
Retro-prob: Retrosynthetic Planning Based on a Probabilistic Model

Chengyang Tian
Harbin Institute of Technology
tiancy07@qq.com

YangPeng Zhang
Harbin Institute of Technology
zhangyp9403@163.com

Yang Liu*
Harbin Institute of Technology
liuyang@hit.edu.cn

Abstract

Retrosynthesis is a fundamental but challenging task in organic chemistry, with broad applications in fields such as drug design and synthesis. Given a target molecule, the goal of retrosynthesis is to find out a series of reactions which could be assembled into a synthetic route which starts from purchasable molecules and ends at the target molecule. The uncertainty of reactions used in retrosynthetic planning, which is caused by hallucinations of backward models, has recently been noticed. In this paper we propose a succinct probabilistic model to describe such uncertainty. Based on the model, we propose a new retrosynthesis planning algorithm called retro-prob to maximize the successful synthesis probability of target molecules, which acquires high efficiency by utilizing the chain rule of derivatives. Experiments on the Paroutes benchmark show that retro-prob outperforms previous algorithms, retro* and retro-fallback, both in speed and in the quality of synthesis plans.

1 Introduction

Retrosynthesis is the process of finding synthesis plans for molecules. Typically, retrosynthesis is regarded as a search problem, with the target molecule as the starting point and a set of purchasable molecules as the endpoint. With the seemingly infinite number of organic molecules and their associated reactions, the search space is vast, making it challenging even for experienced experts. There are already several AI algorithms capable of automatically conducting retrosynthesis analysis, and providing advice to chemists. Despite their differences, these algorithms share a similar framework. They use a one-step backward model to predict reactions and then conduct searches on the network formed by these reactions. However, the outcomes of one-step models are not always accurate, making the routes found by retrosynthesis algorithms impractical. Fortunately, algorithms usually provide multiple routes, and naturally the proportion of successful routes among all results becomes a valuable metric when evaluating algorithms.

Existing methods evaluate the results of retrosynthesis algorithms using metrics such as the route length, the route quality, and the route diversity. A recent study, retro-fallback[1], employs a new metric called Successful Synthesis Probability (SSP), which can be used to evaluate the overall success probability of a synthesis plan generated by an algorithm. Based on a method of stochastic processes (or stochastic samplings), retro-fallback is an algorithm that continuously estimates the SSP of the given target molecule and tries to maximize it during the search process. The concept of

*Corresponding author.

SSP is of practical significance, but there still lacks an efficient method to calculate it since the way of stochastic samplings is fairly slow.

In this paper, we first establish a probabilistic model that allows us to calculate SSP directly, rather than estimating it through sampling. Based on this probabilistic model, we then present an algorithm named *retro-prob*, which utilize a mathematical technique to achieve computational efficiency.

2 Background

Retrosynthesis planning can be divided into two smaller tasks: one-step backward reaction prediction and multi-step retrosynthetic planning. Given a product molecule m , one-step backward model need to identify a set of reactions \mathcal{R} , and each $r \in \mathcal{R}$ should includes m as one of its products. On the basis of one-step model, a retrosynthesis algorithm takes a target molecule t and a set of starting molecules \mathcal{I} as input, and it aims to find out a series of reactions through which people can synthesize t using molecules from \mathcal{I} as source materials.

There mainly exists two types of one-step backward models: template-based and template-free. Template-based methods, as proposed by Coley et al. [2], Segler and Waller [3], extract templates from available chemical reaction datasets and then apply them to unknown molecules. Neutral networks are employed to help filter out the most probable ones from more than 40K templates. Template-free methods, as proposed by Liu et al. [4], Karpov et al. [5], utilize sequence-to-sequence models such as LSTM and Transformer. They transform molecules and chemical reactions into textual strings and then utilize methods in Natural Language Processing (NLP) to predict the outcomes. Such template-free methods are more innovative, capable of discovering unknown reactions that cannot be described by known templates, but their accuracy is comparatively low. In the work by Karpov et al. [5], they achieved an top-1 accuracy of 42.7%, while Segler and Waller [3] claimed a 64% top-1 accuracy in their work on template-based methods.

Different algorithms commonly approach multi-step retrosynthesis as a search problem, with variations in the definitions of their search structures. Algorithm based on Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS)[6] utilizes each node on its search tree to represent a set of molecules. Retro*[7] use an AND-OR tree which consists of molecule nodes and reaction nodes. Retro-fallback[1] maintains its search structure as an AND-OR graph instead of a tree.

2.1 Retro* search algorithm

Retro*[7] is an algorithm inspired by A* search. Retro* aims to improve the quality of routes, which is evaluated by route length (or route cost), and stay efficient at the same time.

AND-OR graph An AND-OR graph is a directed graph that expresses the correlations between molecules and reactions. In an AND-OR graph, each reaction, represented as an AND node, requires all its successors to participate, while a molecule, represented as a OR node, can be synthesized if any one of its successors successfully reacts. Let M be the OR node for a molecule m . If m is one of the products of reaction r , represented by an AND node R , there is an directed edge from M to R . For each reactant molecule of reaction r , there is another edge starts from R and points to the node representing that reactant molecule.

As many molecules and chemical reactions are unknown or unrecorded, it is practically impossible to obtain the overview of the graph prior to retrosynthetic planning. Algorithms only have information about nodes that have already been reached. Tree structures are more natural and are easier to maintain.

AND-OR tree The AND-OR tree was first brought into retrosynthesis by retro*. An AND-OR tree, denoted as T , is the search structure constructed by algorithms when searching on an AND-OR graph. On initialization, retro* creates a root node for the given target molecule. At each step of the search, retro* expands a leaf molecule node. The expansion will call the one-step backward model, and creates new nodes in tree T according to the one-step model’s return. As illustrated in Figure 1, an expansion creates both AND nodes and OR nodes.

For each molecule node $M \in T$, Retro* calculates $g(M)$ and $h(M)$, where $g(M)$ is the distance from M to the root node and $h(M)$ is the predicted cost to synthesize molecule m . On expansion, retro* always selects the leaf node with the lowest $V(M) = g(M) + h(M)$.




Figure 1: The expansion of an AND-OR search tree. Node M_2 is expanded with reactions predicted by the one-step backward model: $m_4 + m_5 \rightarrow m_2$ and $m_6 \rightarrow m_2$ (any side products are ignored).

2.2 Retro-fallback algorithm

Retro-fallback[1] is a greedy algorithm that takes into account the probability of reaction failures. Retro-fallback emphasise finding backup routes in a synthesis plan to increase the success probability.

Successful synthesis probability SSP is used by retro-fallback to evaluate the success probability of a synthesis plan. It is defined as:

$$SSP(T) = \mathbb{P}[\exists \text{ Route} \subseteq T, \text{ with } \sigma(\text{Route}) = 1] \quad (1)$$

where T is the whole search tree (or a synthesis plan), and $\sigma(\text{Route}) = 1$ means every reactions on that route is successful. This is actually a simplified version of SSP’s definition. Retro-fallback provides thorough definitions of what is a *Route* and what is a *success*.

Retro-fallback utilizes stochastic processes to estimate the SSP of a search tree T , requiring multiple samplings based on the probabilities of reactions. At each step of the search, retro-fallback greedily selects a *Route* and simultaneously expands all leaf nodes on the route. The method for selecting the route is also based on stochastic processes. Due to its complexity, we refrain from delving into the details here.

3 A probabilistic model

In this section, we first propose a set of calculation formulas of SSP based on its definition from retro-fallback[1]. Then, we describe the graph-based search structure used in our retro-prob algorithm.

3.1 The calculation formulas for SSP

Let $s(M)$ denote the success probability of molecule node M , and $s(R)$ denote the success probability of reaction node R . We provide the following calculation formulas in the form of recursion:

$$s(M) = \begin{cases} 1, & m \in \mathcal{I} \\ 1 - \prod_{R \in Ch(M)} (1 - s(R)), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$s(R) = P(R) \times \prod_{M \in Ch(R)} s(M)$$

where m is the molecule of node M , \mathcal{I} is the set of starting molecules, and $Ch(X)$ represents the children of node X in the search tree T . $P(R)$ is the feasible probability of reaction r . A reaction is feasible if it is able to occur when provided with all the reactants it needs, but the success of a

reaction node requires the success of its reactants at the same time. These formulas may look similar to the definition of *node success* in retro-fallback[1], but we introduce probabilities with a range of $[0, 1]$ instead of a binary successful/unsuccessful outcome.

After the definitions of $S(M)$ and $S(R)$, we have obtained a method to calculate SSP. In fact, the SSP of a synthesis plan T is exactly the $S(M_t)$ of the given target molecule m_t , where M_t is the root node of the search tree T .

3.2 AND-OR tree with additional edges

As is discussed in Section 2.1, an AND-OR tree is the naturally formed structure when searching on an AND-OR graph. However, there exists weak cycles, cycles, as well as bidirectional edges (representing reversible reactions) in graph. Weak cycles can result in multiple paths from the root node to a particular node, thereby causing such nodes to have multiple copies of themselves in the tree. Cycles and bidirectional edges can potentially result in infinite loops within the tree. Such occurrences caused costly additional expenses for search algorithms and can sometimes be misleading. Typically, loops can be prevented by prohibiting algorithms from creating nodes if an identical node already exists among its ancestors, as illustrated in Figure 2 (b). Maziarz et al. [8] proposed a resolution to reduce costs incurred when algorithms visit and expand different nodes of a same molecule by caching the results of the one-step backward model. It does improve the efficiency significantly, but it does not resolve the issue thoroughly. Nodes representing the same molecule in different positions remain isolated, preventing algorithms from interpreting the relationships between these nodes.




Figure 2: A graph and trees transformed from it. Here all nodes represent molecules, while reaction nodes are omitted. Q_1, Q_2 represent the same molecule, so do nodes $P_i (i = 1, 2, 3)$. Leader nodes are depicted with thick boarder in (c).

Our algorithm retro-prob utilizes an AND-OR *graph* without cycles as its logical structure, but in implementation we use an AND-OR tree with additional edges to describe it. Within such trees, a molecule may have multiple nodes, but it will have only one *leader node*. For a molecule m , let $\mathcal{G}(m)$ denote the set of nodes representing m . Each group \mathcal{G} has one leader node $M_{leader} \in \mathcal{G}(m)$:

$$M_{leader} \leftarrow \arg \max_{M \in \mathcal{G}(m)} Depth(M) \quad (3)$$

where $Depth(M)$ returns the depth of node M in tree T . Such design ensures that the order of leader nodes during level traversal in a tree matches the *topological order* of the graph.

After selecting the leader nodes, we create addition edges from non-leader nodes to their leader nodes to indicate that they represent the same node in graph. Any further expansions will be conducted under the leader nodes and non-leader nodes will no longer have any children. As depicted in Figure 2 (c), loops are still not allowed.

4 Retro-prob Algorithm

4.1 Overview of retro-prob

Retro-prob is a greedy search algorithm that based on the probabilistic model and the search structure introduced in Section 3, and retro-prob expands a single leaf node at each step (see Appendix A.1 for the expansion method). We refer to those nodes that can be selected for expansion as *open nodes*. Open nodes are unexpanded leaf nodes that serve as leader nodes. We denote the set of open nodes as \mathcal{O} . Below we first describe the greedy heuristic used by retro-prob. Then we delve into an efficient practical implementation, which utilizes the chain rule of derivatives.

4.2 A greedy heuristic

Let $s(M_t|expand(M))$ denote the success probability of root node M_t if we would expand node M . We select the next expanding node M_{next} upon heuristic:

$$M_{next} \leftarrow \arg \max_{M \in \mathcal{O}} [s(M_t|expand(M))] \quad (4)$$

When calculating $s(M_t|expand(M))$, we make an optimistic assumption that the expansion of M will result in $s(M) = 1$. Then we use a slightly different formula from Eq 2 to calculate $s(M_t)$ using a bottom-up method (see Appendix A.2 for details).

$$s(M) = \begin{cases} 1, & m \in \mathcal{I} \\ s_0, & m \in \mathcal{O} \\ 1 - \prod_{R \in Ch(M)} (1 - s(R)), & otherwise \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $s_0 > 0$ is a parameter. The positive s_0 allows reactions with more than one reactants to be "seen" by the algorithm. Otherwise the success probabilities $s(R)$ will remain zero for such reactions, resulting in their child nodes never being selected (unless there are no other open nodes). Furthermore, a positive s_0 allows our algorithm to access global information from the entire search tree, including both successful routes and routes that haven't succeed yet.

Algorithm 1 A simple greedy algorithm

```

1: Initialize the root node  $M_t$ 
2: for  $i = 0$  to  $max\_iteration$  do
3:   for  $M \in \mathcal{O}$  do
4:     Calculate  $s(M_t|expand(M))$ 
5:   end for
6:    $M_{next} \leftarrow \arg \max [s(M_t|expand(M))]$ 
7:   Expand  $M_{next}$ 
8: end for
9: return The search tree  $T$ 

```

4.3 Retro-prob with derivatives

The efficiency of the above algorithm is relatively low. There can be thousands of open nodes during the search, thus requiring the bottom-up calculation to be conducted $|\mathcal{O}|$ times.

Instead of attempting to find the maximum $s(M_t|expand(M))$, we try to maximize the derivatives:

$$M_{next} \leftarrow \arg \max_{M \in \mathcal{O}} \left[\frac{ds(M_t)}{ds(M)} \right] \quad (6)$$

We argue that Eq 6 is equivalent to Eq 4, as we assume the expansion of every node $M \in \mathcal{O}$ results in the same increase in $s(M)$. Let $D(X)$ denote the derivative $ds(M_t)/ds(X)$. For each node X , its derivative $D(X)$ can be calculated using Eq 7:

$$D(M) = \begin{cases} \sum_{M_i \in \mathcal{G}(M)} [D(P_i) \cdot ds(P_i)/ds(M_i)], & otherwise \\ 1, & M \text{ is } M_t \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

$$D(R) = D(P) \cdot \frac{ds(P)}{ds(R)}$$

where P_i is the parent node of M_i and P is the parent node of R . Now we can calculate the derivatives for every node in the tree T in a single top-down calculation: For a node X , once the derivative $D(P)$ of its parent node is known, it’s straightforward to compute $ds(P)/ds(X)$ according to Eq 2.

For example in Figure 3, we have $D(M_t) = 1$, and $D(R_1) = ds(M_t)/ds(R_1) = 1 - s(R_2)$. Once we obtained the value of $D(R_1)$, we can easily calculate $D(M_2) = D(R_1) \cdot ds(R_1)/ds(M_2)$.




Figure 3: The top-down calculation of derivatives. Because the leader nodes are always the deepest in \mathcal{G} , the calculation is simply top-down (or in the topological order of a graph).

Eq 7 requires to sum up the derivatives of nodes in set \mathcal{G} , as these nodes represent the same molecule and are thus regarded as a single independent variable. An efficient method for doing this is by delaying the sum up: First calculate $D(M)$ as if M is the only node in \mathcal{G} . After every node in \mathcal{G} has completed its calculation, sum up their values to the leader node of \mathcal{G} . For example in Figure 3, we first calculate $D'(M_3)$ and $D'(M_4)$ independently, and then set $D(M_4) = D'(M_3) + D'(M_4)$. But it’s only after the true $D(M_4)$ has been calculated that we can process into M_4 ’s children nodes, as the value of $D(M_4)$ will be used by children nodes.

Algorithm 2 Retro-prob algorithm

- 1: Initialize the root node M_t
 - 2: **for** $i = 0$ to $max_iteration$ **do**
 - 3: Calculate $D(X)$ for $X \in T$ in a top-down method
 - 4: $M_{next} \leftarrow \arg \max D(M)$
 - 5: Expand M_{next}
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: **return** The search tree T
-

5 Experiments

5.1 Experiment setup

We use the PaRoutes[9] benchmark dataset for evaluation and analysis. PaRoutes is a framework for benchmarking multi-step retrosynthesis methods. It provides two sets of 10k target molecules and starting molecules, along with reference routes. It also provides a trained template-based one-step backward model, which is trained from the popular USPTO chemical reaction dataset from Jin et al. [10]. To reproduce the results of retro*[7] and retro-fallback[1], we partially use the framework in Syntheseus[8]. We use the retro*-0 version of retro* algorithm, which does not include the neural network-guided heuristic and is outperformed by retro* by 6% in terms of success rate from the experiment of Chen et al. [7].

We evaluate the results of algorithms based on the average SSP obtained from a set of 50 target molecules from Paroutes dataset, and we utilize two different methods for obtaining the SSP of a retrosynthesis plan. The first method is based on stochastic processes, which is employed in retro-fallback. The other method is derived from Eq 2 and Eq 5, where we always set $s_0 = 10^{-3}$ for evaluation purposes. Setting a small but positive s_0 helps us evaluate a plan even if it has not succeeded yet. We use the result $s(M_t)$ to express the SSP of a retrosynthesis plan T . In both cases, we obtain the feasible probabilities for reactions using the method outlined in Appendix B.

Table 1: Evaluating algorithms using $s(M_t)$. Max iterations = 120.

Algorithm	retro-prob	retro-prob (log cost)	retro*	retro* (log cost)
$s(M_t)$	0.93	0.46	0.35	0.31
Success rate	62%	62%	20%	84%
Time(s)	57	58	73	19

5.2 Results

5.2.1 The optimal parameter for retro-prob

We search for the optimal parameter s_0 to be used in Eq 5 through experiments. The one-step backward model selects the top-30 templates in this experimentation.




Figure 4: The increase curves of $s(M_t)$ for different s_0 .

As is shown in Figure 4, the groups with $s_0 = 0.03$ and $s_0 = 0.05$ exhibit the best performance. We also add a control group with $s_0 = 0$, represented by the dashed line in Figure 4. It is obvious that the group with $s_0 = 0$ gets worse results than any other groups, especially as iterations increase. We believe this is because it lacks the capability to obtain routes containing reactions with more than one reactant molecule $m \notin \mathcal{I}$. Such routes have lower priority for the algorithm, but if we set $s_0 > 0$, algorithm will eventually search for those routes as iterations increase.

5.2.2 Comparisons

We compare retro-prob against retro*[7] and retro-fallback[1] on the first 50 molecules from Paroutes dataset (N5). The one-step backward model selects the top-50 templates, and retro-prob use a $s_0 = 0.04$. For retro*, we offer two types of reaction costs. One is the bond loss described in Appendix B.2. The other is the *log cost* used in the original retro* algorithm. The log cost may not be consistent with our bond loss, resulting in different evaluations of reactions.

First, we conduct experiments on retro-prob, retro-prob (log cost), retro* and retro* (log cost), using $s(M_t)$ to evaluate their outcomes. For retro-prob with log cost, we replace the loss in Eq 9 with the log cost. Using log cost means algorithms are unaware of the feasible probabilities used during evaluation, which increases the uncertainty. The results are listed in Table 1 and shown in Figure 5. Retro-prob significantly outperforms retro* in terms of $s(M_t)$, and is also time-efficient even when the value updating involves more nodes in the search tree. Log cost methods consume much less time as it does not use the forward model in Appendix B.1. Retro* with log cost achieves the highest success rate while its $s(M_t)$ is the lowest. This phenomenon shows that a successful synthesis plan does not necessarily equate to a high success probability. Within the routes found by retro* (log cost), there may exist lots of reactions with low feasible probabilities. In the same situation, retro-prob with log cost performs better. We believe this is because retro-prob ensures its success probabilities with backup routes.




Figure 5: The curves of $s(M_t)$ for different algorithms. Error bars represent standard errors.

Table 2: Evaluating algorithms using SSP. Max iterations = 200.

Algorithm	retro-prob	retro*	retro* (log cost)	retro-fallback
SSP	0.51	0.10	0.22	0.20
Success-SSP	0.72	0.47	0.25	0.48
Success rate	70%	22%	86%	42%
Time(s)	98	123	33	233

Secondly, we utilize the method of stochastic processes by retro-fallback to estimate the SSP of retro-prob, retro*, retro* (log cost) and retro-fallback. Since this method only considers the success probabilities of successful routes, we provide both the average SSP over all molecules and the average SSP over succeeded molecules (denoted as success-SSP). Results are listed in Table 2 and shown in Figure 6. Retro-prob still performs the best in regard of the estimated SSP, and has an advantage in terms of time consumption over retro-fallback and retro*.




Figure 6: **Left:** The overall SSP. **Right:** The success-SSP. Error bars represent standard errors.

6 Discussions and limitations

In this paper, we propose retro-prob, a greedy retrosynthetic planning algorithm based on a probabilistic model, aimed at maximizing the success probabilities of synthesis plans. By making use of the chain rule of derivatives, retro-prob simplifies multiple bottom-up value updates into a single top-down calculation. We also propose a method for conducting quantitative analysis of reaction feasibility based on a forward prediction model. Through experiments, retro-prob has been demonstrated to outperform both the retro* and retro-fallback algorithms.

Our work certainly has some limitations. Most importantly, although we introduce a method to evaluate its results, our search algorithm still heavily relies on the one-step model. The ability of on-step model is becoming the bottom neck of retrosynthesis. Additionally, we acknowledge that our experiments are inadequate in some aspects. Specifically when evaluating reactions, we make assumptions on the method of transforming bond loss into probabilities, but further experiments are needed to prove its practicality.

However, we believe that employing probabilistic or mathematical models is beneficial for tackling many complex problems. We hope that our method can inspire future works to develop more thorough solutions.

References

- [1] Austin Tripp, Krzysztof Maziarz, Sarah Lewis, Marwin Segler, and Jose Miguel Hernandez-Lobato. Retro-fallback: retrosynthetic planning in an uncertain world. Oct 2023.
- [2] Connor W. Coley, Luke Rogers, William H. Green, and Klavs F. Jensen. Computer-assisted retrosynthesis based on molecular similarity. *ACS Central Science*, page 1237–1245, Dec 2017. doi: 10.1021/acscentsci.7b00355. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acscentsci.7b00355>.
- [3] Marwin H. S. Segler and Mark P. Waller. Neural-symbolic machine learning for retrosynthesis and reaction prediction. *Chemistry – A European Journal*, page 5966–5971, May 2017. doi: 10.1002/chem.201605499. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/chem.201605499>.
- [4] Bowen Liu, Bharath Ramsundar, Prasad Kawthekar, Jade Shi, Joseph Gomes, Quang Luu Nguyen, Stephen Ho, Jack Sloane, Paul Wender, and Vijay Pande. Retrosynthetic reaction prediction using neural sequence-to-sequence models. *ACS Central Science*, page 1103–1113, Oct 2017. doi: 10.1021/acscentsci.7b00303. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acscentsci.7b00303>.
- [5] Pavel Karpov, Guillaume Godin, and Igor V. Tetko. *A Transformer Model for Retrosynthesis*, page 817–830. Jan 2019. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-30493-5_78. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30493-5_78.
- [6] Marwin H. S. Segler, Mike Preuss, and Mark P. Waller. Planning chemical syntheses with deep neural networks and symbolic ai. *Nature*, page 604–610, Mar 2018. doi: 10.1038/nature25978. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature25978>.
- [7] Binghong Chen, Chengtao Li, Hanjun Dai, and Le Song. Retro*: Learning retrosynthetic planning with neural guided a* search. *arXiv: Learning, arXiv: Learning*, Jun 2020.
- [8] Krzysztof Maziarz, Austin Tripp, Guoqing Liu, Megan Stanley, Shufang Xie, Piotr Gaiński, Philipp Seidl, Marwin Segler, and Microsoft Research. Re-evaluating retrosynthesis algorithms with synthesus.
- [9] Samuel Genheden and Esben Bjerrum. Paroutes: a framework for benchmarking retrosynthesis route predictions. Feb 2022. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.26434/chemrxiv-2022-wk8c3>.
- [10] Wengong Jin, Connor W. Coley, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi S. Jaakkola. Predicting organic reaction outcomes with weisfeiler-lehman network. *Neural Information Processing Systems, Neural Information Processing Systems*, Sep 2017.
- [11] Rainer Herges. Coarctate and pseudocoarctate reactions: Stereochemical rules. *The Journal of Organic Chemistry*, 80(23):11869–11876, Dec 2015. doi: 10.1021/acs.joc.5b01959. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.joc.5b01959>.
- [12] Hangrui Bi, Hengyi Wang, Chence Shi, Connor W. Coley, Jian Tang, and Hongyu Guo. Non-autoregressive electron redistribution modeling for reaction prediction. *Cornell University - arXiv*, Jun 2021.

- [13] Philippe Schwaller, Riccardo Petraglia, Valerio Zullo, Vishnu H. Nair, Rico Andreas Haeuselmann, Riccardo Pisoni, Costas Bekas, Anna Iuliano, and Teodoro Laino. Predicting retrosynthetic pathways using transformer-based models and a hyper-graph exploration strategy. *Chemical Science*, page 3316–3325, Mar 2020. doi: 10.1039/c9sc05704h. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/c9sc05704h>.

A Implementation details

A.1 Expansion of a tree

The expansion of a leaf node consists of two steps. The first step is identical to that of a normal AND-OR tree, as depicted in Figure 1. The second step is to maintain the structure described in Section 3.2 by reallocating leader nodes and adjusting additional edges.




Figure 7: The adjustment stage after expansion. All nodes represent molecules, while reaction nodes are omitted.

As demonstrated in Figure 7, the adjustment stage starts when new nodes are created. We require leader nodes to be the deepest one in each node set \mathcal{G} . If a new node Q_0 surpasses the depth of the old leader node $Q_2 \in \mathcal{G}(q)$, Q_0 will become the new leader node and edges will be adjusted. Consequently, the subtree rooted at the old leader node needs to be transferred under the new leader node. This transfer process will change the depth of nodes within the subtree, which might lead to further leader reallocation.

A.2 Update of node values

To calculate the $s(M_t)$ of the root node M_t , there is a bottom-up value update.




Figure 8: The order for updating node values.

First we initialize the value of leaf nodes in the tree T according to Eq 5. Secondly we conduct a bottom-up calculation for nodes. Note that we do not calculate $s(M)$ for a non-leader node M . Instead we copy the value from its leader node. As illustrated in Figure 8, the node X will set its $s(X)$ identical to its leader node Y . This requires the value $s(M_{leader})$ of a leader node $M_{leader} \in \mathcal{G}$ should have been set before it is used by other nodes. Because the leader nodes are always the deepest in \mathcal{G} , the calculation is simply bottom-up.

B Feasible probabilities of reactions

Different from the feasible models employed in retro-fallback, we utilize a forward reaction prediction model to evaluate the outcome of the one-step backward model.

B.1 The forward prediction model

We construct our forward prediction model based on models that predicts the electron flows[11, 12]. It takes a set of reactants as input and outputs the predicted number of chemical bonds between each pair of atoms within them. The model’s structure is illustrated in Figure 9.




Figure 9: The structure of our forward prediction model. **Left:** encoder. **Right:** decoder.

Our forward prediction model consists of an encoder part and a decoder part. The encoder extracts information from molecules, converting atoms into hidden layer representations. The decoder interprets those hidden layer representations and use an attention module to predict the formation or breakdown of chemical bonds between atoms.

B.2 From bond loss to probabilities

Schwaller et al. [13] have proposed the method of round-trip accuracy to evaluate one-step backward models, which counts whether the target molecule is included in the predicted products yield by a forward model. If the results of the backward/forward models are consistent, the resulting reaction is more likely to be correct (or feasible).

Following such idea, we conduct quantitative analysis of reaction feasibility based on the forward prediction model in Section B.1. The results of a one-step backward model is a set of single-product reactions. For each reaction, we feed its reactants (predicted by backward model) into our forward model and obtain the predicted number of chemical bonds between atoms in the products. Then by comparing these products with the target molecule, we obtain the bond loss:

$$loss = \sum_{x \in V_t, y \in V} (T_{(x,y)} - P_{(x,y)})^2 \quad (8)$$

where V_t is the set of atoms in the target molecule, and V is the set of atoms within reactants. $T_{(x,y)}$ represent the bond count between atom x and y , while $P_{(x,y)}$ represent the predicted number of bonds between x and y , which may not be a integer. If neither of a pair of atoms is in set V_t , the predicted bond count between them won't contribute to the loss. Note that Eq 8 implies a precondition that we must know how atoms are mapped between reactants and products (as depicted in Figure 10), which can sometimes be a hard task. Fortunately, when employing template-based backward models, we can obtain the mapping information from the templates.

Finally, we obtain the feasible probability $P(R)$ of a reaction R from Eq 9:

$$P(R) = e^{-a \cdot (loss + bias)} \quad (9)$$




Figure 10: The mapping information between reactants and products. Atoms with the same number are the same atom before and after the reaction.

where a is a parameter we set to 0.2 in experiments. We use $bias = 1.0$ in retro-prob when searching for routes. This parameter is used to represent "route length", making our algorithm prefer shorter routes. For cases where "length" is not considered, it's recommended to set $bias = 0$.

C Sample search trees and extracted routes




Figure 11: A sample search tree created by retro-prob algorithm. (Partial.) Yellow/blue/green/grey nodes indicate purchasable/successful/expanded/open nodes. Additional edges are not depicted in this tree.




Figure 12: A route extracted from the tree in Figure 11.




Figure 13: Another sample search tree created by retro-prob algorithm. (Partial.)




Figure 14: A route extracted from the tree in Figure 13.