

Cite this: *Chem. Sci.*, 2025, 16, 8682

All publication charges for this article have been paid for by the Royal Society of Chemistry

PepINVENT: generative peptide design beyond natural amino acids†

Gökçe Geylan,^{ID}*^{ab} Jon Paul Janet,^{ID}^a Alessandro Tibo,^a Jiazhen He,^a Atanas Patronov,^c Mikhail Kabeshov,^a Werngard Czechtizky,^d Florian David,^b Ola Engkvist^{ID}^{ae} and Leonardo De Maria^{ID}^d

Peptides play a crucial role in drug design and discovery whether as a therapeutic modality or a delivery agent. Non-natural amino acids (NNAAs) have been used to enhance the peptide properties such as binding affinity, plasma stability and permeability. Incorporating novel NNAAs facilitates the design of more effective peptides with improved properties. The generative models used in the field have focused on navigating the peptide sequence space. The sequence space is formed by combinations of a predefined set of amino acids. However, there is still a need for a tool to explore the peptide landscape beyond this enumerated space to unlock and effectively incorporate the *de novo* design of new amino acids. To thoroughly explore the theoretical chemical space of peptides, we present PepINVENT, a novel generative AI-based tool as an extension to the small molecule molecular design platform, REINVENT. PepINVENT navigates the vast space of natural and non-natural amino acids to propose valid, novel, and diverse peptide designs. The generative model can serve as a central tool for peptide-related tasks, as it was not trained on peptides with specific properties or topologies. The prior was trained to understand the granularity of peptides and to design amino acids for filling the masked positions within a peptide. PepINVENT coupled with reinforcement learning enables the goal-oriented design of peptides using its chemistry-informed generative capabilities. This study demonstrates PepINVENT's ability to explore the peptide space with unique and novel designs and its capacity for property optimization in the context of therapeutically relevant peptides. Our tool can be employed for multi-parameter learning objectives, peptidomimetics, lead optimization, and a variety of other tasks within the peptide domain.

Received 11th November 2024
Accepted 31st March 2025

DOI: 10.1039/d4sc07642g

rsc.li/chemical-science

1 Introduction

Peptides occupy a larger surface area than small molecules but a smaller one than proteins, occupying a unique space in drug development.¹ With their high specificity, affinity, and low toxicity, peptides have been receiving increased attention from the drug discovery and development area.² Their ability to bind to larger surface areas allows them to effectively target protein pockets, shallow clefts on protein surfaces and protein-protein interaction interfaces, including those deemed to be

undruggable by small molecule drugs.^{1,3} With 20 proteinogenic amino acids serving as building blocks, the peptidic enumerated space expands exponentially. This space covers a vast combinatorial range of 20^L variations, where L represents the length of the peptide sequence.⁴ However, in nature, it is common for peptides to be modified and diverge from this space with examples such as post-translational modifications in cellular processes or bacteria and fungi synthesizing non-proteinogenic amino acids.¹ These modified peptides impact the survival of many organisms by enabling the signaling and regulation of metabolic pathways. Additionally, they improve potency for protection mechanisms like producing neurotoxins.⁵

In many peptide drug projects, a peptide hit is identified through large library screenings navigating the enumerated space.⁶ The integration of non-natural amino acids (NNAAs), amino acids not encoded by DNA, offers a compelling opportunity to improve the physicochemical and pharmacokinetic profile of peptides in hit-to-lead development. This includes enhancing metabolic stability, binding affinity, or cell permeability.^{5,6} The incorporation of NNAAs enables researchers to access an even broader and more diverse chemical space.

*Molecular AI, Discovery Sciences, BioPharmaceuticals R&D, AstraZeneca, Gothenburg, Sweden. E-mail: gokcegeylan96@gmail.com

^bDivision of Systems and Synthetic Biology, Department of Life Sciences, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden

^cQuantitative Biology, Discovery Sciences, BioPharmaceuticals R&D, AstraZeneca, Gothenburg, Sweden

^dMedicinal Chemistry, Research and Early Development, Respiratory & Immunology, BioPharmaceuticals R&D, AstraZeneca, Gothenburg, Sweden

^eDepartment of Computer Science and Engineering, Chalmers University of Technology, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. See DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1039/d4sc07642g>



Considering only the α -amino acid space, each side chain is chosen from a space similar to that of small molecules. Exploring this uncharted space has transformed peptide therapeutics, allowing further refinement of drug designs for better target specificity and both established and novel biological activities.⁵

Conventional methods, such as display technologies, peptidomimetics, and structure-based computational studies, have been instrumental to the progress of peptide therapeutics.¹ While these methods have played a crucial role in peptide design, they are often limited by the natural amino acids.¹ Even though simple modifications are included in this library, such as stereochemical modifications, the reach of their design space still falls short of the potential scale offered by NNAAs. The virtual space presents a significant challenge to create and is always constrained by the capabilities of the design-make-test-analyze cycle. Generative models have been employed to accelerate the drug discovery and development process to efficiently navigate the chemical space. Generative capabilities allow *de novo* design or molecule optimization with desired properties.⁷ In recent years, there have been many generative modelling studies to design peptides with various optimization tasks such as antimicrobial activity, cell penetration, anticancer properties and immunogenicity.⁴ These studies differ by the characteristics of peptides, the representations and the model architectures they explore; however, they have a common goal of designing a peptide sequence with a set number of amino acids, typically 20 natural amino acids.^{8–12} Grisoni *et al.* used a long short-term memory (LSTM) model, trained on cationic amphipathic peptides, and fine-tuned on known anticancer peptide sequences.¹¹ The model was later used to design membranolytic anticancer peptides, composed of natural amino acids. The novel peptide sequences were later validated experimentally for anticancer activity.¹¹ In other applications, NNAAs were introduced into the building block library to expand the generative model's enumerated space. One example of this was Schissel *et al.* introducing a peptide generator to design peptides for antisense delivery within an enumerated library.¹² Their approach incorporates three unnatural amino acids into the enumerated space of both the generative and the predictive model. A generator–predictor–optimizer loop operates in this expanded repertoire to design peptides with enhanced antisense delivery and lower arginine content in a diversity-conscious manner. The learning loop, mimicking a directed evolution scenario with the genetic algorithm, was shown to propose peptide designs with the desired properties.¹² These generative model applications enable better access to the chemical space and can provide a greater diversity of designs compared to conventional methods. However, the research within the enumerated set of building blocks restricts the peptides to a sequence-level design. Despite the demonstrated uptake of generative models in navigating the peptide sequence space, there remains a need for a design tool that efficiently optimizes peptides within the fully enabled chemical space.

To address the need for flexible generation of natural amino acids and NNAAs, we introduce PepINVENT tailored for *de novo* peptide design. PepINVENT stems from the REINVENT

framework.^{13,14} In the small molecule realm, the state-of-the-art REINVENT framework utilizes reinforcement learning (RL) with a generative model trained on the chemical language, Simplified Molecular Input Line Entry System (SMILES),¹⁵ to design *de novo* molecules through a multi-parameter optimization (MPO) scenario.¹³ Analogous to REINVENT, PepINVENT is an open-source framework consisting of a chemistry-aware pretrained generative model coupled with RL. The framework facilitates the generation of novel NNAAs and diverse peptide topologies to design novel peptides. Inspired by the translation process of proteins and peptides in ribosomes, PepINVENT learns the peptide space on a per amino acid basis and preserves the intricate granularity of the peptide structure. As the generative model proposes amino acids, reinforcement learning guides the overall peptide design using a goal-oriented approach. We demonstrate the potential of PepINVENT to accelerate the peptide drug discovery and development pipeline by extending the design capabilities to novel NNAAs. The tool is suitable for *de novo* design, peptidomimetics, lead optimization and/or peptide property optimization tasks. In this work, we illustrate the utility and effectiveness of PepINVENT through a series of experiments, showcasing: (i) its navigation within the peptidic chemical space, (ii) its capability for the flexible generation of diverse peptide topologies, and (iii) how it can be used to perform MPO for peptide property optimization, with the example of enhancing the permeability and solubility for cyclo REV binding protein.

2 Methods

2.1 Training data preparation

Peptide data are scarce, especially when NNAAs are concerned. The chemical space that can be covered by an enumerated library composed of known amino acids is rather limited compared to that of small molecules. To overcome this challenge, we generated semi-synthetic peptide data to span a greater and more diverse chemical space. In addition to natural amino acids, NNAAs from the virtual library proposed by Amarasinghe *et al.*¹⁶ were employed to obtain our building block library. The virtual library was constructed by identifying reagents from eMolecules¹⁷ that could be utilized as precursors for amino acids in common one-step synthetic approaches. This reaction-based enumeration yields a diverse set of 380 000 readily synthesizable NNAAs in which a representative subset of 10 000 non-natural α -amino acids has been made publicly available.¹⁶ The generative models were previously shown to be able to effectively navigate much larger chemical spaces compared to the space covered by the training data.¹⁸ Therefore, utilizing the virtual library of amino acids can potentially uncover novel amino acids and in turn peptides beyond the semi-synthetic training data.

CHUCKLES^{19,20} is a representation method that encodes amino acids at the atomic level with SMILES.¹⁵ This representation follows its own standardized SMILES pattern at the monomer level. The pattern starts with the amino group in the backbone followed by the α -carbon, the sidechain, and the remaining backbone. This standardized format of N-to-C



denotes the carboxyl group as carbonyl when used in a peptide sequence. Therefore, a sequential concatenation of the CHUCKLES strings of amino acids yields a valid SMILES pattern for the peptide, enabling syntactically correct peptide representation. Our building block library was translated to the CHUCKLES pattern after removing the charges from the amino acids.

The generation of semi-synthetic peptide data encapsulated a decision scheme for peptide length, topology, NNAA content, and common mutations, *i.e.* stereoisomerism information and backbone *N*-methylations. The data scheme begins with the selection of a peptide topology among the options of linear or variations of cyclic, including head-to-tail, sidechain-to-tail or disulfide bridging.

Downstream decisions are made for a predefined number of samples for the query topology. Initially, the number of amino acids in the peptide, or the peptide length, was indicated by selecting a length between 6 and 18 from a normal distribution (Fig. 1). Subsequently, the fraction of NNAAs was determined through random sampling from a left-skewed normal distribution, covering the range of [0, 0.3] (ESI Fig. 1†). Although the range was arbitrarily selected, it was chosen to recognize that generating a high fraction of NNAAs would significantly impact the synthetic feasibility of the peptides. Peptide sequences were enforced to contain up to and primarily around 30% NNAAs by the skewed distribution. Therefore, the semi-synthetic data ensured that the generative model encountered diverse building blocks while continuing to learn within the traditional chemical space with the natural amino acids. The chosen fraction was utilized to define the number of natural amino acids and NNAAs needed for the selected size. The determined numbers of amino acids were sampled without replacement from their respective sets.

Sidechain-to-tail cyclic peptides were constructed through a different amino acid scheme. The amino acids contributing to this cyclization were determined by selecting an amino acid containing a primary amine in its sidechain for the cyclization start and randomly selecting an amino acid for the cyclization termination. The amino acid for starting cyclization was placed at a random position in the given length, fulfilling the condition of forming a cycle with at least 5 amino acids. Similarly,

disulfide bridging was achieved by selecting two amino acids containing a sulfhydryl in their sidechains. In both cases, the remaining positions were filled by sampling the natural and non-natural sets according to the selected fractions. The chosen amino acids, except for those involved in cyclization, were randomly shuffled to mix the natural and non-natural building blocks.

Amino acids selected for a peptide sequence were pre-processed by a series of modifications, starting with stereochemical mutations. The scheme follows a similar trend to the amino acid selection. Initially, a fraction of amino acids containing stereochemical mutations was determined through sampling from a left-skewed distribution, in the range of [0, 0.25] (ESI Fig. 1†). The chosen fraction determined the number of amino acids in the peptide to be modified. A random sampling of the amino acids according to this fraction determined the specific amino acids to be modified. To achieve the stereoisomeric modification, a string manipulation of the stereochemical information was implemented. The backbone *N*-methylation was incorporated into a subset of amino acids by replicating the selection process used for stereochemical modification. *N*-methylation was introduced into the selected amino acids by adding "(C)" after the starting character of the CHUCKLES pattern, representing the nitrogen atom.

Finally, we conducted a preprocessing step to achieve the selected topology. If the topology is linear, the amino acids were concatenated to form the SMILES string with the carboxylic acid of the last amino acid completed (Fig. 2). In the case of cyclization, the atoms of the amino acids involved in the cyclization were modified to denote the beginning and the end of the ring structure. The amino acids selected to contain the topological information of peptides or for *N*-methylation were examined to not contain a secondary amine group in the backbone, *i.e.* proline, for standard cyclization. The distributions for the modification decisions are placed in ESI Fig. 1.† The generated data contained similar distributions of varying size, sequence, NNAA content and modifications to amino acids for each topology.

A total of 1 million unique peptides were generated in this scheme, comprising 40% linear sequences and an equal distribution of the remaining topology categories, 20% each. The peptides with varying topology, size, sequence, NNAA content and modifications to amino acids were split into 90% training, 5% validation and 5% test sets with stratification to preserve both the peptide length and topology distributions. To evaluate the performance of the generative model, two test subsets were prepared from the test set. The first set consisted of 100 masked peptides from each topological class, totaling 400 masked peptides. The peptides from each of these classes were selected in a stratified manner based on the peptide length. This set was used to assess the generative model performance. The second set was utilized for assessing if the model understands the topological context of the peptides. This set was created from the test data by taking 10 peptides from each topological category, totaling 40. The selected peptides with cyclized topologies had one of the amino acids with the



Fig. 1 The characteristics of the semi-synthetic data. The peptide data generated span a range of peptide lengths, different natural-to-non-natural amino acid fractions, and peptide topologies and exhibit stereochemical and backbone modifications.






Fig. 2 CHUCKLES representation for (A) an individual amino acid, tyrosine (T), and (B) a tripeptide, CTP (Cys-Tyr-Pro).

topological information unmasked, where the second one was included among the masked positions.

2.2 Pretraining objective

The generative model was designed to propose amino acids for specific positions within a peptide where modifications are desired. We constructed a semi-synthetic dataset consisting of pairs extracted from the peptides. Each peptide was represented by a string, denoted as ρ , which contains the concatenated CHUCKLES of its amino acids, separated by “|”. Each pair consists of a source string, x , and a target string, y . The source string x is formed by replacing certain amino acids in ρ with the special character “?” and moving those amino acids to the target string y (Fig. 3). The separator “|” facilitates a straightforward mapping of the target to source.

The pairs were generated by masking around 30% of the amino acids in the peptide. Although the masking percentage

was arbitrary, it was inspired by the BART model and Chemformer, a BART-based model pretrained for cheminformatics tasks such as retrosynthesis prediction and molecular optimization.^{21,22} The masking applied in these models was shown to be robust for natural language processing and in cheminformatics tasks, respectively. Similarly, PepINVENT was trained on a text infilling task by masking spans of tokens corresponding to masking individual amino acids from the chemical representation. The selection of amino acids to mask involved determining the fractions of natural amino acids and NNAAs. The fraction for natural amino acids was randomly sampled between 0 and 0.5 from a left-skewed distribution, with a mean of around 0.3 (ESI Fig. 1†). Therefore, the amino acid selection was biased towards more NNAAs overall to prevent overfitting on the natural amino acid patterns. Natural amino acids and NNAAs were randomly masked according to their respective assigned fractions. The pretraining objective was




Fig. 3 A source–target pair to illustrate the text-infilling task the conditional generator was trained on. The amino acids at positions 2 and 5 of a 6-mer peptide, denoted as the original peptide, were highlighted as the residues that can be subjected to modification. The source was constructed as the original peptide with positions 2 and 5 masked, whereas the target shows the two filler amino acids to complete the masked positions. The model trained on source–target pairs learns to generate the required number of amino acids to complete the peptide to follow the CHUCKLES pattern and to understand the complexity of the peptide context.



defined as proposing a set of amino acids to fill the masked positions of the input peptide. When the number of generated amino acids equaled the number of masked positions, the generated amino acids, the target, were mapped to the source peptide, resulting in the generated peptide. The generated peptides must have syntactically correct chemical representation as the model learns the chemistry of individual amino acids and peptides.

2.3 Model architecture and training

Our generative model uses the same implementation and parameters as the transformer model described in REINVENT.^{23,24} The transformer model consists of an encoder and a decoder. More details about its structure can be found in ESI 1.† The transformer model is denoted by a function f_θ parameterized by a set of parameters, denoted by θ .

$$f_\theta: \chi \times \chi \rightarrow [0, 1]^{|V|}$$

The source and target strings were tokenized with a SMILES-based tokenizer and were input to the encoder and decoder during training, respectively. We denote the vocabulary with V , *i.e.* the set of all the possible tokens.²⁵ f_θ assigns the probability of the tokens by which the elements of chemical space χ are represented.²⁵ From now on we assume the source and target strings: $x, y \in \chi$. The following loss function was used for training the model:

$$\text{NLL}(x, y) = -\sum_{t=1}^T \log f_\theta(x, y_{0:t-1})[y_t]$$

where x and y are the source and target sequences of tokens. T is the length of the output sequence y , $[y_t]$ defines the index of y_t , and the t th token of y .²⁵ f_θ computes the probability of the t th token in the target to be generated conditioned on all the previous tokens, $y_{(0, \dots, t-1)}$, and x .²⁵

The model was trained for 24 epochs on an NVIDIA V100 with 32 GB. During an epoch, all the source–target pairs in the training set are included once with a batch size of 16 and batches are shuffled at each epoch. The model was trained following the same strategy and using the same hyperparameters as the original REINVENT transformer model,²³ including the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.0001 with 4000 warm-up steps.

Once trained, the model can be used to generate peptides conditioned on proposing amino acids to fill the masked positions of a source peptide by predicting one token at a time. Initially, the decoder processes the start token along with the encoder outputs to sample the next token from the probability distribution over all the tokens in the vocabulary. The generation process iteratively continues by producing the next token from the encoder outputs and all the previous generated tokens until the end token is found or a predefined maximum sequence length, 500, is reached. To allow for the sampling of multiple generated peptides, multinomial sampling or beam search is used.

The model was trained with 900 K masked peptides and their filler amino acid pairs. After training, the model can generate the exact number of amino acids required to fill the masked positions in the input peptide. As the peptides were represented with chemical language for strings of amino acids, the model learns the overall peptide language as a composition of individual amino acids. The chemical language also enables generating novel amino acids and simple modifications such as backbone *N*-methylation and stereochemical mutations.

2.4 Evaluation metrics

The performance of the generative model was assessed on the task encompassing the generation of the correct number of building blocks to fill the masked positions. Any instance with a larger or a smaller number of generated amino acids compared to the masked positions was considered a failure. When a generated peptide contains as many amino acids as the number of masks, the other evaluation metrics are tested. These metrics include:

(1) Validity: a generated peptide with a syntactically accurate SMILES that follows the chemical rules such as valency and chemical bonding was categorized as valid, with validity assessed using RDKit.²⁶

(2) Uniqueness: it is defined in multiple levels:

(a) Peptide-level uniqueness: the number of unique SMILES strings after the separators are removed and the generated peptide is canonicalized with chirality. As the model generates amino acids to complete an input peptide, the generation of two peptides from the same input might contain the same amino acids in different orders. This makes the two peptides unique but results in a duplicated set of amino acids.

(b) Amino acid-level uniqueness: this was evaluated at three levels to detect the non-canonical, stereochemical and canonical variability of the generated building blocks, respectively, to:

(i) String-level uniqueness refers to the number of amino acid strings generated being unique by comparing them character by character.

(ii) Isomeric SMILES-level uniqueness, similarly to the peptide-level uniqueness, is the number of unique amino acids after the SMILES strings are canonicalized while retaining the chirality.

(iii) Canonical SMILES-level uniqueness is the unique amino acids with canonicalization as the molecules stripped off their stereochemical information. This offers the standardized representation where the uniqueness is ensured by a distinct molecular structure.

(3) Novelty: the novelty was calculated by profiling the unique generated amino acids as natural, non-natural and novel. In this case, non-natural refers to the NNAAs utilized to create the semi-synthetic peptide data for model training, whereas novel refers to the NNAAs that are generated by the model that do not exist in the training set.

We also visualized the chemical space of the amino acids to analyze the diversity of novel amino acids from the natural and NNAA ones. The diversity was illustrated by a t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding (tSNE). The 1024 bit Morgan



fingerprints with `radius=3`, `useChirality=True` and `useCounts=True`²⁷ computed with RDKit v.2024.03.5²⁶ were projected to 2-dimensional space with Scikit-learn v.0.24.2.²⁸ All the amino acids profiled during the novelty analysis were colored according to their labels.

2.5 Experimental setup

The experiments aim to showcase the generative model's capabilities in navigation of the peptide chemical space and how it can facilitate peptide design with optimized properties.

2.5.1. Generative model. The generative model was assessed through a series of experiments using the first test set described in the "Training data preparation" section. The sampling was conducted with two sampling methods, a stochastic method, multinomial, and a deterministic method, beam search, with a beam size of 1000. 1000 sets of filler amino acids were sampled for each masked peptide for both sampling methods. The multinomial sampling was performed in triplicate to ensure reproducibility, and the reported metrics are the average of these runs. The initial evaluation was the task completion, referring to generation of the same number of amino acids as the masked positions. The peptides fulfilling this criterion were evaluated with the rest of the evaluation metrics described earlier in the Methods. The results of these metrics were aggregated over the test peptides by calculating the arithmetic mean to determine the overall performance. Additionally, the evaluation metrics were calculated within the peptide topology categories to detect any performance shifts due to topological constraints.

In the next experiment, we tested if the model learned the topological information of the peptides. For example, a macrocyclic peptide includes two amino acids defining the start and end points of the cyclization, thereby establishing the topological arrangement. This experiment aimed to assess whether the model generates amino acids considering the context of the entire peptide. The second test set comprising 40 peptides was used where 1000 filler amino acid sets were sampled for each peptide. If one of the generated amino acids did not complete the topological arrangement, the resulting peptide was considered an invalid molecule. Therefore, we evaluated the validity per topology for the test peptides.

2.5.2. Reinforcement learning. The search algorithm conceptualized with RL was adapted from REINVENT's infrastructure.¹⁴ In the RL loop, a user-specific scoring function containing one or more scoring components is used to score the molecules and tune the model to improve the scoring objectives over learning steps. The REINVENT framework is informed on the RL setup and the scoring components by a configuration file and produces an RL run accordingly.

The experiments in this section were designed to demonstrate the capabilities of the generative model for peptide property optimization by guiding the generation process through RL. PepINVENT offers peptide-based scoring components and scores the generated peptides after the filler amino acids are mapped to the masked positions of the input peptide. When multiple scoring components are selected, scores from

the components are aggregated by either a weighted average or a geometric mean to compute the final score for each peptide in the learning step. As multinomial sampling was employed, the RL experiments were conducted in triplicate to avoid any potential bias. In the RL experiments on topology, a diversity filter with a penalty was used to prevent the repetitive generation of the same molecule.²⁹ In the experiment on generating soluble and permeable macrocyclic peptides with RL, the diversity filter was selected to penalize the peptides with the same Murcko type scaffold.²⁴ In each step of the RL loop, 32 peptides were generated.

The first experiment was to optimize the peptide to a specific topology by constraining the size of the maximum ring. The topological constraint experiments were assessed over 100 steps of the RL loop and the average score over the batch was reported across the learning steps. The second experiment was to showcase a practical example where a peptide is designed to be soluble and permeable and have a cyclic structure. In this experiment, a custom alerts component was used to penalize the generation of undesirable patterns. The configuration files that were used to run the RL experiments could be found in the PepINVENT repository.

2.5.3. Scoring components

2.5.3.1 Topological constraints. As the model learned various topological arrangements, we primarily focused on sampling distinct peptide topologies *versus* constraining the generation to a specific form. The size of the largest ring in the generated peptide was used to showcase how the generation could be steered towards a specific topology. The scoring component was used in three different optimization scenarios with various score transformations: (i) maximize the ring size, (ii) sample only head-to-tail or side-chain-to-tail peptides and (iii) generate linear peptides. In Fig. 4, the score transformations used in each experimental run are shown. To have a better understanding of the selected score windows, it is important to highlight that a macrocycle is defined as a molecule containing 12 or more atoms in a ring.³⁰ In a cycle where only the backbone atoms of α -amino acids are participating, the number of amino acids in the ring would correspond to $[\frac{\text{number of ring atoms}}{3}]$. However, in any other types of cyclizations or amino acids (*i.e.* β - and γ -), this assumption may not hold. Therefore, the ring size was reported to accurately communicate the proposed molecular structure.

Maximizing the ring size was subjected to a sigmoid score transformation within the window of the macrocycle condition, 12, and an arbitrary high number, 60 (Fig. 4A). For sampling head-to-tail or sidechain-to-tail peptides, the upper bound of the score window was reduced to match the typical number of ring atoms in head-to-tail peptides (Fig. 4B). The double sigmoid ensures equal scoring for macrocyclic peptides, while heavily penalizing those outside the window. Lastly, linear peptides were generated by transforming the scores with a reverse sigmoid within a window of 0 to 60, minimizing the ring size (Fig. 4C).



To demonstrate the structural flexibility of generation, a 9-mer peptide was generated with positions 1, 2, 4, and 9 masked and the remaining amino acids as alanine to facilitate the visual distinction of the generated amino acids. Moreover, the input peptide had no prior topological information to enable the generation of any topology. The described input was constructed as:

"?|?|N[C@@H](C)C(=O)|?|N[C@@H](C)C(=O)|N[C@@H](C)C(=O)|N[C@@H](C)C(=O)|N[C@@H](C)C(=O)|?|".

2.5.3.2 CAMSOL-PTM intrinsic solubility for peptides. CAMSOL-PTM is an intrinsic solubility predictor for peptides composed of natural amino acids or NNAAs.³¹ The tool is used to assess the changes in solubility upon integration of modified amino acids during post-translational modifications (PTMs). The solubility score of a peptide can be predicted by inputting the NNAAs in SMILES strings and natural ones in their corresponding amino acid letters or SMILES. CAMSOL-PTM was integrated into the RL framework as a scoring component where the input molecule is the generated peptide. The calculated score for solubility was transformed with a sigmoid function with limits ranging between 0 and 0.5 and with a slope of 0.5.

2.5.3.3 Peptide permeability model. A predictive model for permeability classification of macrocyclic peptides was built using the practices established in our previous work.³² The XGBoost algorithm was implemented with the xgboost v.1.7.5 package, trained on the parallel artificial membrane permeability assay (PAMPA) data from the Cyclic Peptide Membrane Permeability Database (CycPeptMPDB).³³ The training and test sets were split into 90% and 10% respectively with stratification on labels and data sources. The XGBoost model was shown to perform on the test set with a balanced accuracy of 0.78 and Matthew's correlation coefficient of 0.59.³² The baseline ML model was integrated into the RL framework. The scores for peptides were computed as the probability of the permeable class, using the predict_proba

function. There were no transformations applied to the probability score as the score is in the range of [0, 1].

3 Results

To assess the model's generation performance, peptides were sampled according to input queries from various test sets. The

success criteria for the generative model were defined as generating valid, novel, and diverse peptides. The assessment of the model performance was followed by a series of experiments aimed at providing more in-depth characterization of the generated peptides at the amino acid level. The diversity, novelty, and comprehension of the peptide context when generating individual amino acids were considered. These experiments were conducted to demonstrate the model's capacity to navigate the chemical space of both natural amino acids and NNAAs.

Later, peptide optimization through reinforcement learning was explored. RL-based experiments were aimed at demonstrating the flexibility in steering the generation to a specific peptide topology compared to sampling diverse topologies. Lastly, we showcase a practical application in MPO settings to optimize for permeable and soluble macrocyclic peptides.

3.1 Evaluating the generative model

To evaluate the performance of our model, we explored the fulfillment of the task objective, the percentage of valid peptides generated by the model, and the uniqueness, novelty, and diversity of the generated samples at both peptide and amino acid levels. The model at epoch 10 was chosen as the epoch where both the training and validation loss curves plateau to avoid overfitting to the training data (ESI Fig. 2†).

3.1.1. Validity and uniqueness of peptides. The initial assessment of the model was exploring if the task objective is




Fig. 4 The score transformations to score the size of the largest ring through (A) a sigmoid function fitted between [0, 60 atoms] to maximize the major cyclization size, (B) a double sigmoid function fitted between [0, 30 atoms] to reward macrocycles smaller or equal to the ring size of head-to-tail cyclization for the given peptide, and (C) a reverse sigmoid function fitted between [0, 60 atoms] to penalize macrocycles and to generate linear peptides.



Table 1 The validity and uniqueness of the peptides generated by the beam search and multinomial sampling methods. The reported evaluation metrics were further categorized by the peptide topology and reported as the average (\pm standard deviation) over 400 test peptides

Metric	Sampling method	Total	Linear	Head-to-tail	Disulfide bridge	Sidechain-to-tail
Peptide validity (%)	Beam search	99 (± 7)	100 (± 0)	100 (± 0)	100 (± 2)	98 (± 14)
	Multinomial	98 (± 2)	98 (± 1)	98 (± 1)	99 (± 1)	97 (± 4)
Peptide uniqueness (%)	Beam search	100 (± 0)	100 (± 0)	100 (± 0)	100 (± 0)	100 (± 0)
	Multinomial	98 (± 8)	100 (± 0)	99 (± 7)	94 (± 14)	99 (± 2)

accomplished. In both sampling methods, there were rare instances of peptides failing the validity due to the model failing to generate as many amino acids as it was required to fill in the masked positions. The maximum failed number of generated amino acids was three out of 1000, corresponding to 0.3%. This case was an outlier in test data considering that the mean number of failures was 0.03 (± 0.02). In Table 1, the mean validity of peptides was reported as the percentage of valid molecules over 1000 samples. The validity was further partitioned into distinct topologies that were in the test set to detect whether there is any inflated bias coming from specific molecular structures. More than 99% and 98% of peptides were unique in total, respectively, for beam search and multinomial sampling methods. Both methods showed similarly high validity profiles across different topologies but had a slightly lower validity for the sidechain-to-tail bridged peptides (Table 1).

Next, we explored the uniqueness of the generated peptides for both sampling methods. The beam search is deterministic; therefore, it generates unique strings. However, this does not guarantee that the SMILES representation translates to a unique molecule. Our generative model almost always generates chemically unique peptides, >99% (Table 1). A similar profile was observed with multinomial sampling with higher fluctuations in non-linear peptide topologies as these were reported with higher standard deviations (Table 1). The peptides with disulfide bridges were harder to diversify with multinomial sampling. This stemmed from the training set containing a limited number of amino acids with sulfur in their sidechain. Therefore, the specific topological constraint of having a disulfide substructure in the peptide molecule was harder to learn compared to other topologies. After establishing that our generative model was producing valid and unique molecules across various peptide topologies, the next step was to characterize the building blocks proposed by the model.

3.1.2. Uniqueness, novelty and diversity of amino acids.

The unique, novel and diverse amino acids play a central role in assessing the extent of the building block chemical space explored by the generative model and the potential of generating more diverse peptides. In the generation process, multiple amino acids are generated and mapped back to the masked positions of an input peptide in order. Generating sets of the same amino acids in different orders results in distinct peptides, highlighting a potential bottleneck in achieving diversity. To evaluate the model's generative capabilities, we assessed uniqueness at the building block level using generated strings, canonicalized isomeric SMILES, and canonicalized SMILES. In this analysis, we were primarily interested in the number of building blocks generated to propose amino acids

for a single input. The uniqueness could vary with many factors such as the number of masks, the amino acid content of the input peptide and the topology if the input contains an incomplete ring structure, as shown in Table 1. Therefore, the average uniqueness was averaged over the samples generated from the test set. The amino acids had very similar numbers of string level and isomeric SMILES level unique instances, demonstrating that CHUCKLES representation facilitated a standardized format for the amino acids. Both sampling methods showed a decrease in the unique number of amino acids when the chirality information is removed (Fig. 5). This underscores the role of stereochemistry in enhancing the diversity of the chemical space and as one of the modification options for the model. The multinomial sampling method notably resulted in a significantly larger number of unique amino acids, more than 1400, compared to the beam search, close to 200 (Fig. 5). This difference highlights the influence of the sampling strategy when exploring the chemical space and multinomial sampling, enabling a broader exploration and diversity of the chemical space. Considering the generative models typically trained on a set of 20 natural amino acids, the PepINVENT model successfully expanded the building block chemical space. On average, beam search and multinomial sampling methods respectively resulted in 10- and 70-fold expansions over the traditional natural amino acid space for a single peptide input.

We defined the last step of the uniqueness analysis as the categorization of the type of amino acid generated as detailed in



Fig. 5 The three levels of uniqueness for amino acids obtained on average from sampling 1000 peptides for each of the 400 peptides from the test set with beam search, with a beam size of 1000 and multinomial sampling methods. The number of unique amino acids includes any natural or non-natural amino acids.





Fig. 6 The distributions of the unique amino acids for three levels of uniqueness and categorized by the type of amino acid: natural, non-natural from the training set and novel. The projection of uniqueness on the types of amino acids was plotted for the output from (A) beam search and (B) multinomial sampling methods.

the Methods. In this step, we investigated how the unique amino acids were distributed to the groups of natural, non-natural from the training set and novel (Fig. 6). When a masked peptide was queried, the entire set of 20 natural amino acids was generally proposed during multinomial sampling. This demonstrates that the generative model considers proposing natural amino acids and does not only explore the non-natural space. The NNAAs from the training set were also proposed as the learned building blocks. These NNAAs were more frequently proposed compared to the novel ones. Moreover, in the canonical SMILES-level uniqueness, there was an increase in the average of the non-natural amino acids and a decrease in the novel amino acids. This highlights once again the contribution of stereochemical modifications to the diversity. The novel amino acids, at the canonical SMILES level, were generated with a significant number of options, averaging around 200 and offering as many as 1200 amino acids for a single peptide query.

The drastic difference in the number of amino acids between the two sampling methods arises from how the model learned the amino acid patterns. When a set of amino acids is generated in different orders, it can result in distinct peptides, even though the constituent amino acids are shuffled. In addition, the training set contains more natural amino acids than its non-natural counterpart and some sidechain fragments are frequent among non-natural amino acids. The CHUCKLES pattern for these amino acids and substructures is learned by the model.

Considering these two points, the beam search sampling may result in oversampling of natural amino acids and frequent sidechain patterns, the most probable patterns in the training set, compared to multinomial (ESI Fig. 3†). However, beam search maintains the peptide's uniqueness through positional rearrangements of the amino acids within the peptide. This shows that the model tends to prioritize suggesting natural amino acids initially before venturing into the space of NNAAs. Moreover, shuffling the order of the amino acids illustrates the model's approach in addressing the assigned task by generating a variety of amino acid combinations in a combinatorial fashion. While this may be the case for beam search, the probabilistic nature of multinomial explores the chemical space more freely while preserving the understanding of peptides as a combination of amino acids. Hence, the peptide-level diversity expands into a high-dimensional space that is incomparably broader than the conventional sequence space, requiring strategic navigation.

Lastly, the diversity of the amino acids proposed by the model was analyzed by visualizing the chemical space. As the NNAAs in our training set were already shown to cover a large chemical space,¹⁶ the diversity analysis also described the chemical space that was presented to the model with the training set. The extracted amino acids were canonicalized with isomeric information and covered all the natural amino acids and 10 000 NNAAs in the training set. Moreover, 91 826 novel amino acids were generated to propose amino acids for






Fig. 7 The chemical space visualization plotted with the dimensionality reduction method of t-SNE. The amino acids are colored by the amino acid categories defined as natural, non-natural from the training set and novel amino acids. The chemical space is also illustrated separately for novel, around 92 K NNAAs, and the 10 K NNAAs from the training set, all recovered in sampling, to highlight the overlapping trends between these types of amino acids.

peptides in the test set. The dimensionality reduction plot was plotted with the canonicalized isomeric SMILES since one of the features that the generative model offers is introducing stereochemical modifications. The visualization showed similar coverage for novel and NNAAs, indicating that the novel amino acids were indeed proposed from the learned space (Fig. 7). This was also observed when comparing these novel amino acids and the amino acids from the training set based on the distributions of features related to molecular complexity such as synthetic accessibility score,³⁴ natural product-likeness score,³⁵ number of heavy atoms, and maximal graph length (ESI Fig. 4†).

3.1.3. Learning the topological context. In the previous sections, we have established that the model can generate a specific number of valid, unique and novel amino acids to complete a masked peptide. We further assessed the model's understanding of the peptide topology by evaluating if there are potential limitations to validity when an incomplete peptide topology is presented to the generative model. In such cases, there were no significant changes in validity and the model generated amino acids to complete the topology (Table 2). For example, when there is an amino acid with the indication of participating in a disulfide bridge, the model would generate one of the amino acids to fulfill the structural query. In this

case, one amino acid would contain a sulfur in its sidechain and a SMILES token symbolizing the bridging would be incorporated into the CHUCKLES representation. This highlights the model's ability to comprehend the input peptide not only as a query for a specific number of amino acids but also with the peptide context.

3.2 Reinforcement learning

In this study, we conducted reinforcement learning experiments to show the capability of steering the generation process to constrain the generation to a specific peptide and to optimize peptide properties in a MPO scenario.

3.2.1. Scenario 1: generating a peptide topology of interest. We demonstrate a single scoring component, the maximum ring size of the peptide, effectively driving the generation to a specific peptide topology. We conducted a simulation of multiple RL-based runs using different score transformations preferring distinct topologies. The learning processes were visualized focusing on the change of the maximum ring size of the batch of peptides generated in every step (Fig. 8). Additionally, the learning processes showing the triplicate RL runs can be found in ESI Fig. 5.† The 9-mer head-to-tail cyclized peptide queried in this scenario is likely to have 27 atoms in its backbone if all the amino acids are stitched together by a peptide bond. Sigmoid score transformation favoring the larger sizes showed an increase in the average ring size to a range between 30 and 35 (Fig. 8A). This implies that the generated peptides have the tendency to contain larger rings than a head-to-tail cyclized peptide. A peptide containing a disulfide bridge connecting its first and last amino acids can be an instance of this. Such a peptide would include all the backbone atoms and the side-chain atoms in between the backbone and the sulfur attachment points in its largest ring. In line with this information, the generated topologies were

Table 2 The percentage of validity of the generated peptides was reported as the means and standard deviations in the triplicate runs for distinct topologies and the overall test set

Topology	Validity (%)
All topologies	98.3 (± 6.9)
Linear	99.9 (± 0.5)
Head-to-tail	96.1 (± 12.2)
Disulfide bridge	97.9 (± 6.5)
Sidechain-to-tail	99.4 (± 1.8)





Fig. 8 The scoring component, the ring size of the largest ring, (A–C) and the percentage of valid peptides generated (D–F) over the learning steps in RL runs were plotted. The RL runs were set to optimize the peptide generation for maximizing the ring size (purple), preferring macrocycles with an upper limit of ring size (red), and minimizing the ring size (orange). In every learning step, the average ring size of the batch was plotted with the 95% confidence interval.

observed to be more representative of peptides with disulfide bridges. Moreover, PepINVENT generated some bicyclic peptides, which is a novel topology compared to the training set, highlighting the navigation of the model in the unseen chemical space (ESI Fig. 6†).

In the next RL case, we have biased the scoring to have the best scores throughout the range of the macrocycle condition to the head-to-tail cyclization condition. The learning was limited to these topologies as the average ring size increased until it reached the pre-set threshold of the score transformation (Fig. 8B). Moreover, the broader score range of the steps compared to the disulfide case demonstrates the fluctuations of generating both topologies (ESI Fig. 6†). Lastly, we flip our initial objective to favor lower ring sizes or in other words, linear peptide generation in the RL run. Once again, RL was able to steer the generation to linear peptides as the macrocycles are penalized with lower scores (Fig. 8C). The generation of linear peptides also did not affect sampling heterocycles in the side-chains (ESI Fig. 6†). The preservation of such substructures ensures the diversity of sidechains while conforming to the desired topology. In all the RL cases, the validities of the batch of peptides in the exploration and exploitation stages were generally above 90% and 95%, respectively (Fig. 8D–F). Typically, at approximately 40 learning steps, the objective is reached, marking the transition from exploration of the peptidic chemical space to exploitation of the targeted space

with the desired characteristics. Achieving the objective in under 50 steps, PepINVENT demonstrated high flexibility in transitioning between diverse topologies.

3.2.2. Scenario 2: generating soluble and permeable macrocyclic peptides. In this application example, we target a therapeutically relevant peptide known as the Rev-binding peptide (RBP). Rev protein, a human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) protein, plays an essential role in regulating the transport of mRNA from the nucleus to the cytoplasm in the infected cells. The mRNA transport is a key component of the viral replication as it allows for the translation of viral products and facilitates viral assembly. Given its influence over the HIV lifecycle, Rev protein has been a target for antiviral therapy.³⁶ RBP, with the sequence of YPAASYR, was identified as a potential inhibitor of the Rev protein. The peptide was discovered from the structural analysis of the Rev-antibody complex, corresponding to the paratope of the antibody.^{37–39} Wu *et al.* transformed this sequence into a macrocyclic peptide by extending the sequence with two glycines and cyclizing with head-to-tail cyclization. The RBP was impermeable to the cell membrane.³⁸ Alanines in the peptide were modified with cycloalanines to enhance the permeability of RBP while retaining its bioactivity.³⁸

Inspired by this study, we demonstrate how RBP can be modified to improve permeability and solubility. The amino acids that were shown to not have a major impact on the



bioactivity in the study of Wu *et al.*³⁸ were masked in RBP. These included the alanines that were previously shown to be modified without a significant change in the bioactivity and glycines that were incorporated solely for the cyclization. Over the learning steps, the RBP was modified with PepINVENT in a multi-parameter objective (MPO) scenario to propose new RBP designs by generating sets of amino acids. In the MPO, the RBP was optimized for cell permeability through scoring the designs with a peptide permeability model while maintaining cyclic structures by the topological constraint scoring component. The undesirable substructures were penalized by the custom alert scoring component and we tracked all the learning progress of the individual components as well as the final score. The learning process over a 1000-step RL run was tracked with the four scoring components mainly (Fig. 9). Maximizing the ring size constrained the topology to macrocyclic peptides during the generation (Fig. 9). The custom alerts allowed the generation to maintain consistency with the chemical relevance of the sidechains (Fig. 9). As these components defined the targeted peptidic space, components scoring the permeability and the solubility specified the property optimization objectives.

The intricate interplay between solubility and permeability has been explored by many studies.³⁹ While there are no explicit design guidelines for peptides, it is understood that cell permeable peptides must demonstrate a certain level of solubility in order to unlock the degree of conformational flexibility necessary for passive permeability.⁴⁰ The dynamic

conformational shifts enable peptides to adapt to both aqueous and cell membrane's lipophilic media.⁴¹ Therefore, designing permeable and soluble peptides requires complex design strategies. In this application example, we demonstrate PepINVENT's ability to navigate the chemical space to propose design ideas balancing solubility and permeability. According to the learning progress in the RL runs with RBP, the solubility component was learned first, in the first 100 steps, followed by improving the permeability in the soluble peptide space (Fig. 9B and C). This was also observed by a steep increase followed by a steady profile in the aggregated score computed by the geometric mean of four scoring components (Fig. 9G). Over the learning steps, the proposed peptides showed high solubility and permeability, while permeability was harder to optimize. The aggregated MPO score focuses on the highest scoring peptides through the learning process (Fig. 10A). A peak in permeability scores around step 200 indicates the exploration of the chemical space to reach a design space with permeable peptides and exploiting this space. The drop after this peak demonstrates the impact of the penalty from the diversity filter to steer the model to explore more diverse peptide designs (Fig. 9C). Lipophilicity was also reported as the Wildman–Crippen log *P* value during the runs to visualize the shifts between solubility and this fragment-based solubility scorer (Fig. 9E).⁴² Heterocycle incorporation into the backbone was one of the preferred design ideas for MPO, which is a common peptide modification for permeability (Fig. 10B).³⁹ PepINVENT effectively sampled new macrocyclic peptides that




Fig. 9 Progress of the scoring components of the MPO task during RL runs to design soluble and permeable cyclic Rev-binding peptides. The MPO entailed (A) the topological constraint aiming to generate macrocyclic peptides, (B) solubility measured with the CAMSOL-PTM intrinsic solubility predictor,³¹ (C) permeability assessed through a classifier for passive permeability of peptides and (D) custom alerts penalizing undesirable substructures generally associated with toxicity. During the runs, (E) the lipophilicity, (F) the validity, and (G) the average of the aggregated scores for the batches at each step were tracked for the generated peptides. The plots illustrate the average of triplicate runs and the individual runs are reported in ESI Fig. 7.†






Fig. 10 (A) The ridge plot illustrates the distribution of the MPO scores of the generated peptides over 50-step intervals for the first 500 steps and the remaining learning process. The plot describes how the generation process focuses on the peptides with desired properties in the first 200 steps, followed by exploring the chemical space to find peptides with similar profiles. There were 5146, 534, and 1 soluble macrocyclic peptides without undesirable substructures with permeability scores above 0.6, 0.7 and 0.8, respectively. (B) Examples of generated peptides were reported with MPO components' scores. The generated peptides were positioned around the green framed input peptide, cRBP, with the masked amino acid depicted with green color.

are soluble and permeable while preserving the previously demonstrated high validity of the generative model.

4 Discussion

In this work, we introduced PepINVENT as an extension to the *de novo* design tool for small molecules, REINVENT.¹³ PepINVENT is a transformer-based generative model trained to propose peptide designs given a peptide of interest. The model performs text infilling by producing novel peptides through generating natural or non-natural α -amino acids to substitute user-defined positions within the sequence. In contrast to the previous generative methods for peptide design, PepINVENT suggests amino acids with a chemistry-aware generation process, aiming to exploit the full theoretical chemical space of amino acids. Unlocking the atomic-level design for amino acids facilitates the design of novel sidechains, the incorporation of backbone modifications and stereochemical mutations in the peptide. As the uncharted peptide landscape becomes accessible as the design space, the potential of peptide therapeutics to address previously unmet needs expands significantly.

The scarcity of the publicly available peptides and the known NNAAs being significantly limited compared to the theoretical amino acid space pose a challenge for obtaining large data. Because of these data limitations, generative models in the field are typically customized for topology- or property-specific tasks.^{8–12} Our generative model was trained on semi-synthetic peptide data composed of natural amino acids and readily synthesizable NNAAs from a large virtual library.¹⁶ The semi-synthetic data were not generated based on any property-related patterns or distinct topologies. The conditional aspect

of the generator is defined solely by its ability to generate an equal number of amino acids to the masked positions, yielding valid peptides. Therefore, PepINVENT could serve as a central tool for optimizing various peptide-related objectives and topologies.

Peptides were represented with the CHUCKLES pattern in our model. CHUCKLES enabled the peptides to be encoded, preserving their chemical context while maintaining the sequence order of amino acids. This approach facilitated the translation from the sequence to the molecule, allowing for both assembly of peptides and extraction of amino acids from them in a standardized format, capturing the N-to-C directionality. The generative model trained with this representation was shown to produce valid and unique peptides with diverse amino acids while preserving the granular structure of peptides. The model comprehends the complex nature of a peptide as a sequence of building blocks that make up a beyond-the-rule-of-5 modality. The generative model goes beyond the building block library in the training set to propose novel NNAAs featuring unique sidechains and various stereochemical and backbone modifications.

We demonstrated the capabilities of the PepINVENT framework encompassing the generative model and the RL through two experiments. The first experiment utilized a straightforward physicochemical descriptor, the ring size of the largest ring in the peptide. Various score transformation functions were employed to define different objectives to optimize the largest ring's size with RL. The experiments showed that a peptide without specific structural information can be constrained to a desired topology, with specific cyclizations or linear peptides, in less than 50 learning steps. The flexibility in



guiding the generation towards distinct topologies highlights its flexibility in proposing diverse peptide designs. Since this experiment utilizes a single scoring component, the ring size, to generate a particular topology, it is worth highlighting that the provided solution is not the only possible solution. Other scoring components could also be used to achieve a similar outcome. For example, a substructure match for the disulfide bond could generate disulfide bridged peptides. Another example would be setting a substructure matching objective to a scaffold that defines a part of or the entire peptide backbone. Additionally, more complex scoring components such as secondary structure predictors could be integrated to navigate the generation process toward a desired topology.

In a peptide-based drug discovery project focused on enhancing the peptide affinity, a motif in the original sequence that leads to a certain characteristic, such as permeability, may be preserved. The lead optimization in such a case could be carried out on the amino acids that do not participate in this motif. In contrast, amino acids enabling the peptide's binding to a target protein could be characterized as the pharmacophore.³⁹ The residue-based pharmacophore is preserved while the remaining amino acids are explored for new peptide designs to improve the peptidic properties, such as solubility or oral bioavailability. PepINVENT can selectively optimize the peptide, with respect to the project goals. The latter case was employed to showcase a practical application of PepINVENT in designing a hit peptide when the pharmacophore is defined. The amino acids that are not part of the pharmacophore or modified in other studies without compromising the activity were selected for modification. The proposed peptide designs were optimized to exhibit permeable and soluble features constrained to cyclic designs. The RL-steered generation led to the proposal of novel peptides with the desired properties. This experiment showed how PepINVENT navigates the peptide landscape identifying limited regions within the chemical space that balance the trade-off among multiple properties. PepINVENT could be utilized for multiparameter optimization consisting of physicochemical properties, property predictors and methodologies. Throughout the experiments, the agent consistently avoided invalid amino acid patterns while navigating the peptide landscape, resulting in over 90% validity of the proposed peptides. Proposing novel peptide designs, with both natural and non-natural amino acids, could accelerate peptide-based drug discovery and development projects. The tool can be used for peptide property enhancements, peptidomimetics, lead optimization and many other peptide related tasks for peptides as drug molecules or as conjugates for delivery. In future studies, we aim to demonstrate the impact of the PepINVENT framework in a multi-parameter optimization setting for a real-life application and extend the available scoring components including the synthetic feasibility of the generated peptides.

5 Conclusion

PepINVENT is a robust generative model-based framework for peptide design. The framework provides a platform for optimizing peptides by proposing single or multiple α -amino acids according to user-preferred design objectives. The generative

model can create novel NNAs by designing new sidechains and modifying the backbone or the stereochemistry of amino acids from learning the peptide chemistry provided in the training set. This novelty could accelerate peptide design by traversing the unexplored chemical space of amino acids. The standardized format, CHUCKLES, offers a chemical language for peptides enabling the model to learn the building block chemistry and the peptide context as a structure composed of a chain of amino acids. The diversity, novelty and uniqueness of the peptide designs were established by analyses conducted on the model's generation output.

In this study, we also demonstrated PepINVENT's effectiveness in navigating the peptide landscape by showing its adaptability to specific topological constraints and in showcasing its capacity to accommodate multiple topologies. Additionally, PepINVENT was employed in a multi-parameter optimization scenario to design soluble and permeable macrocyclic peptides. Reinforcement learning steered the generation to the design space that contained desired peptides for all the specified components. Thus, our framework demonstrates its capability to propose tailored peptides and could facilitate peptide optimization in real-life applications. PepINVENT is presented as an open-source framework and as an extension of the *de novo* small molecule design tool, REINVENT. In this work, we present PepINVENT as a tool that could facilitate peptide-based drug discovery and development by addressing the challenge of proposing peptide designs with novel NNAs while improving targeted peptidic properties defined through MPO. Future studies will focus on demonstrating the practical utilization of the framework in peptide-based drug optimization settings.

Data availability

The semi-synthetic training and validation data used in model training are publicly available in Zenodo. The data and configuration files used in model testing are available in: <https://github.com/MolecularAI/PepINVENT/>. The repository also includes a Jupyter Notebook to demo the preparation of CHUCKLES representation, the generative model codes for supervised learning, sampling, and reinforcement learning. The CAMSOL-PTM intrinsic solubility scorer algorithm used in this study is provided as a web server freely available for the academic users upon registration at: <https://www.cohsoftware.ch.cam.ac.uk/>.

Author contributions

G. G. contributed to the main part of the research, performed the experiments, analyzed the results and wrote the manuscript. G. G., L. D. M., A. P. and O. E. designed and conceptualized the project. All the authors discussed the results, provided feedback, and reviewed the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.



Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research (SSF) (Grant ID20-0109) through funding an industrial PhD studentship for GG.

References

- 1 L. Wang, N. Wang, W. Zhang, X. Cheng, Z. Yan, G. Shao, X. Wang, R. Wang and C. Fu, *Signal Transduction Targeted Ther.*, 2022, **7**, 1–27.
- 2 G. Rossino, E. Marchese, G. Galli, F. Verde, M. Finizio, M. Serra, P. Linciano and S. Collina, *Molecules*, 2023, **28**, 7165.
- 3 N. Tsomaia, *Eur. J. Med. Chem.*, 2015, **94**, 459–470.
- 4 F. Wan, D. Kontogiorgos-Heintz and C. la Fuente-Nunez, *Digital Discovery*, 2022, **1**, 195–208.
- 5 Y. Ding, J. P. Ting, J. Liu, S. Al-Azzam, P. Pandya and S. Afshar, *Amino Acids*, 2020, **52**, 1207.
- 6 M. Muttenthaler, G. F. King, D. J. Adams and P. F. Alewood, *Nat. Rev. Drug Discovery*, 2021, **20**(4), 309–325.
- 7 X. Zeng, F. Wang, Y. Luo, S. gu Kang, J. Tang, F. C. Lightstone, E. F. Fang, W. Cornell, R. Nussinov and F. Cheng, *Cell Rep. Med.*, 2022, **3**, 100794.
- 8 X. Xu, C. Xu, W. He, L. Wei, H. Li, J. Zhou, R. Zhang, Y. Wang, Y. Xiong and X. Gao, *Bioinformatics*, 2024, **40**(6), btac364.
- 9 Z. Wu, Y. Wu, C. Zhu, X. Wu, S. Zhai, X. Wang, Z. Su and H. Duan, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 2023, **63**, 7655–7668.
- 10 P. Das, T. Sercu, K. Wadhawan, I. Padhi, S. Gehrman, F. Cipcigan, V. Chenthamarakshan, H. Strobel, C. dos Santos, P. Y. Chen, Y. Y. Yang, J. P. Tan, J. Hedrick, J. Crain and A. Mojsilovic, *Nat. Biomed. Eng.*, 2021, **5**(6), 613–623.
- 11 F. Grisoni, C. S. Neuhaus, G. Gabernet, A. T. Müller, J. A. Hiss and G. Schneider, *ChemMedChem*, 2018, **13**, 1300–1302.
- 12 C. K. Schissel, S. Mohapatra, J. M. Wolfe, C. M. Fadzen, K. Bellovoda, C. L. Wu, J. A. Wood, A. B. Malmberg, A. Loas, R. Gómez-Bombarelli and B. L. Pentelute, *Nat. Chem.*, 2021, **13**(10), 992–1000.
- 13 H. H. Loeffler, J. He, A. Tibo, J. P. Janet, A. Voronov, L. H. Mervin and O. Engkvist, *J. Cheminf.*, 2024, **16**, 1–16.
- 14 M. Olivecrona, T. Blaschke, O. Engkvist and H. Chen, *J. Cheminf.*, 2017, **9**, 1–14.
- 15 D. Weininger, *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.*, 1988, **28**, 31–36.
- 16 K. N. Amarasinghe, L. D. Maria, C. Tyrchan, L. A. Eriksson, J. Sadowski and D. Petrović, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 2022, **62**, 2999–3007.
- 17 eMolecules, <https://www.emolecules.com/>.
- 18 J. Arús-Pous, T. Blaschke, S. Ulander, J. L. Reymond, H. Chen and O. Engkvist, *J. Cheminf.*, 2019, **11**, 1–14.
- 19 M. A. Siani, D. Weininger and J. M. Blaney, *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.*, 1994, **34**, 588–593.
- 20 F. J. Duffy, M. Verniere, M. Devocelle, E. Bernard, D. C. Shields and A. J. Chubb, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 2011, **51**, 829–836.
- 21 M. Lewis, Y. Liu, N. Goyal, M. Ghazvininejad, A. Mohamed, O. Levy, V. Stoyanov and L. Zettlemoyer, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Online, 2020, pp. 7871–7880.
- 22 R. Irwin, S. Dimitriadis, J. He and E. J. Bjerrum, *Mach. Learn.: Sci. Technol.*, 2022, **3**, 015022.
- 23 J. He, E. Nittinger, C. Tyrchan, W. Czechtizky, A. Patronov, E. J. Bjerrum and O. Engkvist, *J. Cheminf.*, 2022, **14**, 1–14.
- 24 J. He, A. Tibo, J. P. Janet, E. Nittinger, C. Tyrchan, W. Czechtizky and O. Engkvist, *J. Cheminf.*, 2024, **16**, 1–15.
- 25 A. Tibo, J. He, J. P. Janet, E. Nittinger and O. Engkvist, *Nat. Commun.*, 2024, **15**(1), 1–12.
- 26 RDKit, <http://www.rdkit.org/>.
- 27 D. Rogers and M. Hahn, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 2010, **50**, 742–754.
- 28 F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot and É. Duchesnay, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2011, **12**, 2825–2830.
- 29 T. Blaschke, J. Arús-Pous, H. Chen, C. Margreitter, C. Tyrchan, O. Engkvist, K. Papadopoulos and A. Patronov, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 2020, **60**, 5918–5922.
- 30 D. G. Jimenez, V. Poongavanam and J. Kihlberg, *J. Med. Chem.*, 2023, **66**, 5377–5396.
- 31 M. Oeller, R. J. Kang, H. L. Bolt, A. L. G. dos Santos, A. L. Weinmann, A. Nikitidis, P. Zlatoidsky, W. Su, W. Czechtizky, L. D. Maria, P. Sormanni and M. Vendruscolo, *Nat. Commun.*, 2023, **14**(1), 1–12.
- 32 G. Geylan, L. D. Maria, O. Engkvist, F. David and U. Norinder, *Digital Discovery*, 2024, **3**(9), 1761–1775.
- 33 J. Li, K. Yanagisawa, M. Sugita, T. Fujie, M. Ohue and Y. Akiyama, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 2023, **63**(7), 2240–2250.
- 34 P. Ertl and A. Schuffenhauer, *J. Cheminf.*, 2009, **1**, 1–11.
- 35 P. Ertl, S. Roggo and A. Schuffenhauer, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 2008, **48**, 68–74.
- 36 rev – Protein Rev – Human immunodeficiency virus type 1 group M subtype B (isolate HXB2) (HIV-1), *UniProtKB*, UniProt, <https://www.uniprot.org/uniprotkb/P04618/entry>.
- 37 S. J. Stahl, N. R. Watts, C. Rader, M. A. DiMattia, R. G. Mage, I. Palmer, J. D. Kaufman, J. M. Grimes, D. I. Stuart, A. C. Steven and P. T. Wingfield, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2010, **397**, 697–708.
- 38 H. Wu, G. Mousseau, S. Mediouni, S. T. Valente and T. Kodadek, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2016, **55**, 12637–12642.
- 39 L. K. Buckton, M. N. Rahimi and S. R. McAlpine, *Chem.–Eur. J.*, 2021, **27**, 1487–1513.
- 40 M. Sugita, S. Sugiyama, T. Fujie, Y. Yoshikawa, K. Yanagisawa, M. Ohue and Y. Akiyama, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 2021, **61**, 3681–3695.
- 41 T. A. Ramelot, J. Palmer, G. T. Montelione and G. Bhardwaj, *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.*, 2023, **80**, 102603.
- 42 S. A. Wildman and G. M. Crippen, *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.*, 1999, **39**, 868–873.

