and CancerCare Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada. ¹⁷¹Goethe University Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany. ¹⁷²Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation/Oklahoma City VA Medical Center, Oklahoma City, USA. ¹⁷³Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, Oklahoma City, USA. ¹⁷⁴Department of Biomolecular Sciences, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences of Ribeirão Preto, University of São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto, SP, Brazil. ¹⁷⁵Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology, Ulsan, South Korea. ¹⁷⁶University of New Mexico Comprehensive Cancer Center, Albuquerque, USA. ¹⁷⁷Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology (UNIST), Ulsan, South Korea. ¹⁷⁸University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK. ¹⁷⁹University of Turin, Turin, Italy. ¹⁸⁰Universidad de La República, CENUR LN, Montevideo, Uruguay. ¹⁸¹Navarrabiomed-IdiSNA, Pamplona, Spain. ¹⁸²Independent, Los Angeles, USA. ¹⁸³Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, USA. ¹⁸⁴University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India. ¹⁸⁵University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia. ¹⁸⁶City of Hope Medical Center, Duarte, USA. ¹⁸⁷Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY 10065, USA. ¹⁸⁸University of Toledo College of Medicine and Life Sciences, Toledo, USA. ¹⁸⁹School of Medicine, Wayne State University, Detroit, USA. ¹⁹⁰University of Georgia, Athens, USA. ¹⁹¹The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Canada. ¹⁹²United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service (USDA-ARS), Washington, DC, USA. ¹⁹³McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada. ¹⁹⁴University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA. ¹⁹⁵The University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia. ¹⁹⁶The University of Connecticut, Storrs, USA. ¹⁹⁷Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, USA. ¹⁹⁸University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA. ¹⁹⁹Sungshin University, Seoul, South Korea. ²⁰⁰University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia. ²⁰¹University Toronto, Toronto, Canada. ²⁰²University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, USA. ²⁰³Centro Nacional de Biotecnología/CSIC, Madrid, Spain. ²⁰⁴Centro de Investigación Médica Aplicada, Pamplona, Spain. ²⁰⁵Centro de Investigación Médica Aplicada, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona, Spain. ²⁰⁶University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, USA. ²⁰⁷Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, USA. ²⁰⁸University of Montana, Missoula, USA. ²⁰⁹Brunel University London, London, UK. ²¹⁰Chapman University, Orange, USA. ²¹¹Weill Cornell Medicine Qatar, Ar-Rayyan, Qatar. ²¹²Université du Québec À Montréal, Montreal, Canada. ²¹³National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan. ²¹⁴Rhodes College, Memphis, USA. ²¹⁵Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, USA. ²¹⁶University of Central Florida, Orlando, USA. ²¹⁷University of Rochester, Rochester, USA. ²¹⁸George Mason University, Fairfax, USA. ²¹⁹University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland. ²²⁰Instituto Investigación Sanitaria La Fe, Valencia, Spain. ²²¹Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich, Germany. ²²²Brandeis University, Waltham, USA. ²²³Universidad de La República, CENUR Litoral Norte, Montevideo, Uruguay. ²²⁴Arabian Gulf University, Manama, Bahrain. ²²⁵University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK. ²²⁶University of Magna Graecia, Catanzaro, Italy. ²²⁷Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, USA. ²²⁸University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, USA. ²²⁹Marquette University, Milwaukee, USA. ²³⁰University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, USA. ²³¹Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada. ²³²CancerCare Manitoba Research Institute (CCMR), Winnipeg, Canada. ²³³The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. ²³⁴University of Manitoba and CancerCare Manitoba Research Institute, Winnipeg, Canada. ²³⁵Sanford Burnham Prebys, La Jolla, USA. ²³⁶University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. ²³⁷UConn Health, Farmington, USA. ²³⁸The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, USA. ²³⁹Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha, South Africa. ²⁴⁰Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, USA. ²⁴¹University of Houston, Houston, USA. ²⁴²Rutgers University, New Brunswick, USA. ²⁴³University of Nevada, Reno, USA. ²⁴⁴Universidad de León, León, Spain. ²⁴⁵School of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, USA. ²⁴⁶School of Medicine, UConn Health, Farmington, USA. ²⁴⁷University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, USA. ²⁴⁸Chapman University School of Pharmacy, Irvine, USA. ²⁴⁹University of Winnipeg/St. Boniface Research Centre, Winnipeg, Canada. ²⁵⁰Fred Hutchinson Cancer

Center, Seattle, USA. ²⁵¹Helmholtz Institute for Pharmaceutical Research Saarland (HIPS), Saarbrücken, Germany. ²⁵²Technical University of Denmark, Kongens Lyngby, Denmark. ²⁵³The City College of New York, New York, USA. ²⁵⁴Children's Cancer, Therapy Development Institute (Cc-TDI), Beaverton, USA. ²⁵⁵Soka University, Hachioji, Japan. ²⁵⁶Institute of Clinical Physiology, National Research Council, Pisa, Italy. ²⁵⁷Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, Australia. ²⁵⁸Washington University, St Louis, USA. ²⁵⁹University of Dundee, Dundee, UK. ²⁶⁰Montreal Heart Institute, Montreal, Canada. ²⁶¹Columbia University Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia, USA. ²⁶²Georgetown University, Washington, USA. ²⁶³Duke University, Durham, USA. ²⁶⁴Center for Applied Medical Research, University of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain. ²⁶⁵King's College London, London, UK. ²⁶⁶Precision Vaccines Program, Division of Infectious Diseases, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, USA. ²⁶⁷Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, USA. ²⁶⁸Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, USA. ²⁶⁹Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand. ²⁷⁰Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, USA. ²⁷¹Central South University, Changsha, China. ²⁷²SUNY Upstate Medical University, Syracuse, USA. ²⁷³University of Oxford, Oxford, UK. ²⁷⁴Goethe-University, Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany. ²⁷⁵Institute for Cardiovascular Prevention (IPEK), Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, Germany. ²⁷⁶Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, USA. ²⁷⁷School of Medicine, Boston University, Boston, USA. ²⁷⁸University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, USA. ²⁷⁹University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland. ²⁸⁰Wadsworth Center, NYSDOH, Albany, USA. ²⁸¹The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.