

A Appendix

A.1 Additional results

Table 5: Mean absolute error ($MAE \pm \sigma$; lower is better) of different predictors on the Caco-2 benchmark with varying numbers of test samples included in fine-tuning (n). Best results in bold; next-best is underlined.

	size	$n = 0$	$n = 7$	$n = 10$	$n = 25$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$
dummy	0	0.57±0.00	0.60±0.00	0.59±0.00	0.58±0.00	0.57±0.00	0.57±0.00
z	128	0.58±0.04	0.55±0.01	0.52±0.01	0.45±0.01	0.41±0.01	0.37±0.01
all attributes	208	0.60±0.09	0.53 ±0.01	<u>0.51</u> ±0.01	<u>0.42</u> ±0.01	<u>0.37</u> ±0.01	<u>0.32</u> ±0.01
all attributes+ z	336	0.70±0.07	<u>0.54</u> ±0.01	0.50 ±0.01	0.41 ±0.01	0.36 ±0.01	0.31 ±0.01
GES blanket	170	0.58±0.06	0.53 ±0.01	0.50 ±0.01	<u>0.42</u> ±0.01	0.36 ±0.01	<u>0.32</u> ±0.01
LiNGAM blanket	199	0.61±0.07	0.53 ±0.01	0.50 ±0.01	0.41 ±0.01	0.36 ±0.01	0.31 ±0.01
Group Lasso blanket	62	0.68±0.05	<u>0.54</u> ±0.01	0.52±0.01	0.45±0.01	0.40±0.01	0.34±0.01
PPFS blanket	107	0.71±0.06	<u>0.54</u> ±0.01	0.52±0.01	0.43±0.02	0.38±0.02	<u>0.32</u> ±0.01
PL blanket	176	<u>0.56</u> ±0.08	0.53 ±0.01	0.50 ±0.01	0.41 ±0.01	0.36 ±0.01	<u>0.32</u> ±0.01
PL blanket (FS)	174	0.53 ±0.04	0.53 ±0.01	0.50 ±0.01	0.41 ±0.01	0.36 ±0.01	0.31 ±0.01

Table 6: Spearman correlation ($\rho \pm \sigma$; higher is better) of different predictors on the Hepatocyte clearance benchmark with varying numbers of test samples included in fine-tuning (n). Best results in bold; next-best is underlined.

	size	$n = 0$	$n = 7$	$n = 10$	$n = 25$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$
dummy	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
z	128	0.27±0.01	0.09±0.02	0.11±0.02	0.15±0.03	0.20±0.03	0.24±0.03
all attributes	208	0.37 ±0.01	0.13 ±0.01	0.16 ±0.01	0.22 ±0.02	0.27 ±0.02	0.30±0.02
all attributes+ z	336	0.35±0.01	0.13 ±0.02	0.14±0.01	<u>0.21</u> ±0.01	0.25±0.02	0.29±0.02
GES blanket	163	0.35±0.01	<u>0.11</u> ±0.02	<u>0.15</u> ±0.02	0.20±0.02	0.25±0.02	0.30±0.02
LiNGAM blanket	194	0.37 ±0.01	0.13 ±0.02	0.16 ±0.01	<u>0.21</u> ±0.02	<u>0.26</u> ±0.02	<u>0.31</u> ±0.02
Group Lasso blanket	168	0.35±0.01	<u>0.11</u> ±0.02	0.12±0.02	0.18±0.01	0.23±0.02	0.29±0.02
PPFS blanket	107	<u>0.36</u> ±0.01	0.13 ±0.02	0.16 ±0.01	<u>0.21</u> ±0.01	0.27 ±0.01	0.34 ±0.01
PL blanket	151	<u>0.36</u> ±0.01	<u>0.11</u> ±0.02	0.14±0.01	0.19±0.01	0.23±0.01	0.27±0.02
PL blanket (FS)	174	0.35±0.00	<u>0.11</u> ±0.02	0.14±0.01	0.20±0.02	0.24±0.02	0.28±0.01

Table 7: Spearman correlation ($\rho \pm \sigma$; higher is better) of different predictors on the Microsome clearance benchmark with varying numbers of test samples included in fine-tuning (n). Best results in bold; next-best is underlined.

	size	$n = 0$	$n = 7$	$n = 10$	$n = 25$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$
dummy	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
z	128	0.43±0.02	0.16±0.02	0.17±0.03	0.23±0.03	0.28±0.03	0.33±0.03
all attributes	208	<u>0.65±0.01</u>	0.39±0.04	<u>0.43±0.02</u>	0.47±0.02	0.50±0.02	0.53±0.02
all attributes+ z	336	0.66±0.01	0.39±0.03	0.42±0.02	0.47±0.01	0.51±0.02	<u>0.54±0.01</u>
GES blanket	154	0.64±0.01	0.37±0.02	0.41±0.03	0.45±0.01	0.49±0.02	0.51±0.03
LiNGAM blanket	191	0.66±0.01	0.41±0.02	<u>0.43±0.02</u>	0.49±0.01	0.53±0.01	0.55±0.02
Group Lasso blanket	172	0.66±0.01	0.39±0.03	0.44±0.02	0.49±0.02	<u>0.52±0.02</u>	0.55±0.03
PPFS blanket	101	0.62±0.02	0.35±0.02	0.40±0.01	0.45±0.02	0.49±0.02	0.52±0.02
PL blanket	121	<u>0.65±0.01</u>	<u>0.40±0.02</u>	0.44±0.01	0.47±0.01	0.50±0.01	0.53±0.02
PL blanket (FS)	174	0.66±0.01	<u>0.40±0.02</u>	<u>0.43±0.02</u>	<u>0.48±0.01</u>	0.51±0.02	0.53±0.02

Table 8: Spearman correlation ($\rho \pm \sigma$; higher is better) of different predictors on the VDss benchmark with varying numbers of test samples included in fine-tuning (n). Best results in bold; next-best is underlined.

	size	$n = 0$	$n = 7$	$n = 10$	$n = 25$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$
dummy	0	—	—	—	—	—	—
z	128	0.49±0.02	0.16±0.02	0.21±0.04	0.32±0.04	0.41±0.02	0.47±0.01
all attributes	208	<u>0.68±0.01</u>	0.37±0.03	0.45±0.03	0.60±0.02	<u>0.65±0.02</u>	<u>0.66±0.01</u>
all attributes+ z	336	0.64±0.01	0.32±0.03	0.39±0.03	0.55±0.02	0.60±0.01	0.62±0.01
GES blanket	170	<u>0.68±0.01</u>	0.40±0.03	<u>0.48±0.03</u>	0.60±0.02	0.64±0.01	<u>0.66±0.01</u>
LiNGAM blanket	196	<u>0.68±0.01</u>	0.38±0.03	0.45±0.03	0.60±0.01	0.64±0.01	0.65±0.01
Group Lasso blanket	145	0.65±0.01	0.36±0.02	0.42±0.03	0.57±0.02	0.62±0.01	0.63±0.02
PPFS blanket	83	<u>0.68±0.01</u>	<u>0.40±0.01</u>	0.46±0.02	<u>0.60±0.01</u>	0.64±0.01	<u>0.66±0.01</u>
PL blanket	109	0.67±0.01	0.39±0.03	0.46±0.04	0.59±0.02	0.64±0.01	0.65±0.01
PL blanket (FS)	174	0.70±0.01	0.41±0.02	0.49±0.03	0.62±0.01	0.66±0.00	0.67±0.01

Table 9: Mean absolute error (MAE $\pm \sigma$; lower is better) of different predictors on the PPBR benchmark with varying numbers of test samples included in fine-tuning (n). Best results in bold; next-best is underlined.

	size	$n = 0$	$n = 7$	$n = 10$	$n = 25$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$
dummy	0	11.40±0.00	11.45±0.25	11.31±0.20	11.03±0.09	10.89±0.07	10.84±0.03
z	128	15.26±0.26	11.64±0.28	11.46±0.27	10.98±0.13	10.78±0.05	10.51±0.10
all attributes	208	15.55±0.46	11.23±0.22	10.92±0.23	10.27±0.12	9.83±0.10	9.43±0.12
all attributes+ z	336	<u>14.27±0.33</u>	11.14±0.21	<u>10.96±0.17</u>	<u>10.26±0.14</u>	<u>9.76±0.10</u>	<u>9.30±0.08</u>
GES blanket	12	17.44±0.39	11.64±0.31	11.33±0.25	10.88±0.12	10.51±0.12	10.02±0.17
LiNGAM blanket	192	15.39±0.30	11.25±0.11	11.07±0.20	10.28±0.11	9.79±0.14	9.41±0.15
Group Lasso blanket	136	16.17±0.43	11.39±0.19	11.03±0.29	10.45±0.19	9.91±0.12	9.47±0.12
PPFS blanket	97	15.73±0.63	11.31±0.24	11.04±0.14	10.56±0.17	10.08±0.10	9.72±0.14
PL blanket	173	15.39±0.61	<u>11.17±0.18</u>	10.99±0.21	10.36±0.17	9.87±0.19	9.55±0.21
PL blanket (FS)	174	14.55±0.67	11.20±0.15	10.92±0.31	10.16±0.16	9.64±0.14	9.22±0.19

Table 10: Mean absolute error (MAE $\pm \sigma$; lower is better) of different predictors on the Lipophilicity benchmark with varying numbers of test samples included in fine-tuning (n). Best results in bold; next-best is underlined.

	size	$n = 0$	$n = 7$	$n = 10$	$n = 25$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$
dummy	0	0.99 \pm 0.00	1.02 \pm 0.01	1.00 \pm 0.01	0.98 \pm 0.00	0.97 \pm 0.00	0.97 \pm 0.00
z	128	0.79 \pm 0.01	0.97 \pm 0.01	0.94 \pm 0.01	0.86 \pm 0.01	0.81 \pm 0.01	0.78 \pm 0.01
all attributes	208	0.62 \pm 0.01	0.85 \pm 0.02	0.79 \pm 0.01	0.67 \pm 0.01	<u>0.64</u> \pm 0.01	0.61 \pm 0.01
all attributes+ z	336	0.62 \pm 0.01	0.85 \pm 0.02	0.79 \pm 0.01	<u>0.68</u> \pm 0.01	<u>0.64</u> \pm 0.01	0.61 \pm 0.01
GES blanket	188	0.62 \pm 0.01	0.85 \pm 0.01	0.80 \pm 0.01	<u>0.68</u> \pm 0.01	<u>0.64</u> \pm 0.01	0.61 \pm 0.01
LiNGAM blanket	197	0.62 \pm 0.01	0.85 \pm 0.02	0.79 \pm 0.01	<u>0.68</u> \pm 0.01	0.63 \pm 0.01	0.61 \pm 0.00
Group Lasso blanket	66	0.72 \pm 0.01	0.93 \pm 0.02	0.89 \pm 0.02	0.78 \pm 0.02	0.73 \pm 0.01	0.70 \pm 0.01
PPFS blanket	102	0.65 \pm 0.01	0.89 \pm 0.02	0.83 \pm 0.01	0.72 \pm 0.01	0.67 \pm 0.01	0.64 \pm 0.01
PL blanket	174	<u>0.63</u> \pm 0.01	<u>0.86</u> \pm 0.01	0.81 \pm 0.01	<u>0.68</u> \pm 0.01	<u>0.64</u> \pm 0.01	<u>0.62</u> \pm 0.01
PL blanket (FS)	174	0.62 \pm 0.01	0.87 \pm 0.02	<u>0.80</u> \pm 0.01	0.69 \pm 0.01	0.65 \pm 0.01	<u>0.62</u> \pm 0.00

Table 11: Mean absolute error (MAE $\pm \sigma$; lower is better) of different predictors on the Solubility benchmark with varying numbers of test samples included in fine-tuning (n). Best results in bold; next-best is underlined.

	size	$n = 0$	$n = 7$	$n = 10$	$n = 25$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$
dummy	0	1.89 \pm 0.00	1.94 \pm 0.01	1.90 \pm 0.01	1.85 \pm 0.01	1.83 \pm 0.00	1.83 \pm 0.00
z	128	1.08 \pm 0.01	1.60 \pm 0.04	1.48 \pm 0.02	1.25 \pm 0.02	1.17 \pm 0.02	1.11 \pm 0.01
all attributes	208	0.94 \pm 0.01	1.44 \pm 0.03	<u>1.31</u> \pm 0.03	1.09 \pm 0.02	1.00 \pm 0.01	<u>0.96</u> \pm 0.01
all attributes+ z	336	0.94 \pm 0.01	1.45 \pm 0.03	1.30 \pm 0.02	1.07 \pm 0.02	1.00 \pm 0.01	0.95 \pm 0.01
GES blanket	178	<u>0.95</u> \pm 0.01	1.44 \pm 0.04	1.32 \pm 0.03	1.09 \pm 0.01	<u>1.01</u> \pm 0.01	<u>0.96</u> \pm 0.01
LiNGAM blanket	204	0.94 \pm 0.01	1.46 \pm 0.04	1.30 \pm 0.03	<u>1.08</u> \pm 0.01	1.00 \pm 0.01	<u>0.96</u> \pm 0.01
Group Lasso blanket	88	0.99 \pm 0.01	1.51 \pm 0.02	1.37 \pm 0.03	1.14 \pm 0.01	1.05 \pm 0.01	1.01 \pm 0.01
PPFS blanket	146	<u>0.95</u> \pm 0.02	<u>1.45</u> \pm 0.04	1.32 \pm 0.02	1.09 \pm 0.02	<u>1.01</u> \pm 0.01	<u>0.96</u> \pm 0.01
PL blanket	170	<u>0.95</u> \pm 0.01	<u>1.45</u> \pm 0.04	1.32 \pm 0.03	1.10 \pm 0.02	<u>1.01</u> \pm 0.01	0.97 \pm 0.01
PL blanket (FS)	174	0.96 \pm 0.02	1.44 \pm 0.02	<u>1.31</u> \pm 0.03	1.09 \pm 0.02	<u>1.01</u> \pm 0.01	<u>0.96</u> \pm 0.01

A.2 Molecular descriptors

Table 12: Descriptors used in small molecule experiments. All descriptors are calculated using RDKit.

Gasteiger/Marsili Partial Charges	NOCount	RingCount
BalabanJ	NumHAcceptors	FractionCSP3
BertzCT	NumHDonors	NumSpiroAtoms
HallKierAlpha	NumHeteroatoms	NumBridgeheadAtoms
Kappa1 - Kappa3	NumRotatableBonds	TPSA
Phi	NumValenceElectrons	LabuteASA
Chi0, Chi1	NumAmideBonds	PEOE_VSA1 - PEOE_VSA14
Chi0n - Chi4n	NumAromaticRings	SMR_VSA1 - SMR_VSA10
Chi0v - Chi4v	NumSaturatedRings	SlogP_VSA1 - SlogP_VSA12
MolLogP	NumAliphaticRings	EState_VSA1 - EState_VSA11
MolMR	NumAromaticHeterocycles	VSA_EState1 - VSA_EState10
MolWt	NumSaturatedHeterocycles	MQNs
ExactMolWt	NumAliphaticHeterocycles	Topliss fragments
HeavyAtomCount	NumAromaticCarbocycles	Autocorr2D
HeavyAtomMolWt	NumSaturatedCarbocycles	BCUT2D
NHOHCount	NumAliphaticCarbocycles	