

Accuracy of macroscopic and microscopic pK_a predictions of small molecules evaluated by the SAMPL6 blind prediction challenge

Mehtap Isik (ORCID: [0000-0002-6789-952X](#))^{1,2*}, Ariën S. Rustenburg (ORCID: [0000-0002-3422-0613](#))^{1,3}, Andrea Rizzi (ORCID: [0000-0001-7693-2013](#))^{1,4}, M. R. Gunner⁶, David L. Mobley (ORCID: [0000-0002-1083-5533](#))⁵, John D. Chodera (ORCID: [0000-0003-0542-119X](#))¹

¹Computational and Systems Biology Program, Sloan Kettering Institute, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY 10065, United States; ²Tri-Institutional PhD Program in Chemical Biology, Weill Cornell Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Cornell University, New York, NY 10065, United States; ³Graduate Program in Physiology, Biophysics, and Systems Biology, Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, NY 10065, United States; ⁴Tri-Institutional PhD Program in Computational Biology and Medicine, Weill Cornell Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Cornell University, New York, NY 10065, United States; ⁵Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Department of Chemistry, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, United States; ⁶Department of Physics, City College of New York, New York NY 10031

*For correspondence:
mehtap.isik@choderlab.org (MI)

17

Abstract

Acid dissociation constant (pK_a) prediction is a prerequisite for predicting many other properties of small molecules such as protein-ligand binding affinity, distribution coefficient ($\log D$), membrane permeability, and solubility due to the necessity of predicting relevant protonation states and the free energy penalty of each state. SAMPL6 pK_a Challenge was the first time that a separate challenge was conducted for evaluating pK_a predictions as a part of SAMPL. It was motivated by the inaccuracies observed in prior physical property prediction challenges, such as SAMPL5 $\log D$ Challenge, caused by protonation state and pK_a prediction issues. The goal of the pK_a challenge was to elucidate the performance of contemporary pK_a prediction methods for drug-like molecules. The challenge set was composed of 24 kinase inhibitor fragment-like small molecules and some of them were multiprotic. 11 research groups contributed blind prediction sets of 37 pK_a prediction methods. Four widely used pK_a prediction methods that were missing from blind predictions were added as reference methods to challenge analysis. Collecting both microscopic and macroscopic pK_a predictions allowed in-depth evaluation of pK_a prediction performance. This article highlights deficiencies of typical pK_a prediction evaluation approaches when the difference between microscopic and macroscopic pK_a s is ignored and suggests more stringent evaluation criteria for microscopic and macroscopic pK_a predictions guided by the available experimental data. Top-performing submissions for macroscopic pK_a predictions achieved RMSE of 0.7-1.0 units and included both quantum-mechanical and empirical approaches. These predictions included less than 8 extra/missing macroscopic pK_a s for the set of 24 molecules. A large number of submissions had RMSE spanning 1-3 pK_a units. Molecules with sulfur-containing heterocycles, iodo, and bromo groups suffered from less accurate pK_a predictions on average considering all methods evaluated. For a subset of molecules, the available NMR-based dominant microstate sequence data was utilized to elucidate dominant tautomer prediction errors of microscopic pK_a predictions which was prominent for charged tautomers. SAMPL6 pK_a Challenge demonstrated the need for improving pK_a prediction methods for drug-like molecules, especially for challenging moieties and multiprotic molecules. The level of pK_a prediction inaccuracy observed in this challenge has potential to be detrimental to the performance of protein-ligand binding affinity predictions in two ways: (1) errors in predicted dominant charge and tautomeric state and (2) errors in the calculation of free energy correction for minor and multiple protonation states of the ligand.

43 0.1 Keywords

44 SAMPL · blind prediction challenge · acid dissociation constant · pK_a · small molecule · macroscopic pK_a · microscopic pK_a · macro-
45 scopic protonation state · microscopic protonation state

46 0.2 Abbreviations

47 **SAMPL** Statistical Assessment of the Modeling of Proteins and Ligands

48 **pK_a** $-\log_{10}$ acid dissociation equilibrium constant

49 **SEM** Standard error of the mean

50 **RMSE** Root mean squared error

51 **MAE** Mean absolute error

52 τ Kendall's rank correlation coefficient (Tau)

53 **R²** Coefficient of determination (R-Squared)

54 1 Introduction

55 The acid dissociation constant (pK_a) describes the protonation state equilibrium of a molecule given pH. Predicting pK_a is a
56 prerequisite for predicting many other properties of small molecules such as protein-ligand binding affinity, distribution coeffi-
57 cient ($\log D$), membrane permeability, and solubility. Computer-aided drug design efforts include assessing properties of virtual
58 molecules to guide synthesis and prioritization decisions. In such cases an experimental pK_a measurement is not possible.
59 Therefore, accurate computational pK_a prediction methods are required.

60 For a monoprotic weak acid (HA) or base (B) dissociation equilibria shown in Equation 1, the acid dissociation constant is
61 expressed as in Equations 2 or its common negative logarithmic form as in Equation 3. The ratio of ionization states can be
62 calculate with HHenderson-Hasselbalch equations shown in Equation 4.



$$K_a = \frac{[A^-][H^+]}{[HA]} \quad K_a = \frac{[B][H^+]}{[BH^+]} \quad (2)$$

$$pK_a = -\log_{10} K_a \quad (3)$$

$$pH = pK_a + \log_{10} \frac{[A^-]}{[HA]} \quad pH = pK_a + \log_{10} \frac{[B]}{[BH^+]} \quad (4)$$

63 Ionizable sites are found often in drug molecules and influence their pharmaceutical properties including target affinity,
64 ADME/Tox, and formulation properties [1]. Drug molecules with titratable groups can exist in many different charge and proto-
65 nation states based on the pH of the environment. We rely on pK_a values to determine in which charge and protonation states
66 the molecules exists and relative populations of these states. The pH of the human gut ranges between 1-8 and 74% of approved
67 drugs can change ionization states withing this physiological pH range [2] and because of this pK_a values of drug molecules pro-
68 vides essential information about their physicochemical and pharmaceutical properties. A wide distribution of acidic and basic
69 pK_a values, ranging from 0 to 12, have been observed in approved drugs [1, 2].

70 Small molecule pK_a predictions influence computational protein-ligand binding affinities in multiple ways. Errors in pK_a pre-
71 dictions can cause modeling the wrong charge, protonation, and tautomerization states which affect hydrogen bonding oppor-
72 tunities and charge distribution of the ligand. The prediction of the dominant protonation state and relative population of minor
73 states in aqueous medium is dictated by the pK_a values. The relative free energy of different protonation states in the aque-
74 ous state is a function of pK_a and pH, it contributes to the overall protein-ligand affinity in the form of a free energy penalty of
75 reaching higher energy protonation states [3].

76 Drug-like molecules present difficulties for pK_a prediction compared to simple monoprotic molecules. Drug-like molecules
77 are frequently multiprotic, have large conjugated systems, heterocycles, tautomerization. In addition that larger molecules
78 with conformational flexibility can have intramolecular hydrogen bonding which shifts pK_a values. These shifts could be real or

79 modeling artifacts due to collapsed conformations caused by deficiencies in solvation models. Yet predicting pK_a s of drug-like
80 molecules accurately is a prerequisite for computational drug discovery and design.

81 The definition of pK_a diverges into two for multiprotic molecules: macroscopic pK_a and microscopic pK_a . Macroscopic pK_a
82 describes the equilibrium dissociation constant between different charged states of the molecule. Each charge state can be
83 composed of multiple tautomers. Macroscopic pK_a is about the deprotonation of the molecule, not a particular titratable group.
84 Microscopic pK_a describes the acid dissociation equilibrium between individual tautomeric states of different charges. We refer
85 to collection of all tautomeric states of different macroscopic states (charge states) as microscopic states. Microscopic pK_a value
86 defined between two microstates captures the deprotonation of a single titratable group with a fixed background protonation state
87 of other titratable groups. Different experimental methods capture different definitions of pK_a s as explained in more detail in
88 this prior publication [4]. Most common pK_a measurement techniques such as potentiometric and spectrophotometric methods
89 measure macroscopic pK_a s while NMR measurements can determine microscopic pK_a s and microstate populations. Therefore,
90 it is important to pay attention to the source and definition of pK_a values to interpret their meaning correctly. Computational
91 methods can predict both microscopic and macroscopic pK_a s. While microscopic pK_a predictions are more informative for
92 determining relevant microstates/tautomers of a molecule and their relative free energies, computing predicted macroscopic
93 pK_a s is useful for direct comparison of methods to more common macroscopic experimental measurements. In this paper,
94 we explore approaches to assess the performance of both macroscopic and microscopic pK_a predictions, taking advantage of
95 available experimental data.

96 1.1 Motivation for a blind pK_a challenge

97 SAMPL (Statistical Assessment of the Modeling of Proteins and Ligands) is a series of annual computational prediction chal-
98 lenges for the computational chemistry community. The goal of SAMPL is evaluate to current performance of the models and to
99 bring the attention of quantitative biomolecular modeling field on major issues that limit the accuracy of protein-ligand binding
100 models.

101 SAMPL Challenges that focus on different physical properties so far have assessed intermolecular binding models of various
102 protein-ligand and host-guest systems, solvation models to predict hydration free energies and distribution coefficients. Poten-
103 tial benefits of these challenges are motivating improvement computational methods and revealing unexpected contributors to
104 error by focusing on interesting test systems. SAMPL Challenges have demonstrated the effects of force field accuracy, sampling
105 issues, solvation modeling defects, and tautomer/protonation state predictions on protein-ligand binding predictions.

106 During the SAMPL5 log D Challenge, the performance of cyclohexane-water log D predictions were lower than expected and
107 accuracy suffered when protonation states and tautomers were not taken into account [5, 6]. With the motivation of decon-
108 voluting the different sources of error contributing to the large errors observed in the SAMPL5 log D Challenge, we organized
109 separate of pK_a and log P challenges in SAMPL6 [4, 7, 8]. For this iteration of the SAMPL challenge, we have taken one step back
110 and isolated just the problem of predicting aqueous protonation states.

111 This is the first time a blind pK_a prediction challenge has been fielded as part of SAMPL. In this first iteration of the challenge,
112 we aimed to assess the performance of current pK_a prediction methods for drug-like molecules, investigate potential causes
113 of inaccurate pK_a estimates, and determine how much current level of expected accuracy might impact protein binding affinity
114 predictions. In binding free energy predictions, any error in predicting the free energy of accessing a minor aqueous protonation
115 state of ligand that contributes to the complex formation will directly add to the error in the predicted binding free energy.
116 Similarly for log D predictions, inaccurate prediction aqueous protonation state that contribute partitioning between phases or
117 prediction of relative free energy of these states will be detrimental to the accuracy of transfer free energy predictions.

118 1.2 Approaches to predict small molecule pK_a s

119 Overview of kinds of pKa prediction methods available (ML, QM, empirical methods ...)

120 2 Methods

121 2.1 Structure and logistics of the SAMPL6 pK_a Challenge

122 The SAMPL6 pK_a Challenge was conducted as a blind prediction challenge focus on predicting aqueous pK_a valueof 24 small
123 molecules that resemble fragments of kinase inhibitors.

124 The challenge molecule set was composed of small molecules with limited flexibility (less than 5 non-terminal rotatable
125 bonds) and covers limited chemical diversity. There are six 4-aminoquinazolines, two benzimidazoles, one pyrazolo[3,4-d]pyrimidine,




Figure 1. Distribution of molecular properties of 24 compounds in SAMPL6 pK_a Challenge. **A** Histogram of spectrophotometric pK_a measurements collected with Sirius T3 [4]. Overlayed carpet plot indicates the actual values. Five compounds have multiple measured pK_a s in the range of 2-12. **B** Histogram of molecular weights of compounds in SAMPL6 set. Molecular weights were calculated by neglecting counter ions. **C** Histogram of the number of non-terminal rotatable bonds in each molecule. **D** The histogram of the ratio of heteroatom (non-carbon heavy atom) count to the number of carbon atoms.

one pyridine, one 2-oxoquinoline substructure containing compounds with log *P* values in the range of 1.95–4.09. Information on experimental data collection is presented elsewhere [?].

Describe the structure of SAMPL6 pKa challenge

Experimental macroscopic pKa values were measured using a UV-metric assay performed using a Sirius T3 [cite exp. paper supported by Merck, MRL, Rahway NJ].

Communicate concepts behind challenge design and why we made specific choices: 1. Explain why we have types I, II, III 2. Explain why we pre-enumerated microstates

Participants had the option to submit predictions in one of 3 categories: Microscopic pKa values (type I), microscopic state populations (type II), or macroscopic pKa values (type III).

The comparison between macroscopic and microscopic pKa values is not always a straightforward one.

- When instructions and input files were made available

- Challenge dates

- Input files

- What to predict? Three type of submissions.

- Multiple submissions allowed

- Predicting the pKa values of the whole set wasn't a requirement.

- 2nd D3R/SAMPL Workshop took place in La Jolla, San Diego on Feb 22-23, 2018.

Referce Figure ???. Drug-like molecules are often larger and more complex than the ones used in this study.

2.2 Enumeration of requested prediction microscopic protonation states

1. OpenEye (filter out resonance structures), Epik

2. Participant supplied structures

Microstate pairs: Only +/-1 charge change transitions are allowed. List of allowed transitions. +2 transitions are not considered.

2.3 Evaluation approaches

2.3.1 Statistical metrics for submission performance

- Root mean squared error (RMSE)

- Mean absolute error (MAE)

- Mean Error (ME)

- Square of Pearson Correlation Coefficient (R^2)

- Slope of prediction vs. experimental value linear fit

Uncertainty in each performance statistic was calculated by bootstrapping (10,000) to estimate 95% confidence intervals.

2.3.2 Matching algorithms for pairing predicted and experimental pKas

Explain why it is necessary due to lacking structural information. Cite recommendations from article such as preserving sequence.

Experimental data doesn't inform protonation site and overall charge of species. Experimental data doesn't capture the whole picture. We don't know charge and we don't know tautomers. We don't know the charge state of macrostates, this causes a matching problem

Explain Hungarian method for matching experimental and predicted pKas

Explain Closest method for matching experimental and predicted pKas

Explain microstate based matching.

2.4 Reference calculations

Schrodinger Epik Schrodinger Jaguar Chemicalize MoKa

3 Results and Discussion

A paragraph to explain the submission methods. Define method categories: DL, LFER, QSPR/ML, QM, QM+LEC, and QM+MM, Blind predictions, Reference calculations, Null model (pKa prospector lookup)




Figure 2. RMSE and unmatched pK_a counts vs. submission ID plots for macroscopic pK_a predictions based on Hungarian matching. Methods are indicated by submission IDs. RMSE is shown with error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals obtained by bootstrapping over challenge molecules. Lower bar plots show the number of unmatched experimental pK_a s (light grey, missing predictions) and the number of unmatched pK_a predictions (dark grey, extra predictions) for each method between pH 2 and 12. Submission IDs are summarized in Table 1. Submission IDs of the form $nb\#\#\#$ refer to non-blinded reference methods computed after the blind challenge submission deadline. All others refer to blind, prospective predictions. Submissions are colored by their method categories. Light blue colored database look up methods are utilized as the null prediction method.

Submissions spanning different method categories were made to the SAMPL6 pK_a Challenge: database lookup (DL), linear free energy relationship (LFER), quantitative structure property relationship (QSPR), machine learning (ML), quantum mechanics (QM) models with and without linear empirical correction (LEC), and combined quantum mechanics and molecular mechanics (QM+MM). Unique submission IDs were assigned to each submission. Table 1 matches method names with submission IDs. Unique IDs were also assigned when multiple submissions exist for different submission types of the same method such as microscopic pK_a (type I) and macroscopic pK_a (type III).

3.1 Analysis of macroscopic pK_a predictions (Type III)

Refer to SI TABLE: Error statistics for all participants. Refer to SI FIGURE: Error distribution ridge plots for each method (exp-pred macroscopic pKa). Which methods tend to overestimate and which methods tend to underestimate?

Describe number of missing and extra pKa for each method. Report in total for all molecules how many predicted pKas are there and how many experimental pKas. Refer to FIGURE: missing and extra pKa counts.

Describe overall performance comparison of different methods, grouped by methods class.

Explain rationale behind how we analyze the data and determine success/failure

Performance comparison of different methods, grouped by methods class

183 Method comparison based on statistical metrics. Explain the numerical matching methods used. Explain rationale behind
184 how we analyze the data and determine success/failure. Method comparison according to different statistics: RMSE, MAE, ME,
185 R2, m, Kendall's tau.

Table 1. Submission IDs, names, category, and type for all the pK_a prediction sets. Reference calculations are labeled as $nb\#\#\#$. The method name column lists the names provided by each participant in the submission file. The “type” column indicates if submission was or a post-deadline reference calculation, denoted by “Blind” or “Reference” respectively. The table is not ordered by performance.

Method Category	Method	Microscopic pK_a (Type I) Submission ID	Macroscopic pK_a (Type III) Submission ID	Submission Type	Ref.
DL	Substructure matches to experimental data in pKa OpenEye pKa Prospector Database v1.0	<i>5nm4j</i>		Null	[9]
DL	OpenEye pKa-Prospector 1.0.0.3 with Analog Search ion identification algorithm	<i>pwn3m</i>		Null	[9]
LFER	ACD/pKa GALAS (ACD/Percepta Kernel v1.6)	<i>v8qph</i>	<i>37xm8</i>	Blind	[10]
LFER	ACD/pKa Classic (ACD/Percepta Kernel, v1.6)		<i>xmyhm</i>	Blind	[11]
LFER	Epik Scan (Schrodinger v2017-4)		<i>nb007</i>	Reference	[12]
LFER	Epik Microscopic (Schrodinger v2017-4)		<i>nb010</i>	Reference	[12]
QSPR/ML	OpenEye Gaussian Process	<i>6tvf8</i>	<i>hytjn</i>	Blind	[6]
QSPR/ML	OpenEye Gaussian Process Resampled		<i>q3pfp</i>	Blind	[6]
QSPR/ML	S+pkA (ADMET Predictor v8.5, Simulations Plus)	<i>hdiyq</i>	<i>gyuhx</i>	Blind	[13]
QSPR/ML	Chemcalize v18.23 (ChemAxon MarvinSketch v18.23)		<i>nb015</i>	Reference	[14]
QSPR/ML	MoKa v3.1.3	<i>nb016</i>	<i>nb017</i>	Reference	[15, 16]
QM	Adiabatic scheme with single point correction: SMD/M06-2X//6-311++G(d,p)//M06-2X/6-31+G(d) for bases and SMD/M06-2X//6-311++G(d,p)//M06-2X/6-31G(d) for acids + thermal corrections	<i>k08yx</i>	<i>ryzue</i>	Blind	[17]
QM	Direct scheme with single point correction: SMD/M06-2X//6-311++G(d,p)//M06-2X/6-31+G(d) for bases and SMD/M06-2X//6-311++G(d,p)//M06-2X/6-31G(d) for acids + thermal corrections	<i>w4z0e</i>	<i>xikp8</i>	Blind	[17]
QM	Adiabatic scheme: thermodynamic cycle that uses gas phase optimized structures for gas phase free energy and solution phase geometries for solvent phase free energy. SMD/M06-2X/6-31+G(d) for bases and SMD/M06-2X/6-31G(d) for acids + thermal corrections	<i>wcvnu</i>	<i>5byn6</i>	Blind	[17]
QM	Vertical scheme: thermodynamic cycle that uses only gas phase optimized structures to compute gas phase and solvation free energy. SMD/M06-2X/6-31+G(d) for bases and SMD/M06-2X/6-31G(d) for acids + Thermal corrections	<i>arcko</i>	<i>w4iyd</i>	Blind	[17]
QM	Direct scheme: solution phase free energy is determined by solution phase geometries without thermodynamic cycle SMD/M06-2X/6-31+G(d) for bases and SMD/M06-2X/6-31G(d) for acids + thermal corrections	<i>wexjs</i>	<i>y75vj</i>	Blind	[17]
QM + LEC	Jaguar (Schrodinger v2017-4)	<i>nb011</i>	<i>nb013</i>	Reference	[18]
QM + LEC	CPCM/B3LYP/6-311+G(d,p) and global fitting	<i>y4wws</i>	<i>35bdm</i>	Blind	[19]
QM + LEC	CPCM/B3LYP/6-311+G(d,p) and separate fitting for neutral to negative and for positive to neutral transformations	<i>qsicn</i>	<i>p0jba</i>	Blind	[19]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/6-311+G(d,p)-P3NI-q-noThiols-2par	<i>kxzt</i>	<i>ds62k</i>	Blind	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/cc-pVTZ-P2-q-noThiols-2par	<i>ftc8w</i>	<i>2ii2g</i>	Blind	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/6-311+G(d,p)-P2-phi-all-2par	<i>ktpj5</i>	<i>nb001</i>	Blind*	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/6-311+G(d,p)-P2-phi-noThiols-2par	<i>wuuvc</i>	<i>nb002</i>	Blind*	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/6-311+G(d,p)-P3NI-phi-all-2par	<i>2umai</i>	<i>nb003</i>	Blind*	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/6-311+G(d,p)-P3NI-phi-noThiols-2par	<i>cm2yq</i>	<i>nb004</i>	Blind*	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/6-311+G(d,p)-P2-phi-all-1par	<i>z7fhp</i>	<i>nb005</i>	Blind*	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/6-311+G(d,p)-P3NI-phi-all-1par	<i>8toyp</i>	<i>nb006</i>	Blind*	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/cc-pVTZ-P2-phi-noThiols-2par	<i>epvmk</i>	<i>tjjd0</i>	Blind	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/cc-pVTZ-P2-phi-all-2par	<i>xnoe0</i>	<i>rnkhqa</i>	Blind	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/MP2/cc-pVTZ-P3NI-phi-noThiols-2par	<i>4o0ia</i>	<i>mpwiy</i>	Blind	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/B3LYP/6-311+G(d,p)-P3NI-q-noThiols-2par	<i>nxaaw</i>	<i>ad5pu</i>	Blind	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/B3LYP/6-311+G(d,p)-P3NI-phi-noThiols-2par	<i>0xi4b</i>	<i>f0gew</i>	Blind	[20]
QM + LEC	EC-RISM/B3LYP/6-311+G(d,p)-P2-phi-noThiols-2par	<i>cywyk</i>	<i>np6b4</i>	Blind	[20]
QM + LEC	PCM/B3LYP/6-311+G(d,p)	<i>gdqeg</i>	<i>yc70m</i>	Blind	[20]
QM + LEC	COSMOtherm_FINE17 (COSMOtherm C30_1701, BP/TZVPD/FINE//BP/TZVP/COSMO)	<i>t8ewk</i>	<i>0hxtm</i>	Blind	[21, 22]
QM + LEC	DSD-BLYP-D3(BJ)/def2-TZVPD//PBEh-3c[DCOSMO-RS] + RRHO(GFN-XTB[GBSA]) + Gsolv(COSMO-RS[TZVPD]) and linear fit		<i>xvxzd</i>	Blind	[23]
QM + LEC	ReSCoSS conformations // DSD-BLYP-D3 reranking // COSMOtherm pKa: DSD-BLYP-D3(BJ)/def2-TZVPD//PBE-D3(BJ)/def2-TZVP/COSMO + RRHO[GFN-XTB + GBSA-water] + Gsolv[DCOSMO-RS(FINE17/TZVPD)] level and COSMOtherm pKa applied at the single conformer pair level (COSMOthermX17.0.5 release and BP-TZVPD-FINE-C30-1701 parameterization)	<i>eyetm</i>	<i>8xt50</i>	Blind	[23]
QM + LEC	ReSCoSS conformations // COSMOtherm pKa: DSD-BLYP-D3(BJ)/def2-TZVPD//PBE-D3(BJ)/def2-TZVP/COSMO + RRHO[GFN-XTB + GBSA-water] + Gsolv[DCOSMO-RS(FINE17/TZVPD)] level and COSMOtherm pKa was applied directly on the resulting conformer sets with at least 5% Boltzmann weights for each microspecies (COSMOthermX17.0.5 release and BP-TZVPD-FINE-C30-1701 parameterization)	<i>ccpmw</i>	<i>yqkga</i>	Blind	[23]
QM + MM	M06-2X/6-31G*(for bases) or 6-31+G*(for acids) for gas phase, solvation free energy using TI with explicit solvent and GAFF, solvation free energy of proton -265.6 kcal/mol	<i>0wfzo</i>		Blind	[24]
QM + MM	M06-2X/6-31G*(for bases) or 6-31+G*(for acids) for gas phase, solvation free energy using TI with explicit solvent and GAFF, solvation free energy of proton -271.88 kcal/mol	<i>z3btv</i>		Blind	
QM + MM	M06-2X/6-31G*(for bases) or 6-31+G*(for acids) + thermal state correction for gas phase, solvation free energy using TI with explicit solvent and GAFF, solvation free energy of proton -265.6 kcal/mol	<i>758j8</i>		Blind	
QM + MM	M06-2X/6-31G*(for bases) or 6-31+G*(for acids) + thermal state correction for gas phase, solvation free energy using TI with explicit solvent and GAFF, solvation free energy of proton -271.88 kcal/mol	<i>hgn83</i>		Blind	

* Microscopic pK_a submissions were blind, however, participant requested a correction after blind submission deadline for macroscopic pK_a submissions. Therefore, these were assigned submission IDs in the form of $nb\#\#\#$.




Figure 3. Additional performance statistics for macroscopic pKa predictions based on Hungarian matching. Methods are indicated by submission IDs. Mean absolute error (MAE), mean error (ME), Pearson's R², and Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient Tau (τ) are shown, with error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals obtained by bootstrapping over challenge molecules. Refer to Table 1 for submission IDs and method names. Submissions are colored by their method categories. Light blue colored database look up methods are utilized as the null prediction method.

Table 2. Four consistently well-performing prediction methods for macroscopic pK_a prediction based on consistent ranking within the Top 10 according to various statistical metrics. Submissions were ranked according to RMSE, MAE, R², and τ . Consistently well-performing methods were selected as the ones that rank in the Top 10 in each of these statistical metrics. These methods also have less than 2 unmatched experimental pK_as and less than 7 unmatched predicted pK_as according to Hungarian matching. Performance statistics are provided as mean and 95% confidence intervals.

Submission ID	Method Name	RMSE	MAE	R ²	Kendall's Tau (τ)	Unmatched Exp. pK _a Count	Unmatched Pred. pK _a Count [2,12]
xvxzd	Full quantum chemical calculation of free energies and fit to experimental pKa	0.68 [0.54, 0.81]	0.58 [0.45, 0.71]	0.94 [0.88, 0.97]	0.82 [0.68, 0.92]	2	4
gyuhx	S+pKa	0.73 [0.55, 0.91]	0.59 [0.44, 0.74]	0.93 [0.88, 0.96]	0.88 [0.8, 0.94]	0	7
xmyhm	ACD/pKa Classic	0.79 [0.52, 1.03]	0.56 [0.38, 0.77]	0.92 [0.85, 0.97]	0.81 [0.68, 0.9]	0	3
8xt50	ReSCoSS conformations // DSD-BLYP-D3 reranking // COSMOtherm pKa	1.07 [0.78, 1.36]	0.81 [0.58, 1.07]	0.91 [0.84, 0.95]	0.80 [0.68, 0.89]	0	0

3.1.1 Consistently well performing methods for macroscopic pK_a prediction

Check if top few performing methods are consistent between error metrics.

3.1.2 Which chemicals are harder to predict?

For physical prediction methods sulfur containing heterocycles, amide next to aromatic heterocycles, compounds with iodo and bromo domains have lower pKa prediction accuracy.

Prediction performance of individual molecules

Which chemical structures make pKa predictions more difficult?

SAMPL6 pKa set consisted of only 24 small molecules which limits our ability to do statistical analysis to determine which chemical substructures contribute to greater errors in pKa predictions.

Illustration/explanation of effects where microscopic pKas and macroscopic pKas can differ

Are there any correlations between molecular descriptors and pKa errors?

What can we learn from failures? Which physical effects are driving failures?

Does molecular descriptors explain errors/performance ? We looked for correlation with descriptors, and potential explanation for errors. Keep spurious correlations in mind if we have many descriptors. No correlation observed. Reference the SI Figure of correlations.

Comparison of errors/performance against molecular descriptors. Look for correlation with descriptors, and potential explanation for errors. Keep spurious correlations in mind if we have many descriptors.

Refer to Figure SI: correlation between prediction error and molecular descriptors. There is no clear correlation between molecular descriptors and mean absolute error for each molecule when calculated for all methods.

Are pKa predictions better in middle region? Error in pKa predictions does not correlate with the true value of pKa. No correlation between pKa value and error was seen. Reference the SI Figure.

Refer to Ridge plots of Delta pKa error to identify compounds that were frequently mispredicted.

Compare ME of molecules across methods. Are there molecules often overestimated or underestimated?

No correlation of macroscopic pKa number to the errors? But we have low representation of multiprotic compounds

3.2 Analysis of microscopic pK_a predictions using microstates determined by NMR (8 molecules)

3.2.1 Comparing microscopic pKa predictions directly to macroscopic experimental pKa values with numerical matching leads to underestimation of errors

Demonstrate how numerical matching often masks the error Match by Hungarian and calculate accuracy of microstate prediction overall. When matched by pKa value, do people come with the same transition pairs?

Reference Figure S4 For most methods the microstate pair of Hungarian predicted pKa does not match experimentally determined microstate pair.

Discussion of matching experimental and predicted values

Difficulty of assessing predicted pKas using experimental data: matching problem




Figure 4. Predicted vs. experimental value correlation plots of 4 consistently well-performing methods, a representative method with average performance (2ii2g), and the null method (5nm4j). Dark and light green shaded areas indicate 0.5 and 1.0 units of error. Error bars indicate standard error of the mean of predicted and experimental values. Experimental pK_a SEM values are too small to be seen under the data points. EC-RISM/MP2/cc-pVTZ-P2-q-noThiols-2par method (2ii2g) was selected as the representative method with average performance because it is the method with the highest RMSE below the median.






Figure 5. Molecules of SAMPL6 Challenge with MAE calculated for all macroscopic pK_a predictions. MAE calculated considering all prediction methods indicate which molecules had the lowest prediction accuracy in SAMPL6 Challenge. MAE values calculated for each molecule include all the matched pK_a values, which could be more than one per method for multiprotic molecules (SM06, SM14, SM15, SM16, SM18, SM22). Hungarian matching algorithm was employed for pairing experimental and predicted pK_a values. MAE values are reported with 95% confidence intervals.



C SAMPL6 molecules with sulfur-containing heterocycles



D SAMPL6 molecules with bromo and iodo groups




Figure 6. Average prediction accuracy calculated over all prediction methods was lower for molecules with sulfur-containing heterocycles, bromo, and iodo groups. (A) MAE calculated for each molecule as an average of all methods. (B) MAE of each molecule broken out by method category. QM-based methods (blue) include QM predictions with or without linear empirical correction. Empirical methods (green) include QSAR, ML, DL, and LFER approaches. (C) Depiction of SAMPL6 molecules with sulfur-containing heterocycles. (D) Depiction of SAMPL6 molecules with iodo and bromo groups.




Figure 7. Macroscopic pK_a prediction error distribution plots show how prediction accuracy varies across methods and individual molecules. (A) pK_a prediction error distribution for each submission for all molecules according to Hungarian matching. (B) Error distribution for each SAMPL6 molecule for all prediction methods according to Hungarian matching. For multiprotic molecules, pK_a ID numbers (pKa1, pKa2, and pKa3) were assigned in the direction of increasing experimental pK_a value.




Figure 8. NMR determination of dominant microstates allowed in depth evaluation of microscopic pKa predictions of 8 compounds.

A Dominant microstate sequence of two compounds (SM07 and SM14) were determined by NMR [4]. Based on these reference compounds dominant microstates of 6 other derivative compounds were inferred and experimental pKa values were assigned to titratable groups with the assumption that only the dominant microstates have significant contributions to the experimentally observed pKa. **B** RMSE vs. submission ID and unmatched pKa vs. submission ID plots for the evaluation of microscopic pKa predictions of 8 molecules by Hungarian matching to experimental macroscopic pKas. **C** RMSE vs. submission ID and unmatched pKa vs. submission ID plots showing the evaluation of microscopic pKa predictions of 8 molecules by microstate-based matching between predicted microscopic pKas and experimental macroscopic pKa values. Submissions *0wfzo*, *z3btv*, *758j8*, and *hgn83* have RMSE values bigger than 10 pKa units which are beyond the y-axis limits of subplot **C** and **B**. RMSE is shown with error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals obtained by bootstrapping over challenge molecules. Lower bar plots show the number of unmatched experimental pKas (light grey, missing predictions) and the number of unmatched pKa predictions (dark grey, extra predictions) for each method between pH 2 and 12. Submission IDs are summarized in Table 1.

218 Explain rationale behind how we analyze the data and determine success/failure

219 Compare experimental data to microscopic pKa predictions, assuming experimental pKas are titrations of distinguishable
220 sides and therefore equal to microscopic pKas. Molecules with only 1 pKa or well separated multiple pKas (more than 3 pKa
221 units apart) SM14 and SM18 were excluded from this analysis, since their experimental pKa values don't satisfy these criteria.

222 Errors computed by microstate-based matching are larger compared to numerical matching algorithms. Microscopic pKa
223 analysis with numerical matching algorithms may mask errors due to higher number of guesses made.

224 Conclusions will only be about 4-aminoquinazoline series and benzimidazole (8 molecules, 10 pKas) Refer to SI figure of
225 dominant microstates.

226 Choosing molecules with right protonation state is important. Do people predict the correct sequence of dominant mi-
227 crostates? " Even if your pKa prediction is correct, protonation state prediction can be wrong." Analyze which state has lowest
228 free energy for each charge group (The sequence of "experimentally visible states")

229 3.2.2 Accuracy of predicted pKa values when microstate matching is used

230 Assessment of individual methods by each of our analysis methods

231 Performance comparison of different methods, grouped by methods class

232 Comment on the ranking of microscopic pKa prediction error statistics for all participants (8 mol, microstate match). Refer to Fig. 9

233 3.2.3 Dominant microstate prediction accuracy of methods

234 Calculate relative free energy of microstates to determine dominant microstate of each charge Compare predicted and experi-
235 mental dominant microstates and calculate accuracy of each method

236 What percent of the time predictions capture the dominant protonation state correctly? Match by microstate and calculate
237 RMSE and MAE. If you know the microstates, can you predict the value of the pKa right?

238 Does top 3 methods predict the same dominant microstate sequence? How differently do different methods predict microscopic transi-
tions? (method vs method correlation plot to see if methods predict the same microstate pairs or not)

239 3.2.4 Which molecules caused lower dominant microstate prediction accuracy?

240 Which molecule has more errors in predicting the major microstates?

241 Comment on consensus prediction accuracy. Comparison of predicted microstates using consensus set of transitions of high accuracy
prediction methods

242 3.3 Analyzing microscopic pKa prediction from the perspective of thermodynamics

243 Explain linearity relative free energy of protonation states with respect to pH. Free energy perspective simplifies data capturing
244 and analysis. Reference Marilyn's paper.

245 Thermodynamic cycle closure checking allows evaluation of microscopic pKas without experimental data. Checking for ther-
246 modynamic consistency

247 3.3.1 Cycle closure error

248 - Introduce linear protonation state free energy diagram [Cite Gunner et al 2019 paper] FIGURE: linear plot of free energy vs pH

249 Marilyn observed very good cycle closure results and very bad one that are up to 10 kcal/mol

250 She suggesting checking the cycle with maximum cycle closure error for each method and reporting that for each method.

251 An histogram of max cycle closure error will help us bin these results into 3 categories: 1. good agreement 2. moderate 3. severe

252 "We think thermodynamic cycles of protonation states need to be closed" Message: Methods need to checked for cycle closure
253 errors. There can be information there that can be used to correct pKa predictions. When cycles are not closed it may be used
254 as an indicator of prediction uncertainty.

255 3.4 How would pKa errors affect protein-ligand binding affinity predictions?

256 Illustrate the ways in which the pKa errors can influence prediction errors for binding affinities




Figure 9. Additional performance statistics for microscopic pK_a predictions for 8 molecules with experimentally determined dominant microstates. Microstate-based matching was performed between experimental pK_a values and predicted microscopic pK_as. Mean absolute error (MAE), mean error (ME), Pearson's R², and Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient Tau (τ) are shown, with error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals obtained by bootstrapping over challenge molecules. Methods are indicated by submission IDs. Submissions are colored by their method categories. Refer to Table 1 for submission IDs and method names. Submissions 0wfzo, z3btx, 758j8, and hgn83 have MAE and ME values bigger than 10 pK_a units which are beyond the y-axis limits of subplots A and B. A large number and wide variety of methods have a statistically indistinguishable performance based on correlation based statistic (C and D), in part because of the relatively small dynamic range the small size of the set of 8 molecules.





Figure 10. Some methods predicted the sequence of dominant tautomers inaccurately. Prediction accuracy of dominant microstate of each charged state was calculated using the dominant microstate sequence determined by NMR for 8 molecules as reference. **(A)** Dominant microstate accuracy vs. submission ID plot was calculated considering all the dominant microstates seen in the 8 molecule experimental microstate dataset. **(B)** Dominant microstate accuracy vs. submission ID plot was generated considering only the dominant microstates of charge 0 and +1 seen in the 8 molecule experimental microstate dataset. Accuracy of each molecule is broken out by total charge of the microstate. **(C)** Dominant microstate prediction accuracy calculated for each molecule averaged over all methods. In **(B)** and **(C)**, the accuracy of predicting the dominant neutral tautomer is showed in blue and the accuracy of predicting the dominant +1 charged tautomer is showed in green. Error bars denoting 95% confidence intervals obtained by bootstrapping.


A When only the minor protonation state can bind to the protein



$$\Delta G_{bind} = \Delta G_{bind}^C + \Delta G_{prot}$$

$$\Delta G_{bind} = \Delta G_{bind}^C + RT(pH - pK_a) \ln(10)$$

B When multiple protonation states can bind to the protein



$$\Delta G_{bind} = \Delta G_{bind}^N + \Delta G_{corr}$$

$$\Delta G_{bind} = \Delta G_{bind}^N - RT \ln \frac{1 + e^{-\frac{\Delta G_{bind}^C - \Delta G_{bind}^N}{RT}} 10^{pK_a - pH}}{1 + 10^{pK_a - pH}}$$

Figure 11. Aqueous pK_a of the ligand can influence overall protein-ligand binding affinity. **A** When only the minor aqueous protonation state contributes to protein-ligand complex formation, overall binding free energy (ΔG_{bind}) needs to be calculated as the sum of binding affinity of the minor state and the protonation penalty of that state. **B** When multiple charge states contribute to complex formation, overall free energy of binding includes a multiple protonation states correction (MPSC) term (ΔG_{corr}). MPSC is a function of pH, aqueous pK_a of the ligand, and the difference between the binding free energy of charged and neutral species ($\Delta G_{bind}^C - \Delta G_{bind}^N$).

How do accuracy limitations in small molecule pK_a prediction translate into modeling errors in ligand affinity prediction?

257

In addition, determining the free energy penalty of such states [3] also requires knowing the pK_a value.

258

EQUATION: free energy of protonation state equation

259

$$\Delta G_{bind} = \Delta G_{bind}^C + \Delta G_{prot}$$

$$\Delta G_{bind} = \Delta G_{bind}^C + RT(pH - pK_a) \ln(10)$$

$$\Delta G_{bind} = \Delta G_{bind}^N + \Delta G_{corr}$$

$$\Delta G_{bind} = \Delta G_{bind}^N - RT \ln \frac{1 + e^{-\frac{\Delta G_{bind}^C - \Delta G_{bind}^N}{RT}} 10^{pK_a - pH}}{1 + 10^{pK_a - pH}}$$

3.5 Lessons learned from SAMPL6 pK_a Challenge

260

Do any methods predict within experimental accuracy (how is the field doing overall)?

261

Common challenging factors for accurate pK_a predictions. Tautomers, Heterocycles etc.

262

Overall results: Do any methods predict within experimental accuracy (how is the field doing overall)? Common challenging factors for accurate pK_a predictions. Tautomers, Heterocycles etc.

263

Discussion of matching problem between experimental and predicted values. Difficulty of assessing predicted pK_a s using experimental data: matching problem Explain rationale behind how we analyze the data and determine success/failure.

264

Conclusion about prediction performance of individual molecules: SAMPL6 pK_a set consisted of only 24 small molecules which limits our ability to do statistical analysis to determine which chemical substructures contribute to greater errors in pK_a predictions. Which chemical structures make pK_a predictions more difficult?

265

What can we learn from failures? Which physical effects are driving failures? Cycle closure errors




Figure 12. Inaccuracy of pK_a prediction (± 1 unit) affects the accuracy of MPSC and overall protein-ligand binding free energy calculation in varying amounts based on aqueous pK_a value and relative binding affinity of individual protonation states ($\Delta\Delta G = \Delta G_{bind}^C - \Delta G_{bind}^N$). All calculations are made for 25°C, and for a ligand with single basic titratable group. **A, C, E, and G show MPSC (ΔG_{corr}) calculated with true vs. inaccurate pK_a . **B, D, F, and H** show comparison of the absolute error to ΔG_{bind} caused by ignoring the MPSC completely (solid lines) vs. calculating MPSC based in inaccurate pK_a value (dashed lines). These plots provide guidance on when it is beneficial to include MPSC correction based on pK_a error, $pH - pK_a$, and $\Delta\Delta G$.**

271 3.6 Suggestions for future challenges

272 Discuss what can be done to further improve future challenges

273 How can we maximize what we learn? What should we have people predict? How should we select compounds / measure
274 pKas?

275 Suggestions about challenge construction

276 Future challenge direction Challenge path: predict pKas, give people pKas to predict logDs on same molecules, then predict
277 for new set of compounds logDs without provided pKas.

278 Enumeration of protonation states before predictions (which states does one need to consider?)

279 Suggestions about challenge analysis

280 NMR experimental techniques could be used to validate microstate information in future challenges

281 Reporting microscopic pKa predictions with charges, microstate free energies is better Experimental dataset with microstate
282 information is more helpful.

283 What can be done to further improve future challenges How can we maximize what we learn? What should we have people
284 predict? How should we select compounds / measure pKas? NMR experimental techniques could be used to validate microstate
285 information in future challenges

286 Suggestions about challenge construction Enumeration of protonation states before predictions (which states does one need
287 to consider?) Suggestions about challenge analysis

288 4 Conclusion

289 5 Code and data availability

- 290 SAMPL6 p_a challenge instructions, submissions, experimental data and analysis is available at
<https://github.com/samplchallenges/SAMPL6>

291 6 Overview of supplementary information

292 Contents of the Supplementary Information:

- 293 TABLE S1: SMILES and InChI identifiers of SAMPL6 p_a Challenge molecules.
- 294 TABLE S2: Evaluation statistics calculated for all macroscopic p_a prediction submissions based on Hungarian match for
295 24 molecules.
- 296 TABLE S3: Evaluation statistics calculated for all microscopic p_a prediction submissions based on Hungarian match for 8
297 molecules with NMR data.
- 298 TABLE S4: Evaluation statistics calculated for all microscopic p_a prediction submissions based on microstate match for 8
299 molecules with NMR data.
- 300 FIGURE S1: Dominant microstates of 8 molecules were determined based on NMR measurements.
- 301 FIGURE S2: MAE of macroscopic p_a predictions of each molecule did not show any significant correlation with any molec-
302 ular descriptor.
- 303 FIGURE S3: The value of macroscopic p_a was not a factor affecting prediction error seen in SAMPL6 Challenge according
304 to the analysis with Hungarian matching.
- 305 FIGURE S4: There was low agreement between experimental dominant microstate pairs and the predicted microstate pairs
306 selected by Hungarian algorithm for microscopic p_a predictions.

307 Extra files included in *SAMPL6-supplementary-documents.tar.gz*:

- 308 • SAMPL6-pKa-chemical-identifiers-table.csv
- 309 • macroscopic-pKa-statistics-24mol-hungarian-match.csv
- 310 • microscopic-pKa-statistics-8mol-hungarian-match-table.csv
- 311 • microscopic-pKa-statistics-8mol-microstate-match-table.csv
- 312 • experimental-microstates-of-8mol-based-on-NMR.csv

313 7 Author Contributions

314 Conceptualization, MI, JDC, CB, DLM ; Methodology, MI, JDC ; Software, MI, AR, ASR ; Formal Analysis, MI, ASR, AR ; Investigation,
315 MI ; Resources, JDC; Data Curation, MI ; Writing-Original Draft, MI, JDC; Writing - Review and Editing, MI, ASR, AR, CB, DLM, JDC;
316 Visualization, MI, AR ; Supervision, JDC, DLM, CB, ASR ; Project Administration, MI ; Funding Acquisition, JDC, DLM.

317 8 Acknowledgments

318 Complete acknowledgments section. Caitlin Bannan, Thomas Fox

319 MI, ASR, and JDC acknowledge support from the Sloan Kettering Institute. JDC acknowledges support from NIH grant P30
320 CA008748. MI acknowledges Doris J. Hutchinson Fellowship. We thank Brad Sherborne for his valuable insights at the conception
321 of the pK_a challenge and connecting us with Timothy Rhodes and Dorothy Levorse who were able to provide resources and
322 expertise for experimental measurements performed at MRL. We acknowledge Paul Czodrowski who provided feedback on
323 multiple stages of this work: challenge construction, purchasable compound selection and manuscript. MI, ASR, AR and JDC are
324 grateful to OpenEye Scientific for providing a free academic software license for use in this work.

325 Mike Chui

326 9 Disclosures

327 JDC is a member of the Scientific Advisory Board for Schrödinger, LLC. DLM is a member of the Scientific Advisory Board of
328 OpenEye Scientific Software.

329 Table ref: [10, 11, 13, 14, 16] trial: [], +, -, *, #, \m

330 References

- 331 [1] **Manallack DT**, Prankerd RJ, Yuriev E, Oprea TI, Chalmers DK. The Significance of Acid/Base Properties in Drug Discovery. *Chem Soc Rev.* 2013; 42(2):485–496. doi: [10.1039/C2CS35348B](https://doi.org/10.1039/C2CS35348B).
- 333 [2] **Manallack DT**, Prankerd RJ, Nassta GC, Ursu O, Oprea TI, Chalmers DK. A Chemogenomic Analysis of Ionization Constants-Implications for Drug Discovery. *ChemMedChem.* 2013 Feb; 8(2):242–255. doi: [10.1002/cmdc.201200507](https://doi.org/10.1002/cmdc.201200507).
- 335 [3] **de Oliveira C**, Yu HS, Chen W, Abel R, Wang L. Rigorous Free Energy Perturbation Approach to Estimating Relative Binding Affinities between Ligands with Multiple Protonation and Tautomeric States. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation.* 2019 Jan; 15(1):424–435. doi: [10.1021/acs.jctc.8b00826](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.8b00826).
- 338 [4] **Işık M**, Levorse D, Rustenburg AS, Ndukwe IE, Wang H, Wang X, Reibarkh M, Martin GE, Makarov AA, Mobley DL, Rhodes T, Chodera JD. pKa Measurements for the SAMPL6 Prediction Challenge for a Set of Kinase Inhibitor-like Fragments. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design.* 2018 Oct; 32(10):1117–1138. doi: [10.1007/s10822-018-0168-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-018-0168-0).
- 341 [5] **Pickard FC**, König G, Tofoleanu F, Lee J, Simonett AC, Shao Y, Ponder JW, Brooks BR. Blind Prediction of Distribution in the SAMPL5 Challenge with QM Based Protomer and pKa Corrections. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design.* 2016 Nov; 30(11):1087–1100. doi: [10.1007/s10822-016-9955-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-016-9955-7).
- 344 [6] **Bannan CC**, Mobley DL, Skillman AG. SAMPL6 Challenge Results from $\text{\$\$}pK_a\$\$$ Predictions Based on a General Gaussian Process Model. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design.* 2018 Oct; 32(10):1165–1177. doi: [10.1007/s10822-018-0169-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-018-0169-z).
- 346 [7] **Işık M**, Levorse D, Mobley DL, Rhodes T, Chodera JD. Octanol-Water Partition Coefficient Measurements for the SAMPL6 Blind Prediction Challenge. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design.* 2020 Apr; 34(4):405–420. doi: [10.1007/s10822-019-00271-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-019-00271-3).
- 348 [8] **Işık M**, Bergazin TD, Fox T, Rizzi A, Chodera JD, Mobley DL. Assessing the Accuracy of Octanol-Water Partition Coefficient Predictions in the SAMPL6 Part II Log P Challenge. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design.* 2020 Apr; 34(4):335–370. doi: [10.1007/s10822-020-00295-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-020-00295-0).
- 350 [9] OpenEye pKa Prospector;. OpenEye Scientific Software, Santa Fe, NM. Accessed on Jan 23, 2018. <https://www.eyesopen.com/pka-prospector>.
- 353 [10] ACD/pKa GALAS (ACD/Percepta Kernel v1.6);. Advanced Chemistry Development, Inc., Toronto, ON, Canada, 2018. <https://www.acdlabs.com/products/percepta/predictors/pKa/>.
- 354 [11] ACD/pKa Classic (ACD/Percepta Kernel v1.6);. Advanced Chemistry Development, Inc., Toronto, ON, Canada, 2018. <https://www.acdlabs.com/products/percepta/predictors/pKa/>.
- 355 [12] **Shelley JC**, Cholleti A, Frye LL, Greenwood JR, Timlin MR, Uchimaya M. Epik: A Software Program for pKa Prediction and Protonation State Generation for Drug-like Molecules. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design.* 2007 Dec; 21(12):681–691. doi: [10.1007/s10822-007-9133-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-007-9133-z).

- 358 [13] Simulations Plus ADMET Predictor v8.5;. Simulations Plus, Lancaster, CA, 2018. <https://www.simulations-plus.com/software/admetpredictor/physicochemical-biopharmaceutical/>.
- 359
- 360 [14] Chemicalize v18.23 (ChemAxon MarvinSketch v18.23);. ChemAxon, Budapest, Hungary, 2018. <https://docs.chemaxon.com/display/docs/pKa+Plugin>.
- 361
- 362 [15] Milletti F, Storchi L, Sforza G, Cruciani G. New and Original pK_a Prediction Method Using Grid Molecular Interaction Fields. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*. 2007 Nov; 47(6):2172–2181. doi: [10.1021/ci700018y](https://doi.org/10.1021/ci700018y).
- 363
- 364 [16] MoKa;. Molecular Discovery, Hertfordshire, UK, 2018. <https://www.moldiscovery.com/software/moka/>.
- 365 [17] Zeng Q, Jones MR, Brooks BR. Absolute and Relative pKa Predictions via a DFT Approach Applied to the SAMPL6 Blind Challenge. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*. 2018 Oct; 32(10):1179–1189. doi: [10.1007/s10822-018-0150-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-018-0150-x).
- 366
- 367 [18] Bochevarov AD, Harder E, Hughes TF, Greenwood JR, Braden DA, Philipp DM, Rinaldo D, Halls MD, Zhang J, Friesner RA. Jaguar: A High-Performance Quantum Chemistry Software Program with Strengths in Life and Materials Sciences. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*. 2013 Sep; 113(18):2110–2142. doi: [10.1002/qua.24481](https://doi.org/10.1002/qua.24481).
- 368
- 369
- 370 [19] Selwa E, Kenney IM, Beckstein O, Iorga BI. SAMPL6: Calculation of Macroscopic pKa Values from Ab Initio Quantum Mechanical Free Energies. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*. 2018 Oct; 32(10):1203–1216. doi: [10.1007/s10822-018-0138-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-018-0138-6).
- 371
- 372 [20] Tielker N, Eberlein L, Güssregen S, Kast SM. The SAMPL6 Challenge on Predicting Aqueous pKa Values from EC-RISM Theory. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*. 2018 Oct; 32(10):1151–1163. doi: [10.1007/s10822-018-0140-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-018-0140-z).
- 373
- 374 [21] Klamt A, Eckert F, Diedenhofen M, Beck ME. First Principles Calculations of Aqueous pK_a Values for Organic and Inorganic Acids Using COSMO-RS Reveal an Inconsistency in the Slope of the pK_a Scale. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*. 2003 Nov; 107(44):9380–9386. doi: [10.1021/jp034688o](https://doi.org/10.1021/jp034688o).
- 375
- 376
- 377 [22] Eckert F, Klamt A. Accurate Prediction of Basicity in Aqueous Solution with COSMO-RS. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*. 2006 Jan; 27(1):11–19. doi: [10.1002/jcc.20309](https://doi.org/10.1002/jcc.20309).
- 378
- 379 [23] Pracht P, Wilcken R, Udvarhelyi A, Rodde S, Grimme S. High Accuracy Quantum-Chemistry-Based Calculation and Blind Prediction of Macroscopic pKa Values in the Context of the SAMPL6 Challenge. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*. 2018 Oct; 32(10):1139–1149. doi: [10.1007/s10822-018-0145-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-018-0145-7).
- 380
- 381
- 382 [24] Prasad S, Huang J, Zeng Q, Brooks BR. An Explicit-Solvent Hybrid QM and MM Approach for Predicting pKa of Small Molecules in SAMPL6 Challenge. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*. 2018 Oct; 32(10):1191–1201. doi: [10.1007/s10822-018-0167-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-018-0167-1).
- 383
- 384 [25] OEMolProp Toolkit 2017.Feb.1;. OpenEye Scientific Software, Santa Fe, NM. <http://www.eyesopen.com>.

Table S1. SMILES and InChI identifiers of SAMPL6 pK_a Challenge molecules. A CSV version of this table can be found in *SAMPL6-supplementary-documents.tar.gz*.

SAMPL6 Molecule ID	Isomeric SMILES	InChI
SM01	c1cc2c(cc1O)c3c(o2)C(=O)NCCC3	InChI=1S/C12H11NO3/c14-7-3-4-10-9(6-7)8-2-1-5-13-12(15)11(8)16-10/h3-4,6,14H,1-2,5H2,(H,13,15)
SM02	c1ccc2c(c1)c(ncn2)Nc3cccc(c3)C(F)(F)	InChI=1S/C15H10F3N3/c16-15(17,18)10-4-3-5-11(8-10)21-14-12-6-1-2-7-13(12)19-9-20-14/h1-9H,(H,19,20,21)
SM03	c1ccc(cc1)Cc2nnnc(s2)NC(=O)c3cccs3	InChI=1S/C14H11N3OS2/c18-13(11-7-4-8-19-11)15-14-17-16-12(20-14)9-10-5-2-1-3-6-10/h1-8H,9H2,(H,15,17,18)
SM04	c1ccc2c(c1)c(ncn2)NCc3ccc(cc3)Cl	InChI=1S/C15H12ClN3/c16-12-7-5-11(6-8-12)9-17-15-13-3-1-2-4-14(13)18-10-19-15/h1-8,10H,9H2,(H,17,18,19)
SM05	c1ccc(c(c1)NC(=O)c2ccc(o2)Cl)N3CCCCC3	InChI=1S/C16H17ClN2O2/c17-15-9-8-14(21-15)16(20)18-12-6-2-3-7-13(12)19-10-4-1-5-11-19/h2-3,6-9H,1,4-5,10-11H2,(H,18,20)
SM06	c1cc2cccnnc2c(c1)NC(=O)c3cc(cnc3)Br	InChI=1S/C15H10BrN3O/c16-12-7-11(8-17-9-12)15(20)19-13-5-1-3-10-4-2-6-18-14(10)13/h1-9H,(H,19,20)
SM07	c1ccc(cc1)CNc2c3cccc3ncn2	InChI=1S/C15H13N3/c1-2-6-12(7-3-1)10-16-15-13-8-4-5-9-14(13)17-11-18-15/h1-9,11H,10H2,(H,16,17,18)
SM08	Cc1ccc2c(c1)c(c(c=O)[nH]2)CC(=O)O)c3cccc3	InChI=1S/C18H15NO3/c1-11-7-8-15-13(9-11)17(12-5-3-2-4-6-12)14(10-16(20)21)18(22)19-15/h2-9H,10H2,1H3,(H,19,22)(H,20,21)
SM09	COc1cccc(c1)Nc2c3cccc3ncn2.Cl	InChI=1S/C15H13N3O.CIH/c1-19-12-6-4-5-11(9-12)18-15-13-7-2-3-8-14(13)16-10-17-15;/h2-10H,1H3,(H,16,17,18);1H
SM10	c1ccc(cc1)C(=O)NCC(=O)Nc2nc3cccc3s2	InChI=1S/C16H13N3O2S/c20-14(10-17-15(21)11-6-2-1-3-7-11)19-16-18-1-2-8-4-5-9-13(12)22-16/h1-9H,10H2,(H,17,21)(H,18,19,20)
SM11	c1ccc(cc1)n2c3c(cn2)c(ncn3)N	InChI=1S/C11H9N5/c12-10-9-6-15-16(11(9)14-7-13-10)8-4-2-1-3-5-8/h1-7H,(H,2,12,13,14)
SM12	c1ccc2c(c1)c(ncn2)Nc3cccc(c3)Cl.Cl	InChI=1S/C14H10ClN3.CIH/c15-10-4-3-5-11(8-10)18-14-12-6-1-2-7-13(12)16-9-17-14;/h1-9H,(H,16,17,18);1H
SM13	Cc1cccc(c1)Nc2c3cc(c(c3ncn2)OC)OC	InChI=1S/C17H17N3O2/c1-11-5-4-6-12(7-11)20-17-13-8-15(21-2)16(22-3)9-14(13)18-10-19-17/h4-10H,1-3H3,(H,18,19,20)
SM14	c1ccc(cc1)n2ncn3c2ccc(c3)N	InChI=1S/C13H11N3/c14-10-6-7-13-12(8-10)15-9-16(13)11-4-2-1-3-5-11/h1-9H,14H2
SM15	c1ccc2c(c1)ncn2c3ccc(cc3)O	InChI=1S/C13H10N2O/c16-11-7-5-10(6-8-11)15-9-14-12-3-1-2-4-13(12)15/h1-9,16H
SM16	c1cc(c(c(c1)Cl)C(=O)Nc2ccncc2)Cl	InChI=1S/C12H8Cl2N2O/c13-9-2-1-3-10(14)11(9)12(17)16-8-4-6-15-7-5-8/h1-7H,(H,15,16,17)
SM17	c1ccc(cc1)CSc2nnc(o2)c3ccncc3	InChI=1S/C14H11N3OS/c1-2-4-11(5-3-1)10-19-14-17-16-13(18-14)12-6-8-15-9-7-12/h1-9H,10H2
SM18	c1ccc2c(c1)c(=O)[nH]c(n2)CCC(=O)Nc3ncc(s3)Cc4ccc(c(c4)F)F	InChI=1S/C21H16F2N4O2S/c22-15-6-5-12(10-16(15)23)9-13-11-24-21(30-13)27-19(28)8-7-18-25-17-4-2-1-3-14(17)20(29)26-18/h1-6,10-11H,7-9H2,(H,24,27,28)(H,25,26,29)
SM19	CCOc1ccc2c(c1)sc(n2)NC(=O)Cc3ccc(c(c3)Cl)Cl	InChI=1S/C17H14Cl2N2O2S/c1-2-23-11-4-6-14-15(9-11)24-17(20-14)21-6(22)8-10-3-5-12(18)13(9)7-10/h3-7,9H,2,8H2,1H3,(H,20,21,22)
SM20	c1cc(cc(c1)OCc2ccc(cc2Cl)Cl)/C=C/3\C(=O)NC(=O)S3	InChI=1S/C17H11Cl2NO3S/c18-12-5-4-11(14(19)8-12)9-23-13-3-1-2-10(6-13)7-15-16(21)20-17(22)24-15/h1-8H,9H2,(H,20,21,22)/b15-7+
SM21	c1cc(cc(c1)Br)Nc2c(cnc(n2)Nc3cccc(c3)Br)F	InChI=1S/C16H11Br2FN4/c17-10-3-1-5-12(7-10)21-15-14(19)9-20-16(23-15)22-13-6-2-4-11(18)8-13/h1-9H,(H,20,21,22,23)
SM22	c1cc2c(cc(c(c2nc1)O))l	InChI=1S/C9H5l2NO/c10-6-4-7(11)9(13)8-5(6)2-1-3-12-8/h1-4,13H
SM23	CCOC(=O)c1ccc(cc1)Nc2cc(cnc(n2)Nc3ccc(cc3)C(=O)OCC)C	InChI=1S/C23H24N4O4/c1-4-30-21(28)16-6-10-18(11-7-16)25-20-14-15(3)24-23(27-20)26-19-12-8-17(9-13-19)22(29)31-5-2/h6-14H,4-5H2,1-3H3,(H2,24,25,26,27)
SM24	COc1ccc(cc1)c2c3c(ncn3oc2c4ccc(cc4)OC)NCCO	InChI=1S/C22H21N3O4/c1-27-16-7-3-14(4-8-16)18-19-21(23-11-12-26)24-13-25-22(19)29-20(18)15-5-9-17(28-2)10-6-15/h3-10,13,26H,11-12H2,1-2H3,(H,23,24,25)

385 10 Supplementary Information

Microstate ID of Deprotonated State (A)	Microstate ID of Protonated State (HA)	Molecule ID	pKa (exp)	pKa SEM (exp)	pKa ID	Microstate identification source
		SM07	6.08	0.01	SM07_pKa1	NMR measurement
		SM14	5.3	0.01	SM14_pKa2	NMR measurement
		SM14	2.58	0.01	SM14_pKa1	NMR measurement
		SM02	5.03	0.01	SM02_pKa1	Estimated based on SM07 NMR measurement
		SM04	6.02	0.01	SM04_pKa1	Estimated based on SM07 NMR measurement
		SM09	5.37	0.01	SM09_pKa1	Estimated based on SM07 NMR measurement
		SM12	5.28	0.01	SM12_pKa1	Estimated based on SM07 NMR measurement
		SM13	5.77	0.01	SM13_pKa1	Estimated based on SM07 NMR measurement
		SM15	8.94	0.01	SM15_pKa2	Estimated based on SM14 NMR measurement
		SM15	4.7	0.01	SM15_pKa1	Estimated based on SM14 NMR measurement

Figure S1. Dominant microstates of 8 molecules were determined based on NMR measurements. Dominant microstate sequence of 6 derivatives were determined taking SM07 and SM14 as reference. Matched experimental pK_a values were determined by spectrophotometric pK_a measurements [4]. A CSV version of this table can be found in SAMPL6-supplementary-documents.tar.gz.




Figure S2. MAE of macroscopic pK_a predictions of each molecule did not show any significant correlation with any molecular descriptor.
 Plots show regression lines, 96% confidence intervals of the regression lines, and R^2 . The following molecular descriptors were calculated using OpenEye OEMolProp Toolkit [25].




Figure S3. The value of macroscopic pK_a s was not a factor affecting prediction error seen in SAMPL6 Challenge according to the analysis with Hungarian matching. There was not clear trend between pK_a prediction error and the true pK_a error. Very high and very low pK_a values have similar inaccuracy compared to pK_a values close to 7. **A** Scatter plot of macroscopic pK_a prediction error calculated with Hungarian matching vs. experimental pK_a value **B** Box plot of absolute error of macroscopic pK_a predictions binned into 2 pK_a unit intervals of experimental pK_a .




Figure S4. There was low agreement between experimental dominant microstate pairs and the predicted microstate pairs selected by Hungarian algorithm for microscopic pK_a predictions. This analysis could only be performed for 8 molecules with NMR data. Hungarian matching algorithm which matches predicted and experimental values considering only the closeness of the numerical value of pK_a and it often leads to predicted pK_a matches that described a different microstates pair than the experimentally observed dominant microstates..

Table S2. Evaluation statistics calculated for all macroscopic pK_a prediction submissions based on Hungarian match for 24 molecules. Methods are represented via their SAMPL6 submission IDs which can be cross referenced with Table 1 for method details. There are eight error metrics reported: the root-mean-squared error (RMSE), mean absolute error (MAE), mean (signed) error (ME), coefficient of determination (R^2), linear regression slope (m), Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient (τ), unmatched experimental pK_as (number of missing pK_a predictions) and unmatched predicted pK_as (number of extra pK_a predictions between 2 and 12. This table is ranked by increasing RMSE. A CSV version of this table can be found in *SAMPL6-supplementary-documents.tar.gz*.

Submission ID	RMSE	MAE	ME	R ²	m	Kendall's Tau	Unmatched exp. pK _a s	Unmatched pred. pK _a s [2,12]
<i>vxxzd</i>	0.68 [0.54, 0.81]	0.58 [0.45, 0.71]	0.24 [-0.01, 0.45]	0.94 [0.88, 0.97]	0.92 [0.84, 1.02]	0.82 [0.68, 0.92]	2	4
<i>gyuhx</i>	0.73 [0.55, 0.91]	0.59 [0.44, 0.74]	0.03 [-0.23, 0.28]	0.93 [0.88, 0.96]	0.98 [0.90, 1.08]	0.88 [0.80, 0.94]	0	7
<i>xmyhm</i>	0.79 [0.52, 1.03]	0.56 [0.38, 0.77]	0.13 [-0.14, 0.41]	0.92 [0.85, 0.97]	0.96 [0.86, 1.08]	0.81 [0.68, 0.90]	0	3
<i>nb017</i>	0.94 [0.72, 1.16]	0.77 [0.58, 0.97]	-0.16 [-0.49, 0.16]	0.88 [0.81, 0.94]	0.94 [0.82, 1.08]	0.73 [0.60, 0.84]	0	6
<i>nb007</i>	0.95 [0.73, 1.15]	0.78 [0.60, 0.97]	0.05 [-0.29, 0.37]	0.88 [0.77, 0.95]	0.84 [0.77, 0.92]	0.79 [0.65, 0.89]	0	13
<i>yqkga</i>	1.01 [0.78, 1.23]	0.80 [0.59, 1.03]	-0.17 [-0.51, 0.19]	0.87 [0.78, 0.93]	0.93 [0.77, 1.08]	0.83 [0.72, 0.91]	0	1
<i>nb010</i>	1.03 [0.77, 1.26]	0.81 [0.61, 1.04]	0.24 [-0.11, 0.59]	0.87 [0.77, 0.94]	0.95 [0.83, 1.08]	0.80 [0.67, 0.90]	0	4
<i>8xt50</i>	1.07 [0.78, 1.36]	0.81 [0.58, 1.07]	-0.47 [-0.82, -0.14]	0.91 [0.84, 0.95]	1.08 [0.94, 1.22]	0.80 [0.68, 0.89]	0	0
<i>nb013</i>	1.10 [0.72, 1.47]	0.80 [0.56, 1.09]	-0.15 [-0.55, 0.22]	0.88 [0.78, 0.95]	1.09 [0.90, 1.25]	0.79 [0.64, 0.90]	0	6
<i>nb015</i>	1.27 [0.98, 1.56]	1.04 [0.80, 1.31]	0.13 [-0.32, 0.56]	0.87 [0.80, 0.93]	1.16 [0.94, 1.34]	0.78 [0.66, 0.86]	0	0
<i>p0jba</i>	1.31 [0.69, 1.73]	1.08 [0.43, 1.72]	-0.92 [-1.72, -0.11]	0.91 [0.51, 1.00]	1.18 [0.36, 1.72]	0.80 [0.00, 1.00]	0	0
<i>37xm8</i>	1.41 [0.93, 1.84]	1.01 [0.68, 1.38]	-0.18 [-0.69, 0.32]	0.83 [0.70, 0.93]	1.16 [0.98, 1.33]	0.70 [0.56, 0.83]	1	1
<i>mkhqa</i>	1.60 [1.13, 2.05]	1.24 [0.90, 1.62]	-0.32 [-0.89, 0.21]	0.80 [0.67, 0.91]	1.14 [0.98, 1.34]	0.64 [0.44, 0.79]	0	6
<i>ttjd0</i>	1.64 [1.20, 2.06]	1.30 [0.96, 1.67]	-0.12 [-0.70, 0.45]	0.81 [0.69, 0.91]	1.2 [1.03, 1.40]	0.65 [0.47, 0.80]	0	5
<i>nb001</i>	1.68 [1.05, 2.37]	1.21 [0.84, 1.68]	0.44 [-0.10, 1.03]	0.80 [0.70, 0.90]	1.16 [0.95, 1.42]	0.72 [0.55, 0.85]	0	7
<i>nb002</i>	1.70 [1.08, 2.38]	1.25 [0.89, 1.70]	0.51 [-0.04, 1.10]	0.80 [0.70, 0.90]	1.15 [0.95, 1.42]	0.72 [0.56, 0.84]	0	7
<i>35bdm</i>	1.72 [0.66, 2.34]	1.44 [0.62, 2.26]	-1.01 [-2.18, 0.13]	0.92 [0.46, 1.00]	1.45 [0.73, 2.15]	0.80 [0.00, 1.00]	0	0
<i>ryzue</i>	1.77 [1.42, 2.12]	1.50 [1.17, 1.84]	1.30 [0.86, 1.72]	0.91 [0.86, 0.95]	1.23 [1.06, 1.41]	0.82 [0.71, 0.91]	0	0
<i>2ii2g</i>	1.80 [1.31, 2.24]	1.39 [1.01, 1.82]	-0.74 [-1.29, -0.15]	0.79 [0.65, 0.89]	1.15 [0.96, 1.37]	0.68 [0.59, 0.82]	0	2
<i>mpwiy</i>	1.82 [1.39, 2.23]	1.48 [1.14, 1.88]	0.10 [-0.54, 0.73]	0.82 [0.70, 0.91]	1.29 [1.12, 1.51]	0.66 [0.49, 0.80]	0	5
<i>5byn6</i>	1.89 [1.50, 2.27]	1.59 [1.24, 1.97]	1.32 [0.84, 1.80]	0.91 [0.85, 0.95]	1.28 [1.10, 1.48]	0.83 [0.72, 0.92]	0	0
<i>y75vj</i>	1.90 [1.50, 2.26]	1.58 [1.21, 1.97]	1.04 [0.46, 1.60]	0.89 [0.79, 0.95]	1.34 [1.16, 1.53]	0.75 [0.57, 0.88]	1	0
<i>w4iyd</i>	1.93 [1.53, 2.28]	1.58 [1.20, 1.98]	1.26 [0.72, 1.76]	0.85 [0.74, 0.92]	1.21 [1.00, 1.40]	0.73 [0.57, 0.85]	0	1
<i>np6b4</i>	1.94 [1.21, 2.71]	1.44 [1.04, 1.94]	-0.47 [-1.08, 0.24]	0.71 [0.60, 0.87]	1.08 [0.81, 1.43]	0.75 [0.62, 0.86]	0	8
<i>nb004</i>	2.01 [1.38, 2.63]	1.57 [1.16, 2.04]	0.56 [-0.10, 1.27]	0.82 [0.72, 0.90]	1.35 [1.15, 1.60]	0.71 [0.54, 0.84]	0	5
<i>nb003</i>	2.01 [1.39, 2.64]	1.58 [1.18, 2.04]	0.52 [-0.14, 1.22]	0.82 [0.73, 0.91]	1.36 [1.16, 1.61]	0.71 [0.54, 0.84]	0	5
<i>yc70m</i>	2.03 [1.73, 2.33]	1.80 [1.48, 2.13]	-0.41 [-1.09, 0.31]	0.47 [0.28, 0.64]	0.56 [0.35, 0.83]	0.53 [0.35, 0.68]	0	27
<i>hytjn</i>	2.16 [1.24, 3.06]	1.39 [0.86, 2.04]	0.71 [0.03, 1.48]	0.45 [0.13, 0.78]	0.62 [0.26, 1.00]	0.47 [0.16, 0.73]	1	27
<i>f0gew</i>	2.18 [1.38, 2.95]	1.58 [1.09, 2.16]	-0.73 [-1.42, 0.04]	0.77 [0.67, 0.89]	1.29 [1.01, 1.63]	0.76 [0.63, 0.86]	0	0
<i>q3pfp</i>	2.19 [1.33, 3.09]	1.51 [0.99, 2.13]	0.59 [-0.10, 1.37]	0.44 [0.13, 0.77]	0.66 [0.27, 1.07]	0.50 [0.20, 0.75]	1	22
<i>ds62k</i>	2.22 [1.62, 2.81]	1.78 [1.34, 2.27]	0.78 [0.06, 1.52]	0.82 [0.70, 0.90]	1.41 [1.20, 1.63]	0.72 [0.55, 0.85]	0	4
<i>xikp8</i>	2.35 [1.94, 2.73]	2.06 [1.66, 2.47]	0.77 [-0.02, 1.58]	0.89 [0.80, 0.95]	1.59 [1.40, 1.81]	0.76 [0.59, 0.89]	1	0
<i>nb005</i>	2.38 [1.79, 2.95]	1.91 [1.44, 2.43]	0.31 [-0.49, 1.15]	0.84 [0.74, 0.91]	1.56 [1.34, 1.82]	0.71 [0.54, 0.83]	0	0
<i>5nm4j</i>	2.45 [1.42, 3.34]	1.58 [0.94, 2.34]	0.05 [-0.80, 1.07]	0.19 [0.00, 0.70]	0.40 [-0.06, 0.81]	0.34 [-0.04, 0.67]	4	1
<i>ad5pu</i>	2.54 [1.68, 3.30]	1.83 [1.24, 2.49]	-0.65 [-1.48, 0.25]	0.76 [0.64, 0.88]	1.43 [1.12, 1.78]	0.77 [0.63, 0.88]	0	0
<i>pwn3m</i>	2.60 [1.45, 3.53]	1.54 [0.83, 2.37]	0.79 [-0.06, 1.77]	0.21 [0.00, 0.63]	0.37 [0.01, 0.78]	0.34 [0.04, 0.63]	1	3
<i>nb006</i>	2.98 [2.37, 3.56]	2.53 [2.00, 3.10]	0.42 [-0.60, 1.47]	0.84 [0.74, 0.92]	1.78 [1.55, 2.06]	0.71 [0.54, 0.84]	0	0
<i>0hxtm</i>	3.26 [1.81, 4.39]	1.92 [1.03, 2.98]	1.38 [0.37, 2.56]	0.08 [0.00, 0.48]	0.28 [-0.17, 0.83]	0.29 [-0.04, 0.61]	3	7

Table S3. Evaluation statistics calculated for all microscopic pK_a prediction submissions based on Hungarian match for 8 molecules with NMR data. Methods are represented via their SAMPL6 submission IDs which can be cross referenced with Table 1 for method details. There are eight error metrics reported: the root-mean-squared error (RMSE), mean absolute error (MAE), mean (signed) error (ME), coefficient of determination (R^2), linear regression slope (m), Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient (τ), unmatched experimental pK_as (number of missing pK_a predictions) and unmatched predicted pK_as (number of extra pK_a predictions between 2 and 12. This table is ranked by increasing RMSE. A CSV version of this table can be found in *SAMPL6-supplementary-documents.tar.gz*.

Submission ID	RMSE	MAE	ME	R ²	m	Kendall's Tau	Unmatched exp. pK _a s	Unmatched pred. pK _a s [2,12]
nb011	0.47 [0.30, 0.64]	0.33 [0.22, 0.46]	-0.02 [-0.18, 0.14]	0.97 [0.94, 0.99]	1.01 [0.97, 1.06]	0.90 [0.78, 0.96]	0	36
hdlyq	0.62 [0.47, 0.76]	0.47 [0.33, 0.62]	0.13 [-0.09, 0.34]	0.95 [0.92, 0.97]	0.34 [0.92, 1.09]	0.87 [0.79, 0.93]	0	16
epvmk	0.63 [0.43, 0.81]	0.47 [0.32, 0.63]	-0.02 [-0.25, 0.21]	0.95 [0.89, 0.98]	0.21 [0.91, 1.04]	0.81 [0.68, 0.91]	0	37
xnoe0	0.65 [0.47, 0.82]	0.50 [0.36, 0.66]	-0.1 [-0.32, 0.13]	0.95 [0.89, 0.98]	0.13 [0.92, 1.05]	0.82 [0.69, 0.91]	0	36
gdqeg	0.65 [0.41, 0.89]	0.43 [0.27, 0.62]	0.11 [-0.10, 0.35]	0.94 [0.88, 0.98]	0.35 [0.87, 1.02]	0.83 [0.67, 0.95]	0	53
400ia	0.66 [0.44, 0.86]	0.47 [0.31, 0.64]	0.00 [-0.22, 0.24]	0.94 [0.88, 0.98]	0.24 [0.87, 1.05]	0.85 [0.73, 0.94]	0	35
nb008	0.76 [0.48, 1.02]	0.52 [0.34, 0.73]	-0.08 [-0.37, 0.17]	0.93 [0.85, 0.98]	0.17 [0.79, 0.93]	0.84 [0.73, 0.92]	0	35
ccpmw	0.79 [0.62, 0.94]	0.62 [0.46, 0.80]	-0.17 [-0.44, 0.11]	0.92 [0.86, 0.96]	0.11 [0.82, 1.05]	0.80 [0.67, 0.89]	0	7
0xi4b	0.84 [0.58, 1.07]	0.61 [0.42, 0.83]	0.22 [-0.07, 0.51]	0.92 [0.84, 0.97]	0.51 [0.91, 1.09]	0.81 [0.65, 0.92]	0	32
cwyk	0.86 [0.60, 1.10]	0.62 [0.42, 0.84]	0.13 [-0.16, 0.44]	0.90 [0.82, 0.96]	0.44 [0.86, 1.08]	0.81 [0.64, 0.92]	0	35
ftc8w	0.86 [0.51, 1.17]	0.59 [0.39, 0.83]	0.10 [-0.19, 0.41]	0.90 [0.77, 0.97]	0.41 [0.84, 0.98]	0.75 [0.57, 0.88]	0	35
nxaaw	0.89 [0.56, 1.25]	0.61 [0.41, 0.87]	-0.02 [-0.35, 0.28]	0.89 [0.75, 0.97]	0.28 [0.85, 1.00]	0.79 [0.63, 0.91]	0	29
nb016	0.95 [0.71, 1.18]	0.77 [0.57, 0.98]	-0.23 [-0.56, 0.12]	0.89 [0.83, 0.95]	0.12 [0.82, 1.07]	0.75 [0.62, 0.85]	0	3
kxzt	0.96 [0.56, 1.33]	0.64 [0.41, 0.92]	0.00 [-0.32, 0.36]	0.90 [0.76, 0.97]	0.36 [0.96, 1.13]	0.79 [0.63, 0.91]	0	37
eyetm	0.98 [0.69, 1.27]	0.72 [0.50, 0.97]	-0.32 [-0.65, 0.00]	0.91 [0.86, 0.96]	0.00 [0.94, 1.22]	0.78 [0.64, 0.88]	0	7
cm2yq	0.99 [0.44, 1.54]	0.56 [0.31, 0.90]	0.10 [-0.21, 0.50]	0.91 [0.83, 0.98]	0.50 [0.96, 1.25]	0.89 [0.80, 0.96]	0	36
2umai	1.00 [0.46, 1.54]	0.57 [0.33, 0.91]	0.07 [-0.25, 0.46]	0.91 [0.82, 0.98]	0.46 [0.96, 1.26]	0.87 [0.76, 0.95]	0	36
ko8yx	1.01 [0.76, 1.25]	0.78 [0.56, 1.01]	0.35 [0.01, 0.67]	0.91 [0.82, 0.96]	0.67 [0.96, 1.19]	0.78 [0.64, 0.89]	0	26
wuuvc	1.02 [0.51, 1.53]	0.62 [0.38, 0.93]	0.19 [-0.13, 0.58]	0.88 [0.80, 0.96]	0.58 [0.85, 1.19]	0.90 [0.81, 0.96]	0	36
ktpj5	1.02 [0.51, 1.56]	0.61 [0.37, 0.95]	0.17 [-0.16, 0.57]	0.88 [0.80, 0.96]	0.57 [0.87, 1.22]	0.89 [0.80, 0.96]	0	36
z7fhp	1.02 [0.49, 1.55]	0.61 [0.36, 0.94]	0.08 [-0.24, 0.48]	0.90 [0.82, 0.97]	0.48 [0.97, 1.26]	0.88 [0.80, 0.95]	0	28
arcko	1.04 [0.73, 1.32]	0.77 [0.53, 1.02]	0.37 [0.05, 0.72]	0.89 [0.80, 0.94]	0.72 [0.90, 1.14]	0.78 [0.62, 0.90]	0	24
y4wws	1.04 [0.70, 1.33]	0.74 [0.49, 1.00]	-0.31 [-0.66, 0.05]	0.91 [0.85, 0.96]	0.05 [1.02, 1.26]	0.79 [0.68, 0.88]	0	30
wcvnu	1.11 [0.80, 1.39]	0.84 [0.59, 1.11]	0.28 [-0.10, 0.66]	0.89 [0.77, 0.95]	0.66 [0.98, 1.22]	0.73 [0.54, 0.88]	1	27
8toyp	1.13 [0.61, 1.65]	0.70 [0.42, 1.05]	0.13 [-0.25, 0.56]	0.88 [0.81, 0.96]	0.56 [0.98, 1.29]	0.83 [0.72, 0.92]	0	27
qsicn	1.17 [0.30, 1.65]	0.88 [0.23, 1.54]	-0.76 [-1.54, 0.01]	0.91 [0.46, 1.00]	0.01 [0.52, 1.59]	0.80 [0.00, 1.00]	0	2
wexjs	1.30 [0.95, 1.62]	0.98 [0.68, 1.29]	0.27 [-0.17, 0.74]	0.86 [0.74, 0.93]	0.74 [1.00, 1.29]	0.73 [0.55, 0.86]	0	25
v8qph	1.37 [0.92, 1.79]	0.98 [0.66, 1.34]	-0.15 [-0.64, 0.34]	0.84 [0.70, 0.93]	0.34 [0.97, 1.32]	0.70 [0.55, 0.82]	0	6
w420e	1.57 [1.18, 1.94]	1.23 [0.90, 1.58]	0.09 [-0.48, 0.62]	0.85 [0.76, 0.91]	0.62 [1.08, 1.46]	0.72 [0.60, 0.82]	0	19
6tvf8	1.88 [0.87, 2.85]	1.02 [0.54, 1.66]	0.45 [-0.14, 1.18]	0.51 [0.16, 0.87]	1.18 [0.26, 0.89]	0.61 [0.34, 0.82]	0	55
0wfzo	2.89 [1.73, 3.89]	1.88 [1.17, 2.68]	0.76 [-0.15, 1.77]	0.48 [0.21, 0.75]	1.77 [0.60, 1.37]	0.51 [0.30, 0.70]	0	4
t8ewk	3.30 [1.89, 4.39]	1.98 [1.06, 3.00]	1.32 [0.27, 2.49]	0.07 [0.00, 0.45]	2.49 [-0.17, 0.79]	0.28 [-0.03, 0.6]	0	6
z3btx	4.00 [2.30, 5.45]	2.49 [1.47, 3.65]	1.48 [0.26, 2.86]	0.29 [0.04, 0.60]	2.86 [0.31, 1.44]	0.43 [0.19, 0.63]	0	1
758j8	4.52 [2.64, 6.18]	2.95 [1.85, 4.25]	1.85 [0.48, 3.38]	0.24 [0.02, 0.58]	3.38 [0.20, 1.51]	0.34 [0.08, 0.57]	0	2
hgn83	6.38 [4.04, 8.47]	4.11 [2.52, 5.93]	2.13 [0.07, 4.28]	0.08 [0.00, 0.39]	4.28 [-0.18, 1.43]	0.32 [0.07, 0.56]	0	0

Table S4. Evaluation statistics calculated for all microscopic pK_a prediction submissions based on microstate pair match for 8 molecules with NMR data. Methods are represented via their SAMPL6 submission IDs which can be cross referenced with Table 1 for method details. There are eight error metrics reported: the root-mean-squared error (RMSE), mean absolute error (MAE), mean (signed) error (ME), coefficient of determination (R^2), linear regression slope (m), Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient (τ), unmatched experimental pK_as (number of missing pK_a predictions) and unmatched predicted pK_as (number of extra pK_a predictions between 2 and 12. This table is ranked by increasing RMSE. A CSV version of this table can be found in *SAMPL6-supplementary-documents.tar.gz*.

Submission ID	RMSE	MAE	ME	R ²	m	Kendall's Tau	Unmatched exp. pK _a s	Unmatched pred. pK _a s [2,12]
nb016	0.52 [0.25, 0.71]	0.43 [0.23, 0.65]	-0.09 [-0.45, 0.30]	0.92 [0.05, 0.99]	0.99 [0.14, 1.16]	0.62 [-0.14, 1.00]	0	3
hdijq	0.68 [0.49, 0.83]	0.60 [0.39, 0.80]	0.38 [0.02, 0.70]	0.86 [0.47, 0.98]	0.91 [0.45, 1.26]	0.78 [0.4, 1.00]	0	16
nb011	0.72 [0.35, 1.07]	0.54 [0.28, 0.86]	0.45 [0.14, 0.83]	0.86 [0.18, 0.98]	0.93 [0.50, 1.21]	0.64 [0.26, 0.95]	0	36
ftc8w	0.75 [0.52, 0.96]	0.68 [0.50, 0.89]	-0.31 [-0.68, 0.16]	0.87 [0.02, 0.99]	1.12 [-0.11, 1.39]	0.56 [-0.10, 1.00]	0	35
6vf8	0.76 [0.55, 0.95]	0.68 [0.46, 0.90]	-0.63 [-0.89, -0.35]	0.92 [0.78, 0.99]	0.94 [0.69, 1.41]	0.87 [0.6, 1.00]	0	55
t8ewk	0.96 [0.65, 1.19]	0.81 [0.46, 1.13]	-0.77 [-1.12, -0.38]	0.80 [0.53, 0.96]	0.96 [0.76, 2.26]	0.78 [0.31, 1.00]	1	7
v8qph	0.99 [0.40, 1.52]	0.67 [0.29, 1.17]	-0.09 [-0.75, 0.45]	0.68 [0.11, 0.97]	0.96 [-1.26, 1.16]	0.38 [-0.3, 1.00]	0	6
ccpmw	1.07 [0.78, 1.27]	0.95 [0.60, 1.25]	-0.83 [-1.25, -0.37]	0.74 [0.43, 0.99]	0.95 [0.70, 2.32]	0.89 [0.52, 1.00]	1	8
Oxi4b	1.15 [0.75, 1.50]	0.98 [0.63, 1.36]	-0.30 [-0.94, 0.44]	0.77 [0.02, 0.98]	1.26 [0.09, 2.10]	0.51 [-0.14, 1.00]	0	33
cywyk	1.17 [0.88, 1.41]	1.06 [0.74, 1.35]	-0.47 [-1.09, 0.24]	0.73 [0.02, 0.98]	1.15 [-0.04, 2.00]	0.56 [-0.08, 1.00]	0	36
eyetm	1.17 [0.77, 1.52]	1.00 [0.61, 1.41]	-0.89 [-1.38, -0.38]	0.67 [0.30, 0.94]	0.93 [0.65, 2.59]	0.72 [0.29, 1.00]	1	8
nb008	1.26 [0.74, 1.71]	1.09 [0.63, 1.57]	0.47 [-0.40, 1.32]	0.79 [0.01, 0.99]	1.21 [-0.59, 1.85]	0.52 [-0.2, 1.00]	0	38
y4wws	1.41 [0.95, 1.80]	1.22 [0.78, 1.66]	-0.71 [-1.44, 0.06]	0.87 [0.05, 0.98]	1.55 [0.41, 2.02]	0.56 [-0.11, 1.00]	0	31
ktpj5	1.46 [0.83, 2.10]	1.15 [0.67, 1.77]	0.94 [0.29, 1.68]	0.77 [0.01, 0.98]	1.28 [-0.26, 1.60]	0.42 [-0.27, 0.95]	0	37
wuuvc	1.47 [0.84, 2.09]	1.18 [0.70, 1.77]	0.99 [0.36, 1.68]	0.78 [0.01, 0.98]	1.27 [-0.24, 1.58]	0.47 [-0.20, 1.00]	0	37
xnoe0	1.54 [1.09, 2.00]	1.39 [1.02, 1.83]	0.91 [0.11, 1.64]	0.82 [0.01, 0.98]	1.47 [-0.30, 1.79]	0.42 [-0.27, 0.95]	0	37
qsicn	1.58 [1.44, 1.70]	1.57 [1.44, 1.70]	-1.57 [-1.7, -1.44]	1.00 [0.00, 1.00]	1.06		0	2
epvmk	1.66 [1.20, 2.15]	1.50 [1.07, 1.96]	1.12 [0.31, 1.82]	0.82 [0.02, 0.98]	1.47 [-0.21, 1.8]	0.42 [-0.25, 0.95]	0	37
400ia	1.73 [1.33, 2.17]	1.62 [1.29, 2.02]	1.31 [0.53, 1.93]	0.87 [0.03, 0.99]	1.50 [0.07, 1.84]	0.56 [-0.07, 1.00]	0	36
ko8yx	1.75 [1.08, 2.45]	1.44 [0.87, 2.12]	1.38 [0.74, 2.10]	0.97 [0.88, 1.00]	1.66 [1.46, 2.28]	0.91 [0.69, 1.00]	0	27
Zumai	1.76 [1.21, 2.35]	1.54 [1.04, 2.11]	1.31 [0.55, 2.03]	0.82 [0.02, 0.98]	1.43 [-0.02, 1.77]	0.47 [-0.17, 0.95]	0	37
cm2yq	1.77 [1.22, 2.36]	1.55 [1.06, 2.12]	1.33 [0.57, 2.04]	0.82 [0.02, 0.98]	1.43 [-0.02, 1.76]	0.47 [-0.17, 0.95]	0	37
nxaaw	1.80 [0.84, 2.80]	1.34 [0.80, 2.18]	0.16 [-0.77, 1.41]	0.59 [0.02, 0.97]	1.37 [-0.08, 2.92]	0.6 [-0.05, 1.00]	0	30
wcvnu	1.90 [1.14, 2.64]	1.57 [0.97, 2.27]	1.44 [0.70, 2.24]	0.97 [0.91, 1.00]	1.78 [1.58, 2.48]	0.91 [0.69, 1.00]	0	27
kxzt	2.00 [1.13, 2.73]	1.64 [1.00, 2.39]	1.64 [1.00, 2.39]	0.83 [0.01, 0.98]	1.42 [-0.21, 1.99]	0.56 [-0.10, 1.00]	0	38
wexjs	2.05 [1.18, 2.93]	1.66 [1.01, 2.47]	1.48 [0.63, 2.39]	0.96 [0.55, 0.99]	1.87 [1.54, 2.29]	0.73 [0.20, 1.00]	0	26
z7fhp	2.14 [1.38, 2.87]	1.80 [1.12, 2.58]	1.28 [0.18, 2.34]	0.78 [0.02, 0.98]	1.71 [-0.41, 2.13]	0.42 [-0.25, 0.95]	0	30
gdqeg	2.38 [1.97, 2.71]	2.25 [1.74, 2.68]	-1.61 [-2.46, -0.37]	0.10 [0.00, 0.98]	0.31 [-0.60, 1.63]	0.29 [-0.45, 1.00]	0	53
8toyp	2.63 [1.89, 3.29]	2.34 [1.59, 3.07]	1.78 [0.47, 2.89]	0.82 [0.02, 0.98]	1.94 [-0.06, 2.39]	0.47 [-0.17, 0.95]	0	29
w4z0e	2.63 [1.81, 3.53]	2.34 [1.67, 3.18]	1.74 [0.46, 2.92]	0.98 [0.55, 1.00]	2.28 [1.52, 2.41]	0.73 [0.20, 1.00]	0	20
arcko	2.64 [1.23, 3.78]	2.08 [1.10, 3.24]	1.71 [0.44, 3.10]	0.57 [0.04, 0.95]	1.42 [0.56, 2.93]	0.56 [-0.06, 1.00]	0	28
0wfzo	18.72 [11.21, 25.03]	15.80 [9.9, 22.35]	15.09 [8.28, 22.12]	0.09 [0.01, 0.73]	2.35 [-10.18, 8.12]	0.02 [-0.65, 0.66]	0	12
z3btv	22.60 [15.03, 29.00]	19.70 [12.97, 26.69]	19.70 [12.97, 26.69]	0.09 [0.01, 0.72]	2.35 [-10.00, 8.28]	0.02 [-0.66, 0.66]	0	7
758j8	23.76 [16.33, 30.24]	21.00 [14.26, 28.00]	21.00 [14.26, 28.00]	0.09 [0.01, 0.71]	2.35 [-10.34, 8.12]	0.02 [-0.65, 0.65]	0	8
hgn83	27.91 [20.54, 34.52]	25.60 [18.9, 32.64]	25.60 [18.9, 32.64]	0.09 [0.01, 0.72]	2.35 [-10.21, 8.00]	0.02 [-0.65, 0.65]	0	5