Variable	D[Mor27m]a _t	D[Mor21u]a _t	D[C-032]me	D[Wi_D/Dt]m _e	D[nArNHR]a _t	D[Mor32m]b _t	D[VE1_Dz(Z)]b _t	D[nRNH2]a _t	D[F02[N- O]]me	D[L2m]b _t
D[Mor27m]at	1.00	-0.15	0.00	0.05	-0.16	0.55	-0.16	0.04	0.00	0.03
D[Mor21u]at	-0.15	1.00	-0.10	-0.63	-0.07	-0.13	-0.57	0.01	-0.16	-0.47
D[C-032]me	0.00	-0.10	1.00	0.10	0.41	-0.02	0.08	-0.18	-0.04	0.12
$D[Wi_D/Dt]m_e$	0.05	-0.63	0.10	1.00	-0.04	-0.08	0.84	0.31	0.42	0.52
D[nArNHR]a _t	-0.16	-0.07	0.41	-0.04	1.00	-0.12	-0.02	-0.21	-0.06	-0.11
D[Mor32m]bt	0.55	-0.13	-0.02	-0.08	-0.12	1.00	-0.14	0.12	-0.19	0.16
$D[VE1_Dz(Z)]b_t$	-0.16	-0.57	0.08	0.84	-0.02	-0.14	1.00	0.33	0.30	0.54
D[nRNH2]at	0.04	0.01	-0.18	0.31	-0.21	0.12	0.33	1.00	-0.04	0.10
D[F02[N-O]]me	0.00	-0.16	-0.04	0.42	-0.06	-0.19	0.30	-0.04	1.00	-0.03
D[L2m]bt	0.03	-0.47	0.12	0.52	-0.11	0.16	0.54	0.10	-0.03	1.00

Table S1. Degree of collinearity among the variables of the GA-LDA model.

Variable	D[nRNH2]a _t	D[L2m]b _t	D[CATS3D_18_DL]bt	$D[D/Dtr05]b_t$	D[C- 030]b _t	D[nPyridines]me	$D[nCt]b_t$	D[T(NO)]m _e	D[CATS3D_07_DA]me	D[CA
D[nRNH2]at	1.00	0.10	0.32	0.16	0.07	0.32	0.30	0.27	0.38	
D[L2m]bt	0.10	1.00	0.12	0.33	0.32	-0.02	0.39	0.17	0.09	
$D[CATS3D_{18}DL]b_t$	0.32	0.12	1.00	0.04	-0.05	-0.03	0.03	0.61	0.37	
$D[D/Dtr05]b_t$	0.16	0.33	0.04	1.00	0.07	0.06	0.20	0.19	0.19	
D[C-030]bt	0.07	0.32	-0.05	0.07	1.00	-0.31	0.29	-0.02	-0.03	
D[nPyridines]me	0.32	-0.02	-0.03	0.06	-0.31	1.00	0.02	-0.03	0.03	
$D[nCt]b_t$	0.30	0.39	0.03	0.20	0.29	0.02	1.00	0.01	0.08	
$D[T(NO)]m_e$	0.27	0.17	0.61	0.19	-0.02	-0.03	0.01	1.00	0.58	
D[CATS3D_07_DA]me	0.38	0.09	0.37	0.19	-0.03	0.03	0.08	0.58	1.00	
$D[CATS3D_{10}PL]b_t$	0.28	0.04	0.18	0.01	-0.06	0.04	0.10	0.23	0.31	

Table S2. Degree of collinearity among the variables of the FS-LDA model.

Variable	D[nRNH2]m _e	D[H- 052]me	D[CATS2D_06_DD]at	D[SsNH2]at	D[T(NN)]at	D[F07[N- Cl]]at	D[Mor31u]b _t	D[CATS2D_02_DD]bt	D[B03[S- Br]]bt	D[F08[N S]]bt
D[nRNH2]me	1.00	0.18	0.43	0.74	0.61	0.02	0.10	0.30	0.16	-0.09
D[H-052]me	0.18	1.00	0.24	0.30	0.29	0.03	0.31	0.11	-0.02	-0.06
$D[CATS2D_06_DD]a_t$	0.43	0.24	1.00	0.34	0.57	0.01	0.19	0.66	-0.01	-0.03
D[SsNH2]at	0.74	0.30	0.34	1.00	0.55	-0.06	-0.01	0.25	0.12	-0.08
$D[T(NN)]a_t$	0.61	0.29	0.57	0.55	1.00	0.01	0.45	0.53	0.07	-0.01
D[F07[N-Cl]]at	0.02	0.03	0.01	-0.06	0.01	1.00	0.08	-0.04	-0.04	-0.02
D[Mor31u]bt	0.10	0.31	0.19	-0.01	0.45	0.08	1.00	0.05	-0.09	-0.03
$D[CATS2D_02_DD]b_t$	0.30	0.11	0.66	0.25	0.53	-0.04	0.05	1.00	-0.01	0.00
$D[B03[S-Br]]b_t$	0.16	-0.02	-0.01	0.12	0.07	-0.04	-0.09	-0.01	1.00	-0.03
$D[F08[N-S]]b_t$	-0.09	-0.06	-0.03	-0.08	-0.01	-0.02	-0.03	0.00	-0.03	1.00

Table S3. Degree of collinearity among the variables of the SFS-LDA model.

Compound	Conditions passed (GA-LDA)	Conditions passed (XGBoost)
ASN19	me: IC ₅₀ at: B bt: AKT	me: ICso, at: B ht: AKT
	me: IC_{50} , at: B, bt: AKT2	me: IC_{50} , at: B, bt: AKT2
	me: IC_{50} , at: B bt: $AKT3$	me: IC ₅₀ , at: B, bt: AKT3
	me: Ki at: B ht: AKT	me: Ki at: B ht: AKT
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT?	me: Ki at: B ht: AKT?
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT3	me: Ki at: B ht: AKT3
	me: IC., at: E ht: AKT	inc. Ki, at. D, bt. AK15
	me. 1050 , at. Γ , bt. AKT	
	me. Ki, at. Γ , bt. AKT	
	me. Ki, at. Γ , bt. AKT2	
ASN21	me: IC at: B bt: AKT	me: IC., at: B bt: AKT
ASIN21	Inc. IC_{50} , al. B , bt. AKT	me. IC_{50} , at. B , bt. AKT
	me. IC_{50} , al. B , bt. AK12 me: IC_{50} , at: B bt: AKT2	me. IC_{50} , at. B , bt. AK12 me: IC_{50} , at: B bt: AKT2
	me. K_{50} , al. D, bl. AK15	me. IC_{50} , at. D , bt. AK15
	me: Ki, at. B, bt. AKT2	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT2
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: $\Lambda KT3$	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT2
	me: IC at: E bt: AKT	me. Ki, at. B, bt. AK15
	me: K_{50} , at. Γ , bt. AKT	
	me: Ki, at. F, bt: AKT?	
	me. Ki, at. Γ , bt. AKT2	
4 SN22	may IC at P bt AVT	may IC at D ht AVT
ASIN22	Ine. IC_{50} , al. B , bl. AKI	IIIC. IC_{50} , al. D, bl. AKI
	Ine. IC_{50} , al. D , bl. AK12	Inc. IC_{50} , al. D, bl. AK12
	me: IC_{50} , al: B, bl: AK15	me: IC_{50} , al: B, bl: AK15
	me: KI, al: B, bl: AKI	me: KI, al: B, bl: AKI
	me: KI, al: B, bl: AK12	me: KI, al: B, bl: AK12
	me: KI, al: B, bl: AK15	me: KI, al: B, bl: AK13
	Ine. IC_{50} , al. Γ , bl. AK I	
	Inc. KI, al. F , bl. AKI	
	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Ine. KI, at. F, bt. AK12} \\ \text{mo: } K_{1} \text{ at: F, bt: } AKT2 \end{array}$	
4 SN2706	me: IC at: P bt: AKT	mo: IC., at: P ht: AKT
ASIN2700	me: IC_{50} , at: B, bt: AKT2	me: IC_{50} , at: B, bt: AKT me: IC_{44} at: B bt: AKT2
	me: IC_{50} , at: B, bt: AKT3	me: IC_{50} , at: B, bt: AKT2 me: IC_{50} at: B bt: AKT3
	me: K_{1} at: B bt: ΔKT	me: Ki at: B ht: AKT
	me: Ki at: B bt: AKT?	me: Ki at: B ht: AKT2
	me: Ki, at: B ht: AKT3	me: Ki at: B ht: AKT3
	me: Ki at: F ht: AKT?	ine. Ki, at. D, ot. 7K15
ASN5093	me: IC _{co} at: B bt: AKT	me: IC to at: B ht: AKT
1010000	me: IC_{50} , at: B bt: AKT?	me: IC_{50} , at: B bt: AKT2
	me: IC_{50} , at: B bt: AKT3	me: IC_{50} at: B bt: AKT3
	me: Ki at: B bt: AKT	me: Ki at: B bt: AKT
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT2	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT2
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT3	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT3
	me: Ki, at: F, bt: AKT2	
	me: Ki, at: F. bt: AKT3	
Asn5283	me: IC ₅₀ , at: B, bt: AKT	me: IC ₅₀ , at: B, bt: AKT
	me: IC_{50} , at: B, bt: AKT2	me: IC_{50} , at: B, bt: AKT2
	me: IC_{50} , at: B, bt: AKT3	me: IC_{50} , at: B, bt: AKT3
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT2	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT2
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT3	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT3
	me: Ki, at: F, bt: AKT2	
Asn6236	me: IC ₅₀ , at: B, bt: AKT	me: IC ₅₀ , at: B, bt: AKT
	me: IC ₅₀ , at: B, bt: AKT2	me: IC ₅₀ , at: B, bt: AKT2
	me: IC ₅₀ , at: B, bt: AKT3	me: IC ₅₀ , at: B, bt: AKT3
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT2	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT2
	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT3	me: Ki, at: B, bt: AKT3
	me: Ki, at: F, bt: AKT2	

Table S4. Experimental conditions under which the virtual hits were predicted to be active

Compound	AKT1			AKT2	АКТЗ		
compound	Vina	Autodock	Vina	Autodock	Vina	Autodock	
Asn0019	-10.00	-10.34	-9.60	-8.57	-8.40	-8.30	
Asn0021	-9.00	-9.04	-9.40	-8.37	-8.40	-8.06	
Asn0022	-10.20	-10.10	-9.40	-8.47	-8.50	-8.34	
Asn5093	-9.20	-8.28	-7.10	-7.22	-7.60	-7.01	
Asn6236	-10.40	-10.47	-9.60	-9.27	-8.80	-8.32	
GSK690693	nd ª	-8.13	nd ª	-8.27	nd ª	-10.20	

Table S5. Molecular docking results with binding energy values (in kcal/mol) of the virtual hits.

^aNot determined.



Figure S1. ROC curves for the two best non-linear models (Xgboost – ROC-AUC score (test): 0.919, ROC-AUC score (validation): 0.932, and RF – AUROC: ROC-AUC score (test): 0.917, ROC-AUC score (validation): 0.930)







Figure S3. Fitting of virtual hits on the structure-based pharmacophores of AKT1 (PDB: 3CQU) and AKT2 (PDB: 2UW9) enzymes



Figure S4. Protein backbone RMSD, ligand RMSD, RMSF and radiation of gyration plots of AKT1 complexes.



Figure S5. Protein backbone RMSD, ligand RMSD, RMSF and radiation of gyration plots of AKT2 complexes.



Figure S6. Protein backbone RMSD, ligand RMSD, RMSF and radiation of gyration plots of AKT3 complexes.



Figure S7. (A) Alignment of AKT3 target sequence with potential template, (B) Z-score estimation of the AKT3 homology model, (C) local QMEAN estimates after manual refinement, (D) AKT3 homology model built using Swiss-Model server using the 6CCy.1.A template 3D structure



94.6% (298/315) of all residues were in favored (98%) regions. 99.7% (314/315) of all residues were in allowed (>99.8%) regions.

There were 1 outliers (phi, psi): 313 Asp (49.1, 82.5)

