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## S1 Simulation Details and Calculated Properties

This section provides information about the simulations performed of IDP sequences in Dataset A and how properties were computed.

In-house molecular dynamics simulations were performed with the HPS model using the LAMMPS simulation package. Simulations were preceded by an energy minimization and run for $10^{9}$ fs using timesteps of 10 fs , thermostatted at 300 K using the Langevin thermostat with a damping constant of 1 ps . Thermodynamic quantities, used for the calculation of heat capacity $C_{v}$, were obtained in intervals of 100 ps . Atom coordinates, used for the calculation radius of gyration $R_{\mathrm{g}}$ and decorrelation time $\tau_{N}$, were obtained in intervals of 5 ps . The following equations were used to calculate $R_{\mathrm{g}}, C_{v}$, and $\tau_{N}$ :

$$
R_{\mathrm{g}}:=\left\langle R_{\mathrm{g}}^{2}\right\rangle^{1 / 2}=\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\langle\left(R_{i}-R_{C M}\right)^{2}\right\rangle\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

where N is the total number of atoms, and $R_{i}$ and $R_{C M}$ are the position of atom $i$ and center of mass of all atoms in the system respectively,

$$
C_{v}:=\left\langle C_{v}\right\rangle=\frac{\left\langle E^{2}\right\rangle-\langle E\rangle^{2}}{k_{b} T^{2}}
$$

where $E$ is the total internal energy of the system,

$$
\tau_{N}:=\left\langle\tau_{N}\right\rangle=\int_{0}^{\infty}\langle\delta R(t) \delta R(0)\rangle d t, \delta R(t)=R_{i=N}(t)-R_{i=1}(t)
$$

where $R_{i=N}(t)$ and $R_{i=1}(t)$ are the end positions of the polymer at a given time t . The integral was approximated by fitting the end-to-end time autocorrelation function to a Kohlrausch-Williams-Watts (KWW) function and performing an analytical integration.

## S2 Model Architectures and Hyperparameters

This section broadly covers hyperparameters and their associated considerations in evaluating featurization strategies. Sections S2.1-S2.4 provide details on the different neural network architectures employed and their associated hyperparameters. The indication of an "optional" layer means that the presence of the layer itself, and all associated parameters, is a hyperparameter. The indication of an "optional, conditional" layer means that its presence is again a hyperparameter but is conditional on the presence of another indicated hyperparameter. Section S2.5 probes the sensitivity of model performance trained to architecture and training hyperparameters for fixed featurization strategies.

## S2.1 Densely Connected Neural Network

L1: Dense Layer
Size: [10-750] intervals of 20
Dropout: [0.0-0.8] intervals of 0.1
Activation: ReLU
L2: Dense Layer (Optional)
Size: [10-750] intervals of 20
Dropout: [0.0-0.8] intervals of 0.1
Activation: ReLU
L3: Dense Layer (Optional, Conditional on L2)
Size: [10-750] intervals of 20
Dropout: [0.0-0.8] intervals of 0.1
Activation: ReLU

## S2.2 1-D Convolutional Neural Network

Conv1: 1-D Convolutional Layer
Filter: [8-64] intervals of 8
Kernel Width: [5,25] intervals of 5
P1: 1-D Pooling Layer (Optional)

Type: Max, Average
Size: [3-9] intervals of 2
Conv2: 1-D Convolutional Layer (Optional)
Filter: [8-64] intervals of 8
Kernel Width: [5,25] intervals of 5
P2: 1-D Pooling Layer (Optional)
Type: Max, Average
Size: [3-9] intervals of 2
Flatten: Flattening operation
L1: Dense Layer
Size: [10-750] intervals of 20
Dropout: [0.0-0.8] intervals of 0.1
Activation: ReLU
L2: Dense Layer (Optional)
Size: [10-750] intervals of 20
Dropout: [0.0-0.8] intervals of 0.1
Activation: ReLU

## S2.3 Graph Convolutional Neural Networks

GL1: Graph Convolutional Layer
Type: GCN, GAT
Size: [2, 42] intervals of 4
GL2: Graph Convolutional Layer (Optional)
Type: GCN, GAT
Size: [2, 42] intervals of 4
P1: Pooling
Type: Sum, Average
L1: Dense Layer

Size: [10-750] intervals of 20
Dropout: [0.0-0.8] intervals of 0.1
Activation: ReLU
L2: Dense Layer (Optional)
Size: [10-750] intervals of 20
Dropout: [0.0-0.8] intervals of 0.1
Activation: ReLU

## S2.4 Long short-term memory cells

B- LSTM1: Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memory Cell
Size: [5-20] intervals of 5
LSTM2: Long Short-Term Memory Cell (Optional)
Size: [5-20] intervals of 5
Flat: Flattening operation
L1: Dense Layer
Size: [10-750] intervals of 20
Dropout: [0.0-0.8] intervals of 0.1
Activation: ReLU
L2: Dense Layer (Optional)
Size: [10-750] intervals of 20
Dropout: [0.0-0.8] intervals of 0.1
Activation: ReLU

## Common Hyperparameters and Training Settings

Batch Size $=[32,64,128,256]^{* * *}$ This interval number was scaled by 10 for models trained on dataset $D$ due to being an order of magnitude larger than the other datasets.

Learning Rates $=[0.001,0.005,0.01]$
Optimizer = Adam
Epochs $=400$
Early Stopping Employed, 50 epochs of patience

During training, it was found that transforming inputs and outputs occasionally helped improve performances of models. The nature of the transformation or whether it was performed is detailed in the Model Performances csv provided in the supporting information.

## S2.5 Hyperparameter Sensitivity Analysis



Fig S1: Comparison of CU fingerprints made with different, fixed model architectures for the prediction task in Dataset $B$. The panels display model performances constructed from (A) scaled fingerprint and (B) sequence tensor featurization paradigms. Both bars above an entry labeled by A* are performances obtained from the same architecture. Each bar above an entry labeled by Opt. are the performances of hyperparameter-optimized models for each CU vector representation. Hyperparameters associated with specific entries are listed in Table S1.

Model architectures and other training hyperparameters were optimized to construct fair comparisons between the utility of the featurization strategies explored in this study. Ultimately, the selection of a particular featurization strategy can be viewed as its own hyperparameter during model development. In this setting, hyperparameters would ideally be simultaneously cooptimized to construct the optimal model, defined by a fixed featurization strategy, model architecture, and learning procedure. From here, one can reasonably conclude that the selected featurization strategy is the best possible representation of the current data.

Fig. S1 shows that both the absolute and relative performance of models can vary significantly as a function of model architecture. For example, entry A1 of panel A suggests using a descriptor vector for CU representation in the scaled fingerprint paradigm is significantly worse than using a OHE vector. Entries A2, A3, and the hyperparameter-optimized models suggest the opposite. Similarly in panel B, entries A1 and A2 suggest the descriptor vector is worse than OHE for CNN model performance trained on a sequence tensor representation, whereas the remaining entries suggest there is no significant difference. To control for this sensitivity, we only compare hyperparameter-optimized models in the main text. For a given architecture, the domain of hyperparameter optimization is kept fixed when training models to enable facile
comparisons of different CU fingerprints. Therefore, the number of hyperparameters associated with an architecture (DNN, CNN, LSTM, GCN) is considered as part of the overall featurization strategy.

Table S1: This table lists the model hyperparameters corresponding to entries in Figure S1. The leftmost layers correspond to those appearing earlier in the model. Relevant hyperparameters associated with layers are provided in entries of the table. Entries with hyphens indicate the layer is not present in the model. For featurization strategies evaluated using hyperparameter-optimized models, each train-test split (five in total) results in a model with different hyperparameters. Distinctly, when evaluating featurization strategies with fixed architectures, the same hyperparameters are used to construct the model for all five splits.

## S3 Description of Supporting Content

This section provides details of the other files present in the supporting content.

## S3.1 Dataset Metadata

Metadata used for chemical unit representations specific to Datasets $\{A, B, C, D\}$ are provided in csv titled Dataset\{A,B,C,D\}_metadata.csv. Each column can be taken as a different means of representation for the chemical unit of polymers in each dataset and were employed in scaled fingerprint and sequence explicit models.

## S3.2 Dataset A Sequences and Labels

The sequences of intrinsically disordered proteins, obtained through the DISPROT database, that were modeled with the HPS molecular dynamics simulations are contained in Datdaset_A_Sequences.txt. Here, the residue identities are represented as numerical encodings. The identity of the residue corresponding to a particular number encoding can be found in DatasetA_metadata.csv. Their corresponding computed labels are provided in a csv file titled labels.csv.

## S3.3 Model Error Metrics

Details on the model performances across all datasets is provided in a csv titled Model Performances.csv. Each line has a corresponding dataset, model / representation type, the identity of the chemical fingerprint used in the representation, strategy of handling degree of polymerization, and the indication of potential input and output transformations used. The remaining columns provide the MAE in absolute units and the goodness of fit R2 of the models, and their corresponding standard errors.

