

Graph Neural Network-Based Prediction of Synergistic Drug Interactions from Multilayer Biological Networks

Gody Draig

Department of Computer Science, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL, USA.

craig1978@ucf.edu

Scott L. Woods

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, USA.

contactscott@buffalo.edu

Abstract

Synergistic drug interactions are foundational to combination therapy, yet their prediction remains a persistent challenge because therapeutic outcomes emerge from multilayered biological interactions across molecular targets, pathways, protein interaction networks, disease modules, and patient-specific contexts. This paper presents a systems-oriented examination of graph neural network architectures for predicting synergistic drug interactions from multilayer biological networks. It integrates perspectives from network medicine, representation learning, computational infrastructure, and science governance. The discussion emphasizes structural trade-offs among encoder depth, attention mechanisms, message passing, scalability, and interpretability. Attention is given to the integration of pharmacogenomic, pathway, protein interaction, and molecular signature resources, as well as to the governance mechanisms required to sustain data quality and provenance. The paper further considers deployment constraints, fairness implications, robustness under distribution shift, and regulatory expectations in biomedical machine learning systems. Rather than treating predictive accuracy as the sole objective, the paper argues that trustworthy synergy prediction requires a broader institutional design that coordinates model architecture, data standards, audit procedures, and clinical translation pathways. A balanced framework is proposed in which model performance is pursued alongside transparency, equity, reproducibility, and operational resilience. The synthesis contributes a scholarly systems perspective for researchers, infrastructure designers, and policy stakeholders developing machine learning systems for polypharmacy, precision therapeutics, and complex biomedical discovery.

Keywords

graph neural networks; drug synergy; multilayer networks; network medicine; biomedical artificial intelligence; systems governance.

1. Introduction

The prediction of synergistic drug interactions has moved from a primarily empirical problem in pharmacology toward a systems challenge that requires the integration of heterogeneous biological knowledge, computational modeling, and institutional data governance. Combination therapies are increasingly important in oncology, infectious disease, and chronic conditions, yet the space of possible drug pairs and higher-order combinations is too large for

exhaustive experimental evaluation. Computational prediction therefore plays a central role in prioritizing combinations for validation, but its reliability depends on how well models capture the relational structure of biological systems. Graph neural networks have emerged as a powerful framework for learning from relational data in domains where entities are connected by complex dependencies [1]. Attention-based mechanisms have further enabled models to weight the importance of neighboring entities differently depending on context [2]. Inductive representation learning strategies have also expanded the applicability of these models to large and evolving graphs [3].

The pharmacological problem is intrinsically relational. Drugs act on proteins, proteins participate in pathways, pathways are embedded in larger networks of physical and functional interactions, and diseases emerge from perturbations that propagate across these layers. Polypharmacy side effects and combination efficacy cannot be fully understood by examining isolated molecular targets. Graph convolutional approaches have been applied to model polypharmacy side effects by learning from molecular and patient-level graphs [4]. Data-driven methods have previously shown that patterns in adverse event reporting and electronic health records can reveal unexpected drug effects and interactions [5]. Major public resources such as DrugBank and the Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes provide structured information about drug targets, metabolic enzymes, transporters, and biological pathways [6,7].

Network medicine supplies a conceptual foundation for these developments by treating disease as a network-level phenomenon in which therapeutic interventions perturb interconnected modules rather than single components [8]. Recent network-based methods have demonstrated that the proximity of drug targets to disease modules can inform the prediction of drug combinations [9]. Complementary community-based strategies have been proposed for identifying synergistic combinations from herbal medicines and complex systems [10]. These approaches share the assumption that therapeutic synergy arises from coordinated effects on network neighborhoods, biological processes, or disease modules. The present paper focuses on the system-level design of graph neural network models that learn from multilayer biological networks, with particular attention to architecture, data governance, deployment, robustness, fairness, and policy implications.

2. Background and Related Work

Prior work in drug combination prediction has evolved from statistical synergy scoring and mechanistic modeling toward machine learning approaches that exploit large molecular and pharmacological datasets. Early computational efforts focused on quantifying synergy from dose-response matrices, but these measurements were often limited by assay variability and the difficulty of translating *in vitro* observations to clinical contexts. Deep learning models have subsequently been developed to predict anticancer drug synergy from chemical descriptors and genomic features, illustrating the value of learned representations over handcrafted features [11]. Nevertheless, such models often treat drug pairs as isolated feature vectors and do not explicitly exploit the rich relational structure of biological networks.

Graph-based methods have become attractive because they can represent drugs, targets, pathways, and diseases as nodes connected by multiple relation types. In this setting, the problem of synergy prediction is formulated as a link prediction or node classification task over a heterogeneous graph. Graph neural networks can propagate information across edges, thereby capturing indirect effects that are difficult to represent in tabular data. This paradigm aligns with the network medicine view that therapeutic action is distributed across interacting

biological components. The use of multilayer networks is particularly relevant because drug effects propagate across physical interaction networks, signaling pathways, transcriptional regulatory networks, and disease association networks at different scales and timescales.

The broader machine learning community has also produced advances that support the modeling of complex relational systems. Deep learning has been used to identify antimicrobial compounds from large chemical libraries, demonstrating that predictive models can accelerate discovery when coupled with appropriate validation infrastructure [12]. Message-passing frameworks have provided a general way to learn representations of molecular graphs by exchanging information between atoms and bonds [13]. These molecular-level innovations can be combined with systems-level biological graphs to create multiscale architectures that reason about both chemical properties and biological context. The challenge is not simply to apply graph neural networks to drug data, but to design architectures and data pipelines that respect the multilayer, heterogeneous, and uncertain nature of biomedical knowledge.

3. Multilayer Biological Network Representation

A multilayer biological network representation provides a formal and practical basis for modeling drug synergy. In such a representation, drugs, proteins, genes, pathways, diseases, and other biomedical entities occupy different layers, and edges represent interactions within or between layers. Physical protein interactions, signaling relationships, transcriptional regulation, metabolic coupling, drug-target binding, disease-gene associations, and drug exposure records can all be encoded as distinct relation types. This structure allows a model to reason about how a perturbation in one layer, such as the inhibition of a kinase, propagates to another layer, such as the transcriptional state of a disease module.

The design of the multilayer representation involves several structural trade-offs. A highly granular graph may capture detailed mechanistic information but introduces sparsity, noise, and computational complexity. A simplified graph may be easier to train but risks losing the cross-layer dependencies that are essential for synergy. For example, two drugs may not share targets but may nonetheless produce synergy by acting on complementary pathways that converge on a common downstream process. A network representation that includes pathway nodes and directional signaling edges enables a graph neural network to learn such convergence patterns. Conversely, a representation that only includes drug-target interactions cannot distinguish between independent additive effects and true pathway-level synergy.

Integration of protein interaction data is particularly important for capturing the physical and functional neighborhood of drug targets. Public databases provide curated and experimentally derived interaction networks with varying levels of confidence and coverage [14]. These networks can be combined with pathway databases to construct a scaffold upon which drug and disease information is overlaid. The resulting graph is heterogeneous because different node and edge types carry different semantic meanings. A key design decision is whether to model all relation types jointly in a single heterogeneous graph or to maintain separate layers and introduce cross-layer message passing. Joint modeling can allow shared representations, while layer-separated modeling can preserve biological specificity and reduce interference between relation types.

The temporal and contextual dimensions of biological networks also matter. Synergy is not a static property of two drugs; it depends on dose, schedule, tissue context, and patient state. Multilayer representations can incorporate contextual nodes such as cell type, disease

condition, or omics profile to condition predictions on these factors. However, adding context increases the dimensionality of the graph and the risk of overfitting. The design challenge is to balance expressivity with statistical identifiability. A well-governed representation should make these choices explicit and document the sources, versions, and filtering criteria used to construct each layer.

4. Graph Neural Network Architectures for Synergy Prediction

Graph neural network architectures for synergy prediction differ along several dimensions, including message-passing scheme, attention mechanism, graph pooling strategy, and readout function. Convolutional architectures propagate node features by aggregating information from local neighborhoods, which is effective for capturing localized target-pathway interactions. Attention-based architectures assign different weights to neighboring nodes, allowing the model to emphasize the most informative interactions for a given drug pair. Message-passing frameworks generalize these ideas by learning functions that update node embeddings from messages exchanged between connected entities [13]. These architectural choices directly affect the model's ability to represent multi-hop dependencies and to distinguish synergistic from additive effects.

The depth of the graph neural network is a central structural trade-off. Shallow architectures tend to capture local interactions but may fail to propagate information across long paths connecting two drugs through multiple intermediate targets and pathways. Deeper architectures can in principle capture longer-range dependencies, but they are known to suffer from oversmoothing, where node representations become increasingly similar and lose discriminative power. This trade-off is especially relevant for multilayer biological networks, where important synergistic mechanisms may require several hops through protein interaction and pathway layers. A common design response is to use residual connections, gating mechanisms, or hierarchical graph structures that allow selective information flow across layers without requiring excessive depth.

Another important architectural consideration is the choice between transductive and inductive learning. Transductive models require access to the full graph at training time and may not generalize well to new drugs or new targets that were absent during training. Inductive models learn aggregation functions that can be applied to unseen nodes, which is essential for translating predictions to novel compounds or emerging biological knowledge [3]. In drug discovery, the ability to generalize to new chemical entities is particularly important because the goal is often to prioritize novel combinations rather than to re-evaluate known combinations. Architectures that support inductive learning can be more sustainable in dynamic biomedical knowledge environments.

Attention mechanisms can improve interpretability by identifying which neighbors contribute most to a prediction. For example, an attention-based model may learn to focus on a particular kinase or pathway node when predicting synergy between two anticancer agents. This attention signal can be inspected by domain experts and compared against known pharmacological mechanisms. However, attention weights are not always reliable causal explanations, and their interpretation requires caution [19]. Architecturally, the use of multiple attention heads can stabilize learning and capture different relation types, but it also increases computational cost and can complicate auditability. These trade-offs must be managed within the broader system design rather than resolved solely by optimizing predictive metrics.

5. Data Integration and Multiscale Governance

The quality of graph neural network predictions depends heavily on the data integration strategy used to construct the underlying multilayer graph. Biomedical databases differ in coverage, curation standards, confidence scores, versioning, and licensing. Drug-target data, protein interaction networks, pathway annotations, and disease associations must be harmonized before they can be combined into a common graph. This harmonization is not only a technical task but also a governance challenge, because inconsistent identifiers, outdated annotations, and heterogeneous evidence types can introduce systematic biases. Effective governance requires documented mappings, reproducible pipelines, and regular updates that reflect new biological knowledge.

Pharmacogenomic and molecular signature resources add further value by providing transcriptomic and phenotypic measurements that contextualize network predictions. For instance, gene expression profiles associated with drug perturbation or disease state can be attached to drug and disease nodes as feature vectors. Connectivity Map resources have enabled systematic analysis of gene expression signatures across small molecules [17]. The next generation of such resources has expanded the scale and resolution of perturbation profiles [18]. These profiles allow models to incorporate functional similarity between drugs beyond chemical structure or target overlap. However, integrating transcriptomic data into graph neural networks raises issues of batch effects, platform differences, and normalization, all of which require robust data governance and validation.

Synergy quantification itself is a critical data governance issue. Different assays, cell lines, and dose-response designs can produce different synergy scores, and the choice of reference model affects whether a combination is classified as synergistic, additive, or antagonistic. Tools for analyzing dose-response matrices have provided standardized frameworks for computing synergy scores, but substantial heterogeneity remains across experimental studies [16]. A graph neural network trained on inconsistently labeled synergy data may inherit these inconsistencies. Governance mechanisms must therefore include clear definitions of outcome labels, stratification by experimental context, and sensitivity analyses that examine whether model behavior changes under alternative synergy metrics.

Multiscale governance also involves the management of uncertainty across the different layers of the model. Protein interaction networks contain false positives and false negatives, pathway annotations are incomplete, and disease-gene associations are heavily biased toward well-studied diseases. A graph neural network can propagate these uncertainties in ways that are difficult to trace. Institutional structures such as data review committees, versioned knowledge graphs, and automated quality dashboards can help manage this complexity. In addition, model developers should publish data cards and model cards that describe the intended use, limitations, and evidence sources. The machine learning literature increasingly recognizes that data governance is an integral component of biomedical machine learning rather than an external prerequisite [15].

6. Computational Infrastructure and Deployment Trade-offs

Deploying graph neural network-based synergy prediction as a usable biomedical research tool requires careful attention to computational infrastructure. Training on large multilayer graphs can be memory intensive, particularly when networks include millions of nodes and multiple relation types. Inference on new drug combinations may be less demanding, but still requires efficient representation lookup and neighbor sampling. Infrastructure choices such as

cloud-based graphics processing units, distributed graph storage, and caching strategies influence both cost and responsiveness. These choices are not neutral with respect to equity, because institutions with greater computational resources can train and maintain more complex models, potentially widening disparities in precision medicine research.

The trade-off between model complexity and operational feasibility is particularly important in translational settings. A highly expressive architecture with many parameters may achieve higher internal validation performance but may also be difficult to retrain, audit, and deploy across different computing environments. Simpler models may be more robust and easier to maintain, even if they perform slightly worse on benchmark tasks. In clinical research infrastructure, reproducibility and uptime often matter more than marginal improvements in predictive accuracy. System designers should therefore evaluate graph neural network models not only on static benchmark datasets but also on deployment criteria such as latency, memory footprint, retraining cost, and compatibility with existing biomedical data warehouses.

The sustainability of computational infrastructure also depends on data and model versioning. Biological knowledge is continually updated, and a synergy prediction model that remains static will gradually diverge from current pharmacological understanding. Continuous integration pipelines can retrain models when new drug-target interactions, pathway annotations, or synergy measurements become available. However, frequent retraining can introduce instability in predictions and complicate regulatory evaluation. A robust deployment strategy should include model versioning, rollback procedures, and prospective validation protocols that compare model predictions with experimentally confirmed outcomes over time. The scientific value of such systems depends on their ability to remain reliable as both data and clinical questions evolve.

Another deployment consideration is the integration of graph neural network predictions with existing laboratory workflows. A model that produces a ranked list of candidate drug combinations is only useful if those predictions can be tested in appropriate assays and interpreted by pharmacologists. Human-in-the-loop systems that present predictions alongside explanatory network paths, attention weights, and supporting evidence are more likely to be adopted than opaque scoring systems. Building such interfaces requires collaboration between machine learning engineers, biomedical curators, and clinical researchers. The infrastructure should therefore include not only model serving components but also data visualization, evidence retrieval, and decision support capabilities.

7. Robustness, Fairness, and Interpretability

Robustness is a serious concern for graph neural network models in biomedical applications. Biological networks are incomplete and noisy, and the distribution of known drug interactions is shaped by historical research priorities. Models trained on such data may perform well on well-studied drug classes but poorly on rare diseases, underserved populations, or novel chemical spaces. Robustness evaluation should include perturbation analyses that examine how predictions change when edges are removed, node features are corrupted, or graph structure is subsampled. It should also include external validation on datasets not used during training, as internal cross-validation can overestimate model performance when biological redundancy creates optimistic biases.

Fairness in drug synergy prediction is closely related to data representation. If the training data are dominated by combinations involving widely studied anticancer agents, the model

may systematically underperform for infectious diseases, pediatric conditions, or drugs with fewer genomic annotations. This can reinforce existing disparities in therapeutic development. Fairness cannot be reduced to a single metric because different stakeholders may have different definitions of equitable performance. A systems-level approach should examine model behavior across disease classes, demographic contexts, and drug categories, and should document uncertainty in underrepresented regions. Governance structures that include independent audit and community input can help align model development with broader public health priorities.

Interpretability is particularly important when predictions inform decisions about combination therapy. Clinicians and researchers need to understand not only that two drugs are predicted to interact synergistically, but also through which biological mechanisms the synergy may occur. Graph neural networks can support interpretability by exposing multi-hop paths between drug targets and disease modules, by learning attention weights over pathways, and by comparing predicted synergy against known network neighborhoods. However, these explanatory signals are not automatically trustworthy. Attribution methods can highlight influential nodes or edges, but they may be sensitive to small input changes and may not capture the full causal structure of drug action [19]. Interpretability should therefore be treated as an ongoing design objective rather than a post hoc justification.

A responsible approach combines multiple explanation strategies and validates them against experimental and clinical domain knowledge. For example, model-derived network paths can be compared with pathway databases, literature-derived mechanisms, and preclinical synergy studies. Discrepancies should be investigated rather than ignored. This process requires institutional support for interdisciplinary review and transparent reporting. The machine learning community has acknowledged that interpretability, fairness, and robustness are interdependent properties of trustworthy systems [20]. In the context of graph neural network-based drug synergy prediction, these properties must be evaluated jointly because a model that is accurate but brittle, opaque, or biased may be less useful and less safe in translational settings.

8. Policy, Sustainability, and Translation Implications

The translation of graph neural network predictions into experimental and clinical research raises policy questions that extend beyond computational methodology. Regulators, research funders, and health systems increasingly require evidence that machine learning tools are reproducible, auditable, and relevant to real-world decision-making. For synergy prediction, this means that models should be accompanied by clear documentation of training data, outcome definitions, validation procedures, and limitations. Policies that encourage or require such documentation can improve trust and enable independent evaluation. At the same time, overly prescriptive requirements may slow innovation and create barriers for smaller research groups. Policy design must balance accountability with the need for flexible exploratory research.

Sustainability is another policy dimension. Large-scale biomedical graph learning depends on continuously maintained knowledge bases, computational resources, and expert curation. These resources are often funded through short-term grants, leading to fragmented infrastructure and discontinuities. Sustainable synergy prediction systems require long-term investment in data curation, model maintenance, and community standards. International coordination can help reduce duplication and improve interoperability across public databases. Policy mechanisms such as open data mandates, shared benchmarking platforms, and funded

data steward roles can support the long-term health of the ecosystem. Without such mechanisms, even technically sophisticated models may fail to produce durable scientific value.

The clinical translation of synergy predictions must also address evidentiary standards. A computational prediction is not sufficient to justify clinical use, but it can inform the design of preclinical experiments and early-phase trials. Policymakers and regulators may need to clarify how model-generated hypotheses fit within existing frameworks for drug combination evaluation. This includes questions about whether model predictions should be disclosed in trial protocols, how to handle conflicts between computational and preclinical evidence, and what level of prospective validation is required. Clear guidance can reduce uncertainty for researchers and sponsors while preserving public safety. At the same time, policy should remain adaptive because graph neural network methods and biological knowledge are evolving rapidly.

Finally, policy should encourage the development of community governance structures that include diverse stakeholders. Researchers, clinicians, patients, data stewards, and regulators bring different perspectives on acceptable risk, data privacy, and benefit distribution. Multilayer biological networks often incorporate sensitive omics and health data, raising privacy and consent issues that require careful institutional oversight. Fairness concerns, as discussed, are deeply connected to which diseases and populations are represented in training data. Inclusive governance can help ensure that graph neural network-based synergy prediction serves broad public health goals rather than narrow commercial or disciplinary interests. The systems perspective offered in this paper therefore treats policy not as a constraint applied after model development, but as an integral component of the research and deployment lifecycle.

9. Future Directions

Future research should move beyond static multiplex graphs toward dynamic multilayer models that can represent temporal changes in drug exposure, disease progression, and adaptive cellular responses. Biological systems are not fixed networks but evolving processes, and synergy often depends on the timing and order of drug administration. Graph neural networks that incorporate temporal edges, event sequences, or state-dependent message passing could provide richer predictions for sequential and combination therapies. However, such models introduce additional complexity in data collection, graph construction, and validation, and their development should be guided by clear biomedical questions rather than purely architectural novelty.

Another promising direction is the integration of mechanistic simulation with data-driven graph learning. Hybrid systems could combine network propagation, kinetic models, and graph neural network embeddings to improve generalization and interpretability. For example, mechanistic pathway models could constrain the space of plausible drug effects while graph neural networks learn from noisy high-throughput data. This integration may be especially valuable for rare disease contexts where training data are sparse but mechanistic knowledge is reasonably well developed. Cross-disciplinary collaborations will be necessary to build such hybrid models and to define appropriate evaluation criteria that go beyond standard predictive benchmarks.

The development of open benchmark suites and community challenge platforms would also advance the field. Standardized tasks that include diverse disease areas, data modalities, and

evaluation metrics can help compare methods fairly and reveal failure modes. Benchmarks should include metrics for robustness, calibration, fairness, and interpretability, not only area under the curve. In addition, prospective validation studies are needed to assess whether graph neural network predictions actually lead to confirmed synergistic interactions and whether those interactions translate across model systems. Such studies are expensive but essential for building confidence in the translational value of these methods. Future work should therefore combine algorithmic innovation, data governance research, and empirical validation in a coordinated research agenda.

10. Conclusion

Graph neural network-based prediction of synergistic drug interactions from multilayer biological networks is a promising systems-oriented approach that integrates relational learning, network medicine, and biomedical data infrastructure. The power of this paradigm lies in its ability to capture indirect and cross-layer effects that are difficult to represent in conventional feature-based models. However, predictive accuracy alone does not guarantee translational utility. The design of synergy prediction systems involves structural trade-offs in graph representation, model architecture, data integration, deployment infrastructure, and governance. These trade-offs must be addressed through interdisciplinary collaboration and explicit institutional design.

A responsible path forward requires balancing expressivity with robustness, transparency with clinical actionability, and innovation with sustainability. Graph neural network models should be evaluated not only on benchmark performance but also on their behavior under distribution shift, their fairness across disease and population contexts, and their compatibility with existing biomedical workflows. Policy and governance mechanisms should support long-term data curation, independent auditing, and equitable access to computational resources. By treating drug synergy prediction as a socio-technical systems challenge, researchers and decision-makers can build computational tools that are both scientifically powerful and socially accountable.

References

1. Kipf, T. N., & Welling, M. (2017). Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
2. Veličković, P., Cucurull, G., Casanova, A., Romero, A., Liò, P., & Bengio, Y. (2018). Graph attention networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
3. Hamilton, W. L., Ying, R., & Leskovec, J. (2017). Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30.
4. Zitnik, M., Agrawal, M., & Leskovec, J. (2018). Modeling polypharmacy side effects with graph convolutional networks. *Bioinformatics*, 34(13), i457-i466.
5. Tatonetti, N. P., Ye, P. P., Daneshjou, R., & Altman, R. B. (2012). Data-driven prediction of drug effects and interactions. *Science Translational Medicine*, 4(125), 125ra31.
6. Wishart, D. S., Feunang, Y. D., Guo, A. C., Lo, E. J., Marcu, A., Grant, J. R., Sajed, T., Johnson, D., Li, C., Sayeeda, Z., Assempour, N., Iynkkaran, I., Liu, Y., Maciejewski, A., Gale, N., Wilson, A., Chin, L., Cummings, R., Le, D., ... Wilson, M. (2018). DrugBank 5.0: a major update to the DrugBank database for 2018. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 46(D1), D1074-D1082.

7. Kanehisa, M., Furumichi, M., Tanabe, M., Sato, Y., & Morishima, K. (2017). KEGG: new perspectives on genomes, pathways, diseases and drugs. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 45(D1), D353-D361.
8. Barabási, A.-L., Gulbahce, N., & Loscalzo, J. (2011). Network medicine: a network-based approach to human disease. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 12(1), 56-68.
9. Cheng, F., Kovács, I. A., & Barabási, A.-L. (2019). Network-based prediction of drug combinations. *Nature Communications*, 10, 1197.
10. Wang, Yinyin, et al. "HerbSyner_Finder: a network community-based model for identifying synergistic combinations from herbal medicines and complex systems." *Targetome 2.2* (2026).
11. Preuer, K., Lewis, R. P. I., Hochreiter, S., Bender, A., Bulusu, K. C., & Klambauer, G. (2018). DeepSynergy: predicting anti-cancer drug synergy with deep learning. *Bioinformatics*, 34(9), 1538-1546.
12. Stokes, J. M., Yang, K., Swanson, K., Jin, W., Cubillos-Ruiz, A., Donghia, N. M., MacNair, C. R., French, S., Carfrae, L. A., Bloom-Ackermann, Z., Tran, V. M., Chiappino-Pepe, A., Badran, A. H., Andrews, I. W., Chory, E. J., Church, G. M., Brown, E. D., Jaakkola, T. S., Barzilay, R., & Collins, J. J. (2020). A deep learning approach to antibiotic discovery. *Cell*, 180(4), 688-702.
13. Gilmer, J., Schoenholz, S. S., Riley, P. F., Vinyals, O., & Dahl, G. E. (2017). Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
14. Szklarczyk, D., Gable, A. L., Lyon, D., Junge, A., Wyder, S., Huerta-Cepas, J., Simonovic, M., Doncheva, N. T., Morris, J. H., Bork, P., Jensen, L. J., & Mering, C. V. (2019). STRING v11: protein-protein association networks with increased coverage, supporting functional discovery in genome-wide experimental datasets. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 47(D1), D607-D613.
15. Vamathevan, J., Clark, D., Czodrowski, P., Dunham, I., Ferran, E., Lee, G., Li, B., Madabhushi, A., Shah, P., Spitzer, M., & Zhao, S. (2019). Applications of machine learning in drug discovery and development. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 18(6), 463-477.
16. Ianevski, A., He, L., Aittokallio, T., & Tang, J. (2017). SynergyFinder: a web application for analyzing drug combination dose-response matrix data. *Bioinformatics*, 33(15), 2413-2415.
17. Lamb, J., Crawford, E. D., Peck, D., Modell, J. W., Blat, I. C., Wrobel, M. J., Lerner, J., Brunet, J. P., Subramanian, A., Ross, K. N., Reich, M., Hieronymus, H., Wei, G., Armstrong, S. A., Haggarty, S. J., Clemons, P. A., Wei, R., Carr, S. A., Lander, E. S., & Golub, T. R. (2006). The Connectivity Map: using gene-expression signatures to connect small molecules, genes, and disease. *Science*, 313(5795), 1929-1935.
18. Subramanian, A., Narayan, R., Corsello, S. M., Peck, D. D., Natoli, T. E., Lu, X., Gould, J., Davis, J. F., Tubelli, A. A., Asiedu, J. K., Lahr, D. L., Hirschman, J. E., Liu, Z., Donahue, M., Julian, B., Khan, M., Wadden, D., Smith, I. C., Lam, D., ... Golub, T. R. (2017). A next generation Connectivity Map: L1000 platform and the first 1,000,000 profiles. *Cell*, 171(6), 1437-1452.

19. Ribeiro, M. T., Singh, S., & Guestrin, C. (2016). Why should I trust you? Explaining the predictions of any classifier. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 1135-1144.
20. Floridi, L., Cows, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689-707.