VarDrug: A Machine Learning Approach for Variant-Drug Interaction, Application to Drugs for Psychiatric Disorders

MohammadReza KarimiNejad[1,†], Narges SangaraniPour[2,†], Yasmin Naji[3], Mohammad Shafiezadeh[1], Reza Tavakoli[4], Siavash Ahmadi[5], Babak Khalaj[6], Mohammad Hossein Rohban[1,*]

[1] Department of Computer Engineering, Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran.

[2] School of Medicine, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

[3] Department of Computer Science, Amirkabir University of Technology, Tehran, Iran.

[4] Department of Mathematical Science, Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran.

[5] Electronics Research Institute, Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran.

[6] Department of Electrical Engineering, Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran.

[*]Corresponding author: rohban@sharif.edu

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work

Contributing authors: mokar2001@gmail.com, nargessangaranip@gmail.com; yasmin.naji.cs@gmail.com; moh788672@gmail.com; seyedreza.tavakoli@sharif.edu; s.ahmadi@sharif.edu; khalaj@sharif.edu; rohban@sharif.edu;

Abstract

Predicting variant-drug interactions is essential for advancing precision medicine across therapeutic areas. The Pharmacogenomics Knowledge Base (PharmGKB) dataset, with ~11,000 samples, is underutilized in machine learning (ML) due to its limited size. After filtering for variant mappings and excluding metabolizer-related conditions, we obtain ~4,000 samples for a six-class prediction task (increasing or decreasing toxicity, efficacy, and dosage). We introduce VarDrug, the first ML framework for variant-drug interaction prediction using PharmGKB, designed to model interactions between genetic variants and drugs. VarDrug integrates a self-supervised VariantEncoder pre-trained on 100,000 GRCh38 variants, Fingerprint method for drug encoding, and gene co-expression profiles for enhanced variant representation. Using SMOTE for class balancing and 5-fold cross-validation, we evaluate five ML models (CatBoost, RandomForest, ExtraTree, DecisionTree, SVC) against label encoding and rule-based baselines. RandomForest achieves a weighted F1 score of 0.66 and top-2 accuracy of 0.93, significantly outperforming baselines (best weighted F1: 0.39). Ablation studies

confirm the VariantEncoder's critical role, while a case study on psychiatric disorders, focusing on borderline personality disorder (BPD), demonstrates biological plausibility with alignment to known pharmacogenetic annotations for genes like ABCB1 and CYP2D6. VarDrug's approach, mapping drug-gene and mechanism-of-action-gene interactions, offers a scalable framework for optimizing treatment strategies and reducing adverse drug reactions across pharmacogenomic applications.

1. Introduction

Drug–gene interactions (DGIs) are a major contributor to inter-individual variability in drug response and toxicity, driven by complex interactions among drugs and genetic factors [1]. These interactions are critical for advancing **precision medicine** [2]. Variants in genes involved in drug metabolism, transport, and targets can influence the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of medications, altering the risk and type of **adverse drug reactions (ADRs)** [3].

The growing availability of pharmacogenomic databases, such as **PharmGKB**, provides comprehensive data on variant–gene–drug relationships, enabling the development of predictive models for ADRs based on genetic profiles [3]. Recent studies emphasize the importance of incorporating both drug–drug and drug–gene interactions to improve ADR prediction, advocating for their integration into clinical decision-making [4].

Machine learning approaches show significant promise in enhancing ADR prediction by integrating heterogeneous data sources, including genetic variants, drug properties, and interaction networks [5]. For example, models trained on PharmGKB and related datasets have been effectively applied to specific therapeutic areas, such as dermatological treatments, demonstrating improved predictive power for specific ADR classes [5]. Additionally, embedding-based methods like **metapath2vec** have improved DGI predictions by capturing complex multi-hop relationships between drugs, genes, and variants in heterogeneous biomedical networks [6].

In this study, we focus on variant-drug interaction prediction, specifically exploring the role of genetic variants in classifying **ADRs** associated with drug–gene interactions. Using curated data from the **Pharmacogenomics Knowledge Base (PharmGKB)** [7], we aim to classify ADRs based on variant–gene–drug relationships, leveraging computational techniques to enhance prediction accuracy and contribute to safer pharmacotherapy. This work establishes a robust framework for variant-level drug interaction prediction, with plans for significant expansion through future research and collaborative contributions.

2. Methods

2.1. Dataset

The **PharmGKB** database contains approximately 11,000 variant–drug and condition–drug interactions, each annotated with clinical outcomes such as **toxicity**, **efficacy**, and **dosage adjustments** [7]. Variants are identified using **Reference SNP IDs (RSIDs)**, while drugs are specified by their generic names. Each interaction is labeled with a type (toxicity, efficacy, dosage) and direction (increased or decreased), defining a **six-class prediction task**: increased/decreased toxicity, increased/decreased efficacy, and increased/decreased dosage. The dataset exhibits **class imbalance**, with certain interaction types, such as decreased efficacy, being underrepresented, necessitating the application of class balancing techniques [8].

2.2. Data Preprocessing

We preprocessed the **PharmGKB** dataset, consisting of approximately 11,000 samples, to ensure robust **variant-drug interaction** prediction [7]. Initially, we excluded rows lacking variant annotations, such as those associated solely with conditions (e.g., metabolizer status), reducing the dataset to approximately 4,000 samples with clinically relevant **variant-drug interactions**. Subsequently, we mapped each variant to its target gene using **ClinVar** [9], extracting gene annotations through API queries. Variant IDs were retrieved in the format **CHROM_POS_REF_ALT** from ClinVar to ensure standardized genomic coordinates for downstream analysis [9]. For drug encoding, we linked each drug's generic name to **DrugBank** [10] and **PubChem** [11] to obtain **SMILES strings**, which represent molecular structures. These preprocessing steps resulted in a curated dataset with **variant-gene mappings** and **drug SMILES**, enabling multi-modal feature engineering for the **VarDrug** machine learning framework.

2.3. Variant Encoder

We trained a **Variant-Aware MultiModal AutoEncoder (VMAE)** on 100,000 **GRCh38** variants (distinct from **PharmGKB**) to effectively encode genetic variants [12]. For each variant, a 201-bp **flanking region** was extracted from the **GRCh38 human genome** (**Ensembl release 108**) [13], centered on the variant's position. This region was processed using **DNABert2-100M** [14], a transformer-based model, to generate semantic embeddings of **768 dimensions**. Three embedding strategies were evaluated: (1) embedding the reference sequence, (2) embedding the mutated sequence, and (3) combining both embeddings. The **reference-only approach** demonstrated the best performance.

As depicted in **Figure 1**, the VMAE architecture integrates the **768D DNABert2-100M embedding** with learnable embeddings for **chromosome** (16D) and **relative position** (32D, left-side or mid-gene). These embeddings are concatenated and processed through a **Linear (816, 512)** layer with **ReLU activation** and **2% dropout**, followed by a **2x4-head-layer Transformer Encoder** to compress the data into a **128-dimensional latent space** [15]. The latent representation is then decoded using a **2x4-head-layer Transformer Decoder**, followed by a **Linear (128, 512)** layer with **ReLU** and **2% dropout**, and a final **Linear (512, 20)** layer to predict **20 consequence classes** (e.g., frameshift, missense) [15].

The VMAE loss function combines **KL-divergence** (weight: 0.15) for regularization and **cross-entropy** (weight: 0.85) for consequence prediction, a common approach in **variational autoencoders** [16]. After **30 epochs**, the pre-trained model achieved a final loss of **0.63**, with overfitting observed thereafter [19].



2.4. VMAE Loss

The **VMAE loss function** for the **Variant-Aware MultiModal AutoEncoder (VMAE)** in the **VarDrug** project combines two components to train robust variant embeddings for the **PharmGKB** dataset [7]. The **cross-entropy loss** measures the accuracy of predicting **20 variant consequence classes** (e.g., frameshift, stop codon), comparing

predicted logits to true labels. The **KL-divergence loss** regularizes the **variational autoencoder** by minimizing the divergence between the learned latent distribution (**Mu: 256, 128; LogVar: 256, 128**) and a standard normal distribution, ensuring generalizable embeddings [16].

These losses are weighted, with **cross-entropy** prioritized (weight: **0.85**) over **KL-divergence** (weight: **0.15**), yielding a total loss that balances classification performance and latent space regularization. This approach, achieving a final loss of **0.68** (**20-Classes Cross-Entropy**) after pretraining on **100,000 GRCh38 variants**, supports VMAE's ability to encode variants into **128-dimensional representations** for downstream **pharmacogenomic predictions** [12].

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{VMAE}} = -\sum_{i=1}^{20} y_i \log(\hat{y}_i) + 0.15 \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{128} \left(1 + \log(\sigma_j^2) - \mu_j^2 - \sigma_j^2\right) \right)$$

2.5. Benchmarking Drug Encoder

To assess the representational power of various **drug encoders**, we benchmarked **MolFormer** [20] against several established methods: **quantum DFT-derived electronic and structural descriptors**, **Morgan Fingerprints** for topological features [21], **ChemBERTa** for chemical language modeling [28], **RDKit Descriptors** for physicochemical properties [22], **ECFP** for extended connectivity [21], **MACCS Keys** for predefined substructures [30], **Mol2Vec** for unsupervised substructure embeddings [23], **JT-VAE** for variational latent molecular representations [24], and **MolBERT**, a transformer trained for property prediction [25]. Each model was evaluated using **SMILES strings** and **3D atomic structures** where applicable. We also tested an **encoder-decoder transformer model**, based on a variational autoencoder approach, which transforms **SMILES representations** of drugs into **3D structured graph structures**, with the decoder attempting to reconstruct the 3D structure of the drug's target protein.

We extracted embeddings from each encoder and trained a **linear-kernel Support Vector Classifier (SVC)** [50] to predict **six pharmacogenomic outcome classes—efficacy**, **toxicity**, and **dosage**, each with **increased** or **decreased** categories—using only drug features, excluding all gene or variant information, on the **PharmGKB** dataset [7].

The **fingerprint-based method** outperforms other encoders, highlighting their robustness and relevance in capturing **pharmacogenomically meaningful chemical substructures** for downstream predictive tasks [27].

2.6. Feature Engineering

To encode the features of the **PharmGKB** dataset, we implemented three embedding strategies. As illustrated in the lower section of **Figure 2**, for **genes**, we utilized **Gene2Vec** [17] to generate **200-dimensional embeddings** from gene names, leveraging **co-expression patterns** derived from public transcriptomic data [18]. For **drugs**, **SMILES strings** were processed with the **fingerprint method**, a transformer-based model, producing **768-dimensional embeddings** that capture molecular structure and properties [21]. For **variants**, we applied our pretrained **Variant-Aware MultiModal AutoEncoder (VMAE)** to generate **128-dimensional embeddings** from **RSID-linked genomic contexts** [12].

Given the limited dataset size (~4,000 samples), we avoided **deep learning-based automatic feature extraction** to mitigate **overfitting** on the test set [51]. All features were concatenated to form a **high-dimensional input** for downstream machine learning, then normalized to **zero mean** and **unit variance** using **standard scaling techniques** [26].



3. Results

We systematically evaluated a range of **machine learning models** for predicting **drug response** in the context of specific **genetic variants**, ensuring consistency across experiments by training and evaluating all models using a unified pipeline with identical

preprocessing steps, **feature inputs**, and **evaluation metrics** [52]. We employed **5-fold cross-validation** and split the data into training and test sets, ensuring the test set included sufficient **unseen drugs**, **variants**, and **drug-variant pairs** to demonstrate model generalization and robustness. Model performance was assessed using **top-1** and **top-2 F1 scores** on the test set, which are critical in clinical settings where ranking the most likely responses is essential [27].

As shown in **Figure 3**, the **Random Forest (RF)** classifier [29] demonstrated the best overall performance, achieving a **top-1 F1 score** of **0.66** and a **top-2 F1 score** of **0.93**. This highlights RF's strong capability in modeling **non-linear interactions** between genetic variants and drug response labels [53]. To facilitate further exploration, we developed an open-source application, **Vardrug**, available at github.com/SUCBG/vardrug. This tool allows researchers to leverage our trained RF model for new **drug response predictions**, enabling efficient discovery of **variant–drug interactions** in diverse genomic datasets.

CatBoost [31], known for its efficiency in handling categorical variables and built-in regularization, performed competitively but did not surpass RF. **Extra Trees** [32] showed robust behavior due to increased randomness in node splitting, though with slightly lower F1 scores. In contrast, **Decision Trees (DT)** [33] exhibited weaker performance, likely due to their tendency to **overfit** when not used in ensemble configurations [34]. The **Support Vector Classifier (SVC)** [50] delivered moderate performance, reflecting challenges in applying kernel-based methods to structured biological features without **domain-specific feature engineering** [35].

To quantify the contribution of our **variant embedding module**, we conducted **ablation studies** comparing models trained with and without these embeddings. As shown in **Figure 3**, incorporating **variant embeddings** consistently improved both **top-1** and **top-2 F1 scores** across all algorithms, supporting the hypothesis that our encoder captures **biologically meaningful signals** relevant to drug response [36]. Specifically, the average **weighted F1-score** improved from **0.56** (ML only) to **0.63** (ML + VMAE), indicating a significant performance boost from **learned variant embeddings**. These embeddings are integrated into the **Vardrug** application, enabling users to apply **biologically informed features** for enhanced predictive accuracy.

We also implemented a **baseline model** using classical statistical features, such as **Chromosome Frequency**, **Reference Frequency**, **Alternative Frequency**, **Drug Frequency**, and **Gene–Drug Interaction scores** [37]. While this model achieved a **top-1 F1-score** of **0.97**, it was not evaluated on **external datasets**. **Holdout testing** with unseen **variant–drug pairs** revealed a sharp performance drop, suggesting

overfitting to internal data distributions rather than capturing generalizable **biological relationships** [19].

We explored **deep learning models**, including **convolutional neural networks (CNNs)** and **transformer-based encoders**, to extract features directly from raw genetic and drug data [38]. These models achieved high performance on training data but exhibited poor generalization on validation sets due to **overfitting**, particularly given the **small sample size** and **class imbalance**. This aligns with prior findings cautioning against deep architectures in small-scale biological datasets [51].

The **normalized confusion matrix** (**Figure 3**) reveals that most misclassifications occurred within the same broader response categories (i.e., **efficacy**, **toxicity**, **dosage**), particularly in distinguishing the **direction of change** (increase vs. decrease). For example, the model correctly predicts the drug's impact on **efficacy** or **toxicity** as a category but often confuses whether it causes an **increase** or **decrease**. This suggests that while models capture the **general response class**, they are less consistent in predicting the precise **modulation direction**. The **Vardrug** application provides tools to visualize **confusion matrices**, aiding researchers in interpreting predictions and identifying areas for refinement.

Overall, our results support a **hybrid modeling approach** combining **classical machine learning algorithms** with **biologically informed, low-dimensional variant embeddings**. This strategy balances **interpretability**, **predictive performance**, and **robustness**, avoiding the pitfalls of complex **deep learning models** and the limitations of **manual feature engineering** in genomics applications with constrained data [39]. The **Vardrug** application encapsulates this hybrid approach, offering a practical tool for researchers to apply our findings to new datasets, fostering further discoveries in **precision medicine**.



4. Discussion

Drug-gene interactions are pivotal in **personalized medicine** by enabling tailored treatments that account for individual **genetic variability** [2]. Understanding these interactions is crucial for optimizing **drug efficacy** and minimizing **adverse effects**, especially in **polypharmacy scenarios** [40]. **Genetic polymorphisms** in **drug-metabolizing enzymes**, **transporters**, and **receptors** can alter **pharmacokinetics** and **pharmacodynamics**, significantly impacting therapeutic outcomes [3].

For instance, consider a patient with **type 2 diabetes** managed with **metformin**, a drug that does not influence **cytochrome P450 (CYP)** enzymes [41]. If this patient carries **reduced-function variants** in **CYP2C9** (*2/*3 variants) and starts treatment with **gliclazide**, a substrate of **CYP2C9/CYP2C19**, the reduced metabolism of gliclazide can lead to increased **drug efficacy** [42]. While this may enhance **glycemic control**, it also elevates the risk of **hypoglycemia**, a potentially severe **adverse event** [43]. This

example underscores the necessity of integrating **pharmacogenomic data** into **clinical decision-making** to balance therapeutic benefits against risks [4].

Moreover, **pharmacogenomics** can improve **drug development pipelines** by identifying potential **gene-drug interactions** early, reducing the likelihood of **adverse events** during **clinical trials** [44]. For instance, studies have demonstrated the importance of **genetic screening** in determining patient responses to **warfarin** and **clopidogrel**, which are influenced by variants in **CYP2C9** and **CYP2C19**, respectively [45, 46]. These findings highlight the broader applicability of **pharmacogenomic insights** in diverse **therapeutic areas** [2].

4.1. Case study: ADR predictions related to Borderline personality disorder

In this study, we constructed a **drug-gene interaction network** for **borderline personality disorder (BPD)** and other **psychiatric conditions** using data from **PharmGKB** [7]. **Figure 4** visualizes this network, where **drugs** are categorized by indication (**BPD** vs. other **mental disorders**) and connected to their associated **genes**. Notably, genes such as **ABCB1**, **CYP2D6**, and **HTR2A** appear as central hubs, linked to multiple **pharmacological agents**. These genes are well-known **pharmacogenomic markers** involved in **drug metabolism** and **neurotransmission**, and their prominence in our network underlines their **clinical relevance** [54].



To deepen our understanding of **drug action**, we annotated our dataset with **mechanisms of action (MOAs)** using **MedChemExpress** [49]. The resulting **MOA-gene interaction network** is presented in **Figure 5**, where **MOAs** are linked to **genes** they influence or are influenced by. This visualization traces how individual genes participate across **pharmacological classes** such as **dopamine D2 receptor antagonists**, **serotonin reuptake inhibitors**, and **HDAC inhibitors**. Notably, genes like **ABCB1** emerge as influential nodes, reflecting their broad **pharmacological impact** beyond individual drug associations [54].



This two-tiered analysis—linking **drugs to genes** (**Figure 4**) and **mechanisms of action (MOAs) to genes** (**Figure 5**)—offers a **systems-level perspective** on **psychiatric pharmacogenomics** [47]. It highlights potential **redundancies** or **complementarities** in drug effects, which are critical in complex **psychiatric syndromes** like **borderline personality disorder (BPD)** where multiple symptom domains are targeted pharmacologically.

The framework presents practical opportunities for improving **psychiatric care** through **pharmacogenomics**. Clinically, the **drug-gene interaction map** (**Figure 4**) can inform **treatment selection** and **dosing strategies**. For example, patients with **polymorphisms in CYP2D6** may exhibit altered responses to **antipsychotics** such as

aripiprazole or **risperidone**, prompting **genotype-guided dosing adjustments** [55]. Similarly, **variants in ABCB1** might influence **therapeutic efficacy** and **CNS penetration** of **antidepressants** like **fluoxetine** or **citalopram** [56].

From a **translational research** standpoint, the **MOA-gene network** (**Figure 5**) can support **drug repurposing** and **combination therapy strategies**. Drugs with distinct **MOAs** but overlapping **genetic targets**—such as **HDAC inhibitors** and **voltage-gated sodium channel blockers**—may yield **synergistic effects** or **compensatory profiles** when used together [57]. This is particularly valuable in **treatment-resistant BPD**, where standard monotherapies often fall short.

Moreover, these **annotated networks** can be integrated into **machine learning models** to predict **adverse drug reactions (ADRs)** and personalize regimens **in silico** prior to clinical deployment. Such predictive modeling, already employed in fields like **dermatology** [5], could be extended to **psychiatry** using the structured **drug-gene-MOA relationships** outlined here [47].

Overall, our work provides a **foundational resource** for understanding the **genomic underpinnings** of **psychiatric drug action** and for guiding **precision treatment strategies** in **borderline personality disorder** and beyond.

5. Conclusions

The **VarDrug framework** introduces a pioneering **machine-learning approach** for predicting **variant-drug interactions** using the **PharmGKB dataset** [7], designed to model interactions between **genetic variants** and **drugs** across diverse **therapeutic areas**. By addressing the challenge of a limited sample size (~4,000 samples after filtering) through innovative **feature engineering**, VarDrug leverages a **self-supervised VariantEncoder** pre-trained on **100,000 GRCh38 variants**, **Fingerprint method** for drug encoding, and **gene co-expression profiles** [18] to achieve a **weighted F1 score** of **0.66** and a **top-2 accuracy** of **0.93** with the **RandomForest model** [29], significantly outperforming baseline methods (best-weighted F1: **0.39**) [40].

A case study on **psychiatric disorders**, specifically **borderline personality disorder (BPD)**, demonstrates alignment with known **pharmacogenetic annotations** for key genes like **ABCB1** and **CYP2D6** [47], validating the framework's **biological plausibility** and **clinical relevance** as an illustrative application [47]. **Ablation studies** [36] underscore the critical role of the **VariantEncoder** in predictive performance. VarDrug's approach, integrating **drug-gene** and **mechanism-of-action-gene interactions**, provides a **scalable** and **adaptable tool** for optimizing **treatment strategies** and reducing **adverse drug reactions** across **pharmacogenomic applications** [2].

Future work could enhance **generalizability** through **external validation datasets** [19], fine-tune the **VariantEncoder** for broader **pharmacogenomic applications** [42], and incorporate **multi-omics data** to further strengthen **predictive accuracy** [48].

References

1. Pirmohamed M, James S, Meakin S, et al. Adverse drug reactions as cause of admission to hospital: prospective analysis of 18,820 patients. *BMJ*. 2004;329(7456):15-19.
2. Roden DM, McLeod HL, Relling MV, et al. Pharmacogenomics. *Lancet*. 2019;394(10197):521-532.
3. Palleria C, Di Paolo A, Giofrè C, et al. Pharmacokinetic drug-drug interaction and their implication in clinical management. *J Res Med Sci*. 2013;18(7):601-610.
4. Relling MV, Evans WE. Pharmacogenomics in the clinic. *Nature*. 2015;526(7573):343-350.
5. Zitnik M, Agrawal M, Leskovec J. Modeling polypharmacy side effects with graph convolutional networks. *Bioinformatics*. 2018;34(13):i457-i466.
6. Zhao J, Wang X, Zhang Y, et al. metapath2vec: Scalable representation learning for heterogeneous networks. *Proc KDD*. 2017;135-144.
7. Whirl-Carrillo M, McDonagh EM, Hebert JM, et al. Pharmacogenomics knowledge for personalized medicine. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2012;92(4):414–417.
8. Chawla NV, Bowyer KW, Hall LO, et al. SMOTE: Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique. *J Artif Intell Res*. 2002;16:321-357.
9. Landrum MJ, Lee JM, Benson M, et al. ClinVar: improving access to variant interpretations and supporting evidence. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2018;46(D1):D1062-D1067.
10. Knox C, Wilson M, Klinger CM, et al. DrugBank 6.0: The DrugBank knowledgebase. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2024;52(D1):D1265-D1275.
11. Kim S, Chen J, Cheng T, et al. PubChem 2025 update. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2025;53(D1):D1516–D1525.
12. Kingma DP, Welling M. An introduction to variational autoencoders. *Found Trends Mach Learn.* 2019;12(4):307–392. doi:10.1561/2200000056
13. Cunningham F, Allen JE, Allen J, et al. Ensembl 2022. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2022;50(D1):D988-D995.
14. Zhou Z, Ji Y, Li W, et al. DNABERT-2: Efficient Foundation Model and Benchmark For Multi-Species Genome. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15006v2. 2023.
15. Vaswani A, Shazeer N, Parmar N, et al. Attention is All You Need. *Adv Neural Inf Process Syst*. 2017;30:5998-6008.
16. Kingma DP, Welling M. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*. 2014.

17. Du J, Jia P, Zhao X, et al. Gene2vec: Distributed representation of genes based on co-expression. *BMC Genomics*. 2019;20(Suppl 12):927.
18. GTEx Consortium. The Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) project. *Nat Genet.* 2013;45(6):580–585. doi:10.1038/ng.2653.
19. Kohavi R. A study of cross-validation and bootstrap for accuracy estimation and model selection. *Proc IJCAI*. 1995;14(2):1137-1145.
20. Huang K, Fu T, Gao W, et al. MoLFormer: Large-scale chemical language representations capture molecular structure and properties. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.15472. 2022.
21. Rogers D, Hahn M. Extended-connectivity fingerprints. *J Chem Inf Model*. 2010;50(5):742-754.
22. Landrum G. RDKit: Open-source cheminformatics software. 2006. http://www.rdkit.org.
23. Jaeger S, Fulle S, Turk S. Mol2vec: Unsupervised Machine Learning Approach with Chemical Intuition. *J Chem Inf Model*. 2018;58(1):27-35.
24. Jin W, Barzilay R, Jaakkola T. Junction Tree Variational Autoencoder for Molecular Graph Generation. *Proc ICML*. 2018;80:2323-2332.
25. Fabian B, Edlich T, Gaspar H, et al. Molecular representation learning with language models and domain-relevant auxiliary tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13230*. 2020.
26. Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *J Mach Learn Res*. 2011;12:2825-2830.
27. Sokolova M, Lapalme G. A systematic analysis of performance measures for classification tasks. *Inf Process Manag*. 2009;45(4):427-437.
28. Chithrananda S, Grand G, Ramsundar B. ChemBERTa: Large-Scale Self-Supervised Pretraining for Molecular Property Prediction. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09885. 2020.
29. Breiman L. Random Forests. *Mach Learn*. 2001;45(1):5-32.
30. Durant JL, Leland BA, Henry DR, et al. Reoptimization of MDL keys for use in drug discovery. J Chem Inf Comput Sci. 2002;42(6):1273-1280.
31. Prokhorenkova L, Gusev G, Vorobev A, et al. CatBoost: unbiased boosting with categorical features. *Adv Neural Inf Process Syst*. 2018;31:6638-6648.
32. Geurts P, Ernst D, Wehenkel L. Extremely randomized trees. *Mach Learn*. 2006;63(1):3-42.
33. Quinlan JR. Induction of decision trees. *Mach Learn*. 1986;1(1):81-106.
34. Dietterich TG. Overfitting and undercomputing in machine learning. *ACM Comput Surv*. 1995;27(3):326-327.
35. Brown MP, Grundy WN, Lin D, et al. Knowledge-based analysis of microarray gene expression data by using support vector machines. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2000;97(1):262-267.
36. Kohavi R, John GH. Wrappers for feature subset selection. *Artif Intell*. 1997;97(1-2):273-324.
37. Altman N, Krzywinski M. Points of significance: Simple linear regression. *Nat Methods*. 2015;12(11):999-1000.
38. LeCun Y, Bengio Y, Hinton G. Deep learning. *Nature*. 2015;521(7553):436-444.

39. Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nat Med*. 2019;25(1):44-56.
40. Edwards IR, Aronson JK. Adverse drug reactions: definitions, diagnosis, and management. *Lancet*. 2000;356(9237):1255-1259.
41. Graham GG, Punt J, Arora M, et al. Clinical pharmacokinetics of metformin. *Clin Pharmacokinet*. 2011;50(2):81-98.
42. Elliot DJ, Suharjono, Morgan DJ, et al. Gliclazide metabolism is mediated by CYP2C9: implications for pharmacogenetics. *Pharmacogenomics J*. 2007;7(5):315-322.
43. Schernthaner G, Grimaldi A, Di Mario U, et al. GUIDE study: double-blind comparison of once-daily gliclazide MR and glimepiride in type 2 diabetic patients. *Eur J Clin Invest*. 2004;34(8):535-542.
44. Roses AD. Pharmacogenetics in drug discovery and development: a translational perspective. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2008;7(10):807-817.
45. Limdi NA, Wadelius M, Cavallari L, et al. Warfarin pharmacogenetics: a single VKORC1 polymorphism is predictive of dose across 3 racial groups. *Blood*. 2010;115(18):3827-3834.
46. Mega JL, Close SL, Wiviott SD, et al. Cytochrome P450 polymorphisms and response to clopidogrel. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;360(4):354-362.
47. Hasin Y, Seldin M, Lusis A. Multi-omics approaches to disease. *Genome Biol*. 2017;18(1):83.
48. Subramanian I, Verma S, Kumar S, et al. Multi-omics data integration, interpretation, and its application. *Bioinform Biol Insights*. 2020;14:1177932219899051.
49. MedChemExpress. Mechanism of action. Retrieved May 24, 2025, from https://www.medchemexpress.com.
50. Cortes C, Vapnik V. Support-vector networks. Mach Learn. 1995;20(3):273-297.
51. Zhang J, Wang Y, Zhang X. Deep learning on small datasets: Challenges and strategies. PLoS One. 2016;11(12):e0167231.
52. Hastie T, Tibshirani R, Friedman J. The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction. 2nd ed. Springer; 2009.
53. Biau G, Scornet E. A random forest guided tour. Test. 2016;25(2):197-227
54. Mrazek DA. Psychiatric pharmacogenomic testing in clinical practice. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci.* 2010;12(1):69–76. doi:10.31887/DCNS.2010.12.1/dmrazek
55. Hicks JK, et al. Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) guideline for CYP2D6 and CYP2C19 genotypes and dosing of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors and antipsychotics. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2015;98(2):127-134.
56. Hodges LM, et al. Association of ABCB1 polymorphisms with response to antidepressant treatment. Pharmacogenomics J. 2011;11(2):110-120.

57. Paul SM, Mytelka DS, Dunwiddie CT, et al. How to improve R&D productivity: the pharmaceutical industry's grand challenge. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2010;9(3):203-214.