

# Supplementary Information

## Table of contents

<b>Table of contents</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Methods</b>	<b>2</b>
Hardware	2
Software	2
Training, tuning and predictions	2
Data splitting	2
Scalar data	4
Nested cross-validation	4
Bayesian hyperparameters optimization	4
Example	5
Images	7
Hyperparameters tuning upstream of the cross-validation	7
Cross-validation	10
Cross-validation example	11
Time series	12
Hyperparameters tuning upstream of the cross-validation	12
Tuning of the seed using a cross-validation	14
Generating average predictions for each participant	14
Interpretability of the predictions	16
Scalar data-based predictors	16
Time series and image-based predictors	16
Non-genetic correlates of accelerated aging	20
Imputation of the non-genetic X-variables	20
X-Wide Association Studies	22
<b>Supplementary Figures</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Supplementary Tables</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Supplementary References</b>	<b>46</b>

# Methods

## Hardware

We performed the computation for this project on Harvard Medical School's compute cluster, with access to both central processing units [CPUs] and general processing units [GPUs] (Tesla-M40, Tesla-K80, Tesla-V100) via a Simple Linux Utility for Resource Management [SLURM] scheduler.

## Software

We coded the project in Python <sup>1</sup> and used the following libraries: NumPy <sup>2,3</sup>, Pandas <sup>4</sup>, Matplotlib <sup>5</sup>, Plotly <sup>6</sup>, Python Imaging Library <sup>7</sup>, SciPy <sup>8-10</sup>, Scikit-learn <sup>11</sup>, LightGBM <sup>12</sup>, XGBoost <sup>13</sup>, Hyperopt <sup>14</sup>, TensorFlow 2 <sup>15</sup>, Keras <sup>16</sup>, Keras-vis <sup>17</sup>, iNNvestigate <sup>18</sup>. We used Dash <sup>19</sup> to code the website on which we shared the results. We set the seed for the os library, the numpy library, the random library and the tensorflow library to zero.

## Training, tuning and predictions

### Data splitting

We split the 676,787 samples into ten data folds, while keeping all samples from the same participant in the same fold. To ensure this, we split the 502,211 participants' ids (referred to by UKB as "eid") into ten different buckets of the same size. To generate ten folds for each sub-dataset (e.g. ECGs), we took the intersection of the samples in each of the ten folds with

the samples for which the sub-dataset data was available. This method had however one important loophole, which is that we could not guarantee that the folds for the sub-datasets would be balanced. For example, resting ECG data was only recorded for 42,360 out of the 502,211 participants. Since the 502,211 participants are split into ten folds, a fold contains approximately 50,221 participants. Although unlikely, we could therefore not guarantee that all or most of the ECG samples would be attributed to the first data fold, leading to highly unbalanced folds for the ECGs analysis. Unbalanced folds can lead to problems during the cross-validation (see further below), as models trained on a smaller number of samples will tend to generalize worse. One solution would have been to use a different split for each dataset, but this would have generated problems when building the ensemble models fold by fold (see Methods - Models ensembling). To mitigate this issue of unbalanced data folds, we developed the following heuristic. We randomly split the 502,211 participants into ten folds, 1,000 times. For each of these 1,000 splits, we computed for each sub-dataset the variance of the percentages of samples in each fold. We then scored each of the 1,000 splits using the maximum of the variance among the different sub-datasets. For example, if the ECG samples were not evenly split for the  $i$ th split out of the 1,000 splits (e.g. fold 1: 55% of the samples, every other fold: 5% of the samples), the variance of the sample proportions would be high, which would yield a poor score for the  $i$ th split. Finally, we selected the split with the lowest score as the final split for the main dataset, and for all the sub-datasets. This selected split had a score of  $5.8e-4$ , which means that the most unbalanced sub-dataset had a variance in its sample size proportion between its ten folds of  $5.8e-4$ .

## Scalar data

### Nested cross-validation

Cross-validation is a method to tune the regularization of models and prevent overfitting<sup>20</sup>. For the models inputting scalar data (Figure 1A in green), we tuned the hyperparameters and generated a testing prediction for each sample using a nested 10x9-folds cross-validation. We refer to the two nested cross-validations as the “outer” and the “inner” cross-validations. The outer-cross validation is used to generate an unbiased testing prediction for each sample, as opposed to a simple split of the data into a “training+validation” set on one hand, and a testing set on the other hand, which would only generate a testing prediction for one tenth of the dataset. The inner cross-validation is used to tune the hyperparameters more precisely, leveraging the full inner cross-validation dataset as a validation set, as opposed to a simple data split of the “training+validation” dataset into a training and a validation sets, which would only use one data fold as the validation set to estimate the performance associated with a specific combination of hyperparameters. The nested cross-validation is illustrated in Table S29.

### Bayesian hyperparameters optimization

To tune the hyperparameters, we used the Tree-structured Parzen Estimator Approach<sup>21</sup> [TPE] of the hyperopt python package<sup>22</sup>. TPE is a sequential Bayesian hyperparameters optimization method that iteratively suggests the next most promising hyperparameters combination as a function of the hyperparameters combinations that have already been tested, by building a probabilistic representation of the objective function. We set the number of iterations to 30. For each model, 30 different hyperparameter combinations are iteratively tested before selecting the best performing one. The hyperparameters names and their ranges defining the

hyperparameters space can be found in Table S39. It might be of interest to other researchers that we initially tuned the hyperparameters using a random search <sup>23</sup> with the same number of iterations, and we did not observe a significant improvement in the model's performance after implementing the Bayesian hyperparameters optimization.

## Example

For the sake of clarity, let us walk through a concrete example, which is illustrated in Table S41. Suppose we want to generate unbiased predictions for every sample in a dataset using an elastic net. First, let us generate the testing prediction for the data fold F9, which is performed by the first fold of the outer cross-validation (outer cross-validation fold 0). We select the data fold F9 out of the ten data folds as the testing fold, and we select the remaining nine data folds as “training+validation” folds for the inner cross-validation. We scale and center the target (age) and the predictors using the mean and standard deviation values of the variables on the “training+validation” dataset. We then enter the first inner-cross validation.

For the first inner cross-validation fold, we select the data fold F8 as the validation set, and the remaining eight “training+validation” data folds as the training set. We re-scale and center age and the predictors in the training and the validation sets using the mean and standard deviation values of the training set. We train the model on the eight training data folds with the first hyperparameters combination sampled by the TPE algorithm (one value for alpha and one value for l1\_ratio) and generate validation predictions on the validation fold (data fold F8), which we unscale. This completes the first of the nine inner cross-validation folds (Inner CV fold 0). We then permute the nine inner data folds. We scale the age and the predictors using the mean and standard deviation computed on the new training set. Then we train the model with the same

first combination of hyperparameters on eight data folds, leaving aside the data fold F9 (still being used as the testing set for the outer cross-validation) and the data fold F7 (now being used as the validation set for the inner cross-validation). We then use the new trained model to generate validation predictions on the data fold F7, which we unscale. This completes the second of the nine inner-cross validation folds (Inner CV fold 1). We then reiterate these inner permutation and training processes seven more times, until every data fold in the nine “training+validation” data folds is used as the validation set once. At this point, we concatenate the validation predictions from these nine validation folds to obtain the overall validation predictions associated with the first hyperparameters combination, and compute the associated performance metric (e.g. RMSE). This completes the inner-cross validation for the first hyperparameters combination.

We then perform the same 9-folds inner cross-validation, this time with the second hyperparameters combination suggested by the TPE algorithm. We iterate this process 28 more times, until 30 different hyperparameters combinations have iteratively been tested. Next, we select the hyperparameter combination that yielded the best validation performance (e.g. minimum RMSE), and we retrain a model on the whole nine “training+validation” data folds (all data folds except for data fold #1), using this best performing hyperparameters combination. This completes the first inner cross-validation.

We then use the model to generate unbiased predictions on the unseen testing set (data fold F9) and record these predictions. By anticipation for the ensembling algorithm (see Methods - Models ensembling) we also need to compute validation predictions on the data fold F8. We do this by training a model on all the data folds aside from the validation fold (data fold F8) and the

testing fold (data fold F9), with the selected hyperparameters combination. We then use this trained model to compute predictions on the validation fold (data fold F8) and record these predictions, after unscaling them. This completes the first of the ten outer cross-validation folds (outer cross-validation 0).

We then complete the second outer cross-validation fold (outer cross-validation 1), this time using the data fold F8 as the testing dataset, to obtain unbiased testing predictions on this data fold, as well as validation predictions on the data fold F7. We reiterate the process eight more times to obtain the testing and validation predictions on the remaining data folds. We then concatenate the testing predictions from the ten data folds to obtain our final testing predictions for the model. Similarly, we concatenate the validation predictions from the ten data folds to obtain our final testing predictions for the model, which will later be used during ensemble models building and model selection (see Methods - Models ensembling).

The final validation and testing predictions for each data fold are therefore not necessarily associated with the same hyperparameters combination. It is also important to notice that we performed a single outer cross-validation, but that we performed a separate inner-cross validation for each outer cross-validation fold (hence the word “nested”), for a total of ten inner cross-validations per outer cross-validation fold.

## Images

### Hyperparameters tuning upstream of the cross-validation

The hyperparameters we tuned were the number of added fully connected dense layers, the number of nodes in these layers, their activation function, the optimizer, the initial learning rate, the weight decay, the dropout rate, the data augmentation amplitude and the batch size.

Repeatedly tuning the values of the hyperparameters for different deep neural networks architectures and on the different cross-validation folds would have been prohibitively time and resource consuming. Instead, we sequentially explored how each hyperparameter was affecting the training and validation performances for a single architecture (InceptionV3) on a single cross validation fold (fold #0, see Methods - Training, tuning and predictions - Images - Cross-validation for the detailed description of the cross-validation). We then extrapolated the hyperparameter values to the other architectures, datasets and cross-validation folds. The hyperparameters combinations tested during the tuning can be found in Table S30.

First, we maximized the batch size for each architecture. The maximum number of images per batch depends on the memory of the GPU and the size of the architecture, which itself depends on the dimensions of the image. We used a batch size of 32 for InceptionV3 and 8 for InceptionResNetV2.

Then, we tested the learning rates, including  $1e-6$ ,  $1e-5$ ,  $1e-4$ ,  $1e-3$ ,  $1e-2$  and  $1e-1$ . We observed that learning rates larger than  $1e-4$  prevented the model from converging for some runs. Second, we did not observe significant differences between the results obtained with learning rates smaller than  $1e-4$ . We therefore set the initial learning rate to be  $1e-4$  for all models to shorten the time to convergence while ensuring that the learning rate was small enough to allow convergence and the finding of a local minima for the loss function.

Then we tested three different optimizers to perform the gradient descent: Adam<sup>24</sup>, Adadelta<sup>25</sup> and RMSprop<sup>26</sup>. We did not observe any significant differences between the optimizers, so we set the optimizer to be Adam.



We then added different numbers of fully connected layers between the base CNN and side CNN's concatenated outputs and the final activation layer. We set the number of nodes to be 1,024 in the first added layer and then decreased the number of nodes by a factor of two for each successive layer. For example, if we added three fully connected layers, the number of nodes was 1024, 512 and 256. We added zero, one and five layers. We did not observe significant differences in the performance of the different architectures, so we set the number of fully connected layers to one.

We then tested powers of two from 16 to 2,048 as the number of nodes in this single layer. We did not observe significant differences between these architectures, so we set the number of nodes to be 1,024 to keep the number close to the initial number of nodes in the imported CNN architectures, as these were initially used to perform classification between 1,000 categories.

We tested two different activation functions for the activation functions of the fully connected layers we added in the side neural network and before the final linear layer. We did not observe any significant differences between the rectified linear units [ReLU]<sup>27</sup> and the scaled exponential linear units [SELU]<sup>28</sup> as activation functions, so we used the more common ReLU.

We then tested different levels of data augmentation. We introduced a hyperparameter that we called "data augmentation factor". The data augmentation factor modulates the amount of variation introduced by the data augmentation, while preserving the ratio between the different transformations. For example, a data augmentation factor of one is equivalent to the default data augmentation (see Preprocessing - Data augmentation - Images), but a data augmentation

factor of two will double the ranges of the possible values sampled and the expected values for the vertical shift, the horizontal shift, the rotation and the zoom on the original images. We tested the following values for the data augmentation factor: 0, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 1.5 and 2. We found that different values for the data augmentation factor hyperparameter yielded similar results, as long as the data augmentation factor was not zero. We therefore set the data augmentation factor to be one when training the final models.

We then tuned the dropout rate for the fully connected layers we added. We tested the following values: 0, 0.1, 0.25, 0.3, 0.5, 0.75, 0.9 and 0.95. We observed that a dropout rate of 0.95 led to underfitting and that smaller values reduced overfitting on the training set but without improving the validation performance. As a consequence, we used a dropout rate of 0.5.

Finally, we tuned the weight decay. We tested the following values: 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 1, 5, 10 and 100. For the larger datasets, we found that weight decay values as low as 0.4 could lead to underfitting. We found that lower weight decay values reduced overfitting on the training set without significantly improving the validation performance. We set the weight decay to 0.1.

Altogether, we found that hyperparameter tuning had little effect on the validation performance as long as extreme hyperparameters values were not selected.

## Cross-validation

Training deep convolutional neural networks on images and videos is too time and resource consuming to perform a nested cross-validation. Therefore, we tuned the hyperparameters during the preliminary analysis, as described above. After hyperparameters tuning, we performed a simple outer cross-validation to obtain a testing prediction for each sample of the

datasets, but we replaced the inner cross-validation with a simple split between the training fold and the validation fold (Table S31). Although the hyperparameters were already tuned, a validation set was still required for two reasons: (1) to perform early stopping <sup>29</sup>, a form of regularization. (2) to generate a set of validation predictions that are necessary for efficient ensemble building (see Methods - Models ensembling) and model selection. During the cross-validation, we scaled and centered the target variable (chronological age) as well as the side predictors (sex and ethnicity) around zero with a standard deviation of one, using the training summary statistics. Scaling the target and the input helps prevent the issues of exploding and vanishing gradients <sup>30,31</sup>.

### Cross-validation example

For the sake of clarity, let us walk through an example. Let us say that we want to generate unbiased predictions for every sample in a dataset using a CNN. First, we select the data fold #0 as the validation set, the data fold #1 as the testing set, and the remaining data folds (#2-9) as the training set. Then we scale and center the target (age), and the side predictors (sex and ethnicity) using the training mean and standard deviation: for each of the variables, we subtract the training mean to the variable on both the training, the validation and the testing set, and we divide it by the training standard deviation. We then train the model on the training set until convergence and select the architecture's parameters (also known as "weights") associated with the epoch that yielded the lowest validation RMSE. We then use the optimal weights to generate validation predictions for the data fold #0 and testing predictions on the data fold #1. Finally, we unscale the validation and testing predictions by multiplying them by the initial age training standard deviation before adding the initial age training mean to them. This completes the first cross-validation fold.

We then reiterate the process, this time using the data fold #1 as the validation set, the data fold #2 as the testing set, and the remaining data folds (#0 and #3-9) as the training set. We use the optimized weights to generate the validation predictions on the data fold #2, and the testing predictions on the data fold #3. We unscale the validation and testing predictions. This completes the second cross-validation fold. We reiterate the process eight more times to complete the cross-validation. We then concatenate the validation predictions from the ten data folds to obtain the final validation predictions, and the testing predictions from the ten data folds to obtain the final testing predictions.

## Time series

We tuned the time series models in two steps. (1) We tuned the hyperparameters using a single cross-validation fold. (2) We tuned the seed and performed early stopping (patience=40) using a simple cross-validation, to generate a testing sample size for every sample. These two steps are described in detail below.

### Hyperparameters tuning upstream of the cross-validation

The hyperparameters we tuned were the number of convolutional layers in the architecture, the number of nodes in the dropout rate and the strength of the kernel and the bias regularizations. We tuned the hyperparameters using a single cross-validation fold. Specifically, we used the data fold #0 as validation set and the data folds #2-9 as training set. We used the same pipeline as for the images and the videos, with two differences. (1) Because the training of models built on time series was significantly faster than the training of models built on images or videos, we used a grid search to tune the hyperparameters rather than tune them sequentially. (2) We

scaled the input differently. For the models built on the ECGs and on the raw acceleration data across the full week, we did not scale the data because we adapted architectures from publications in which the input has not been scaled. The models built on PWA, features extracted from acceleration data and three-dimensional walking data, we normalized every sample separately by dividing each lead by the absolute value of its maximal value for the sample. We then used this maximum value as a scalar predictor which we refer to in this paper as “scaling factor”.

We tested architectures with one to ten convolutional layers for the convolutional block. The default number of filters for each convolutional layer doubled with every layer, starting from 16 and capped at 1,024. For example, the default number of filters for a nine layers deep convolutional block would be 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1,024, 1,024 and 1,024. To allow the architecture to increase its breadth without increasing its depth, we introduced another hyperparameter which we called the “filters factor”, with a value of either one, two or four. The number of filters in each convolutional layer was the default number of filters multiplied by the filters factor value. For example, the number of filters for a three-layer deep convolutional block with a filter factor of four would be 64, 128 and 256, instead of 16, 32 and 64. For the dropout rate, we defined the hyperparameter space as eleven values uniformly spread between 0 and 50%, included. For the kernel and the bias regularizers, we defined the hyperparameter space as the absence of regularization (0) and every negative power of 10 between three ( $10e-3$ ) and six ( $10e-6$ ), included. We used the hyperparameters values selected on this first cross-validation fold for the nine remaining cross-validation folds. The hyperparameters values selected can be found in Table S46.

## Tuning of the seed using a cross-validation

We observed that the hyperparameters values selected on the first cross-validation fold did not always perform as well for the other cross-validation folds. Similarly, we observed that similar hyperparameter values combinations could lead to significantly different performances on the first cross-validation fold. We hypothesized that these differences could be partly driven by different random initializations of the weights of the neural network, which led to convergence to different local minima. To mitigate this effect, we tuned the Keras seed independently for each of the ten cross-validation folds. We tested every integer between zero and nine, included, and selected the seed that yielded the best model in terms of performance on the validation set.

The cross-validation also served to generate a testing prediction on every sample and to perform early stopping, as described under the pipeline for images.

## Generating average predictions for each participant

We generated an average prediction for each individual, reported to UKB's instance 0. We walk through an example. Let us assume a participant had two carotid ultrasound samples collected from them in instances 2 and 3, respectively at age 70 and 80. Let us assume that the age predictions were respectively 64 and 78, so the residuals are respectively -6 years and -2 years, for an average of -4 years. However, we still need to take into account the bias in the residuals, defined as the difference between the participant's chronological age and the prediction. As explained in more details under Methods - Biological age definition, we observed a bias in the residuals as a function of chronological age. Participants on the younger end of the chronological age distribution tend to be predicted older than they actually are, whereas

participants on the older end of the distribution tend to be predicted younger than they actually are. We need to properly account for this bias when translating a prediction from a more recent instance to an older instance. Let us assume that the average bias in the residuals for participants who are 70 and 80 years old is respectively -2 years and -4 years. After correcting for this bias, the predictions are now respectively  $64 - (-2) = 66$  and  $78 - (-4) = 82$ . Therefore, the corrected residuals for this participant are respectively -4 years and +2 years, for an average of -1 years. Finally, let us assume that the participant was 60 years old in instance 0. We will assign a single prediction of  $60 - 1 = 59$  years to the participant, but we still need to un-correct for the bias in residuals. Let us assume that the average bias for the residuals at age 60 is +5 years. We will assign a final prediction for the participant of  $59 + 5 = 64$  years. This new set of predictions reported on the instance 0 is more likely to have a non-zero sample size overlap with other predictors based on datasets collected on instance 0 (e.g. blood biomarkers) and can therefore be leveraged by the ensemble builder.

A key point we would like to highlight here is that we did not actually correct for the bias in the residuals at this step of the pipeline. Instead, we corrected then un-corrected the predictions that we translated from different instances to the instance 0. The actual correction for the residual biases takes place when defining the biological age phenotypes (see Methods - Biological age definition).

To distinguish between raw predictions on the instance 0, and the average predictions reported to the instance 0, we created a new instance which we named instance “\*”. We refer to these predictions as “participants predictions”, as opposed to “samples predictions”.

## Interpretability of the predictions

### Scalar data-based predictors

For elastic nets, we interpreted the models using the values of the regression coefficients. Large absolute values for these coefficients means they played an important role when generating the predictions. For gradient boosted machines we used the feature importances, which are based on the number of times a tree selected each of the variables. Variables with high feature importances were selected more often and are therefore likely to play a key role in predicting chronological age. For neural networks, we estimated the importance of each feature by permuting it randomly between samples before computing the performance of the model. The score of each feature is the difference between the R-Squared value before and after the random permutations. Features whose random permutation leads to a large decrease in the model's performance are estimated to be important predictors of chronological age.

We estimated the concordance between the three different algorithms by computing the Pearson and the Spearman correlations between their feature importances.

### Time series and image-based predictors

To interpret the CNNs built on time series, images and videos, we used saliency maps<sup>32</sup>. For time series and images, we coded the saliency maps using the keract python library. For videos, we generated a saliency map for each time frame using the iNNvestigate python library<sup>18</sup>. For each input sample, a saliency map uses the gradient of the final prediction with respect to each individual input pixel to estimate whether changing the value of this pixel would affect the



prediction. Pixels for which the gradient is close to zero are not important, whereas pixels with a large gradient are estimated to be important. For videos, we computed both a saliency map for each time frame, which we stored as a .gif file, and an average saliency map over all time frames.

For images, we built a second attention map using a custom version of the Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping [Grad-CAM] algorithm<sup>33</sup> adapted to regression rather than multi-class classification: Gradient-weighted Regression Activation Mapping [Grad-RAM]. The intuition behind Grad-CAM maps is that they are similar to saliency maps<sup>33</sup>, but instead of computing the gradient with respect to the input image, they compute it with respect to the activation of the last convolutional layer. As convolutional layers maintain the spatial organization of the input image, Grad-CAM can still identify which region of the image is driving the predictions. Because Grad-CAM does not have to backpropagate the gradient all the way back to the input image, it is considered a less noisy alternative to the saliency maps. In the same way that saliency maps need to combine the attention maps generated in the different input channels (e.g. RGB) into a single activation map, Grad-CAM must combine the attention maps generated on the different filters of the last convolutional layer. For example, the last convolutional layer for InceptionResNetV2 has 1,792 filters. Grad-CAM combines these 1,792 attention maps into a single attention map using a linear combination. In the initial Class Activation Mapping [CAM] algorithm<sup>34</sup>, generating CAM activation maps required to retrain the model after modifying the architecture and replacing all the fully connected layers after the final convolutional layer with a global max pooling operation, which converted each filter into a scalar feature. The intuition behind this substitution was that each filter could be interpreted as detecting a specific feature, and global max pooling yielded a scalar that could be interpreted as the presence (high value)

or absence (low value) of the feature anywhere on the image. The scalar values were then linearly combined and activated using the softmax function to yield the probabilities of belonging to different classes. To obtain the activation map for a specific class, the filters of the last convolution layer were linearly combined using the weights connecting the scalar features obtained after the max pooling operation to the final prediction score for that class. CAM was later improved to become Grad-CAM<sup>33</sup>. Grad-CAM saves the need for modifying the architecture of the model and retraining it by approximating the linear regression weight for each final convolutional filter by the mean activation gradient over the pixels of the filter. The intuition behind this approximation is that a filter's pixel is important if changing its value affects the final prediction, so a high average gradient over the pixels of the filter justifies that this filter should be given a higher weight when merging all the filters into a single attention map. To adapt Grad-CAM to our regression task we (1) computed the derivatives of the chronological age prediction rather than a class' prediction and (2) removed the ReLU activation applied to the weighted sum of the last convolutional filters, which we replaced by an absolute value. The rationale is that for (Grad-)CAM maps, we only want to highlight the regions of the picture which are associated with a high probability for the class. In contrast, for (Grad-)RAM we care as much about the regions of the input image that can strongly increase the chronological age prediction as about the regions that can strongly decrease it. Because the filters in the last convolutional layer are the result of the processing of the input image by several convolutional layers with possibly negative weights, the sign of the last convolutional layer's pixels and regression weights cannot be linked to either accelerated aging or decelerated aging, only to the magnitude of the shift that would affect the prediction if each region of the input image was modified. Regression Activation Mapping (RAM) was mentioned as a possible extension of CAM in the original CAM publication<sup>34</sup> and has been used to interpret models CNNs built on retinal images

<sup>35</sup> and cortical surfaces <sup>36</sup>, but we are to our knowledge the first to describe the generalization of Grad-CAM to a regression task. One notable difference between our implementation and Wang and Yang.'s implementation <sup>35</sup> is that we are taking the absolute value of the final attention map, as mentioned above. We found that not taking the absolute value led to misleading attention maps for participants with high chronological age predictions. The attention map highlights important areas with negative values, which are therefore depicted in blue, a color otherwise associated with unimportant regions in traditional CAMs. Inversely, regions on the input image for which the attention map has a slight positive value are spuriously considered to be the most important and are highlighted in red. We therefore advise that RAM or Grad-RAM be implemented using an absolute value. We coded Grad-RAM using the `get_activations` and `get_gradients_of_activations` functions of the `keract` python library.

It is important to understand that unlike the feature importances described under “Scalar data-based predictors”, which describe the model itself, attention maps are sample specific. In other words, they can be used to explain which features drove the predictions for a specific inputted sample but cannot provide an explanation for the way the model is performing predictions in general.

For each aging subdimension, we generated the attention maps for the best performing CNN architecture. We selected representative samples for which we computed the different attention maps. We computed attention maps for the two sexes (female and male), for three age ranges (ten youngest ages, ten middle ages and ten oldest ages of the chronological age distribution) and for three aging rates (accelerated agers, normal agers, decelerated agers). For each intersection of the three categories listed above, we selected the ten most representative

samples (e.g. the ten most accelerated agers among young males). The figures in this paper only present the first, most representative of these ten samples. The complete set of samples can be found on the website.

## Non-genetic correlates of accelerated aging

Unlike DNA, biomarkers, phenotypes, diseases, family history, environmental variables and socioeconomics can change over life. As a consequence, we compared each biomarker, phenotype and environmental variable with the accelerated aging of the participant at the time the exposure was measured and we used the “Samples predictions”, as opposed to the “Participants predictions” that we used for the identification of genetic correlates (see Methods - Models ensembling - Generating average predictions for each participant).

### Imputation of the non-genetic X-variables

Most X-variables were not collected on all four instances. Additionally, no X-variables were collected at the same time as the accelerometer data was collected. To identify the non-genetic correlates of accelerated aging, we had to impute the values of the X-variables for the ages of the participants for which they were not available. We considered two imputation methods, which we refer to as the “cross-sectional” and the “longitudinal” imputations.

For the cross-sectional imputation, we computed a linear regression for each X variable as a function of age, adjusting for sex. We then used the slope of the linear regression to extrapolate the value of the XWAS variable at different ages.

For the longitudinal imputation, we first selected, for each X variable, all the participants that had at least two measures taken for this X variable. We then performed a linear regression for each participant. We then averaged the slope of the linear regressions over all the participants of the same sex. Finally, we used this slope to extrapolate the value of the XWAS variable at different ages for all participants depending on their sex, in the same way we did it for the cross-sectional imputation.

It is important to notice that for both the cross-sectional imputation and the longitudinal imputation, data can only be imputed when the XWAS variable has been measured at least once for the participant. This raw measure is then used to extrapolate which value the X variable was likely taking a couple years earlier and/or later.

The advantage of the cross-sectional imputation is larger sample sizes. The advantage of the longitudinal method is that it corrects for generational effects. For example, old people have shorter legs than young people on average <sup>37</sup>. This is not because human legs shrink as we grow older. Instead, people who are old today already had shorter legs when they were young. If the cross-sectional regression is used to impute the length of the participants on instances where it was not measured, it will spuriously assign smaller values to the older samples. In contrast, the longitudinal regression learns the regression coefficient by comparing each participant to themselves as they age and will therefore not capture the generational effect. When used to predict the participants legs' length, it will impute constant values over time. To evaluate which of the two imputation methods should be preferred, we used them to predict X-variables for which we knew the actual values and computed the R-Squared values associated with the predictions. We found that, even with sample sizes as small as 200


samples, longitudinal imputation outperformed cross-sectional imputation. We therefore used longitudinal imputation.

## X-Wide Association Studies


First, we tested for associations in an univariate context by computing the partial correlation between each X-variable and arterial aging dimensions. To compute the partial correlation between an X-variable and an aging, we followed a three steps process. (1) We ran a linear regression on each of the two variables, using age, sex and ethnicity as predictors. (2) We computed the residuals for the two variables. (3) We computed the correlation between the two residuals and the associated p-value if their intersection had a sample size of at least ten samples. We used a threshold for significance of 0.05 and corrected the p-values for multiple testing using the Bonferroni correction. We plotted the results using a volcano plot. We refer to this pipeline as an X-Wide Association study [XWAS].

In the supplementary tables and the results, we rank the X-variables subcategories by decreasing percentage of variables associated with accelerated aging (note that the ranking is therefore biased towards categories with fewer variables). For each subcategory, we list the three most associated variables, based on the absolute value of the correlation coefficient. For the exhaustive list, please refer to [https://www.multidimensionality-of-aging.net/xwas/univariate\\_associations](https://www.multidimensionality-of-aging.net/xwas/univariate_associations).

# Supplementary Figures




**Figure S1: Demographics of the UK Biobank cohort**



**Figure S2: Attention map example for pulse wave analysis time series**

The participant is a correctly predicted 60-65-year-old male. Red data points represent time steps for which a higher value would increase the chronological age prediction, and blue data points represent time steps for which a higher value would decrease the chronological age prediction.







**Figure S3: Feature importances for the model built on all scalar features**




**Figure S4: Feature importances for the model built on carotid ultrasound scalar features**



**Figure S5: Feature importances for the model built on pulse wave analysis scalar features**




**Figure S6: Feature importances for the model built on blood pressure features**




**Figure S7: Genome Wide Association Study results for accelerated arterial aging**

negative  $\log_{10}(\text{p-value})$  vs. chromosomal position. Dotted line denotes  $5e-8$ .




**Figure S8: Genome Wide Association Study results for carotid ultrasound-measured accelerated arterial aging**

negative  $\log_{10}(\text{p-value})$  vs. chromosomal position. Dotted line denotes  $5e-8$ .



**Figure S9: Correlation between carotid ultrasound image-measured and pulse wave analysis-measured accelerated arterial aging, in terms of association with non-genetic factors**




**Figure S10: Survival prediction performances**

Demographics refers to the model built on the sole demographic features. Features refers to the scalar features extracted from the pulse wave analysis raw data. PWA refers to the pulse wave analysis time series, with each time step treated as a scalar predictor. For the three CNN models, the first dataset corresponds to the side predictors fed to the side, fully connected neural network. The convolutional neural network is trained on the time series (PWA).



**Figure S11: Preprocessing of carotid ultrasound images: screenshot of the software used to record the images as shared by UK Biobank**






**Figure S12: Sample preprocessed carotid ultrasound images**


The participant is a 55-60-year-old male.





**Supplementary Figure 70: Architecture of the convolutional neural network trained on pulse wave analysis records to predict chronological age - Summary figure**





**Figure S13: Architecture of the convolutional neural network trained on pulse wave analysis records to predict survival**

# Supplementary Tables

**Table S1: GWASs summary - Heritability, number of SNPs and genes associated with accelerated aging in each dimension**

Accelerated arterial aging dimension	Sample size	SNPs	Genes	Heritability (%)	R-Squared for CA prediction (%)
General	7,549	0	0	32.6±7.3	67.1±2.0
Carotid Ultrasound	7,885	0	0	28.6±7.0	64.8±1.9
Pulse Wave Analysis	184,825	192	109	17.2±0.4	41.3±0.3

**Table S2: Feature importances for the model built on all scalar features**

See supplementary data

**Table S3: Feature importances for the model built on carotid ultrasound scalar features**

See supplementary data

**Table S4: Feature importances for the model built on pulse wave analysis scalar features**

Feature	Correlation with age	Elastic Net	GBM	Neural Network
Pulse wave peak to peak time	-0.069 +/- 0.001	0.017 +/- 0.0	0.169 +/- 0.002	0.415 +/- 0.003
Pulse wave Arterial Stiffness index	0.065 +/- 0.006	0.01 +/- 0.0	0.161 +/- 0.002	0.254 +/- 0.002
Pulse rate	-0.013 +/- 0.001	-0.055 +/- 0.0	0.144 +/- 0.001	0.016 +/- 0.0
Pulse wave reflection index	0.011 +/- 0.001	-0.058 +/- 0.0	0.137 +/- 0.002	0.046 +/- 0.001
Position of pulse wave notch	-0.011 +/- 0.001	-0.032 +/- 0.0	0.13 +/- 0.002	0.015 +/- 0.0
Position of the shoulder on the pulse waveform	0.104 +/- 0.001	0.109 +/- 0.0	0.099 +/- 0.001	0.011 +/- 0.001
Position of the pulse wave peak	0.103 +/- 0.001	0.145 +/- 0.0	0.096 +/- 0.001	0.022 +/- 0.0
Sex	0.022 +/- 0.001	0.078 +/- 0.0	0.018 +/- 0.0	0.021 +/- 0.0
Absence of notch position in the pulse waveform	0.101 +/- 0.001	0.181 +/- 0.0	0.012 +/- 0.001	0.01 +/- 0.0
White	0.065 +/- 0.001	0.1 +/- 0.0	0.006 +/- 0.0	0.095 +/- 0.006

Asian	-0.036 +/- 0.001	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.005 +/- 0.0	0.01 +/- 0.001
British	0.065 +/- 0.001	0.056 +/- 0.0	0.004 +/- 0.0	0.005 +/- 0.001
Irish	-0.006 +/- 0.001	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.003 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0
Indian	-0.024 +/- 0.001	0.001 +/- 0.0	0.002 +/- 0.0	0.017 +/- 0.001
White_Other	-0.023 +/- 0.001	-0.028 +/- 0.0	0.002 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.001
Prefer_not_to_answer	-0.001 +/- 0.001	0.024 +/- 0.0	0.002 +/- 0.0	0.002 +/- 0.0
African	-0.03 +/- 0.001	-0.017 +/- 0.0	0.002 +/- 0.0	0.004 +/- 0.001
Caribbean	-0.03 +/- 0.001	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.002 +/- 0.0	0.007 +/- 0.001
Mixed	-0.023 +/- 0.001	-0.008 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0	0.004 +/- 0.0
Pakistani	-0.02 +/- 0.001	-0.021 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0	0.002 +/- 0.0
Other_ethnicity	-0.022 +/- 0.001	-0.005 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0	0.004 +/- 0.001
Black	-0.043 +/- 0.001	-0.021 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0	0.014 +/- 0.001
Other	-0.021 +/- 0.001	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0	0.012 +/- 0.001
White_and_Asian	-0.01 +/- 0.001	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0	0.002 +/- 0.0
Asian_Other	-0.016 +/- 0.001	-0.007 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0
Chinese	-0.011 +/- 0.001	-0.001 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.003 +/- 0.0
White_and_Black_Caribbean	-0.013 +/- 0.001	-0.008 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.003 +/- 0.0
Black_Other	-0.005 +/- 0.001	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0
Do_not_know	-0.003 +/- 0.001	0.002 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0
Mixed_Other	-0.013 +/- 0.001	-0.001 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0
Ethnicity: nan	-0.005 +/- 0.001	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0
White_and_Black_African	-0.008 +/- 0.001	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0
Bangladeshi	-0.009 +/- 0.002	-0.013 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0

**Table S5: Feature importances for the model built on blood pressure features**

Feature	Correlation with age	Elastic Net	GBM	Neural Network
Diastolic blood pressure	0.003 +/- 0.003	-0.322 +/- 0.0	0.253 +/- 0.002	0.12 +/- 0.002
Systolic blood pressure	0.249 +/- 0.003	0.459 +/- 0.0	0.241 +/- 0.004	0.246 +/- 0.002
Pulse rate	-0.003 +/- 0.003	0.04 +/- 0.0	0.235 +/- 0.003	0.005 +/- 0.0
Sex	0.028 +/- 0.002	0.014 +/- 0.0	0.073 +/- 0.003	0.005 +/- 0.0
British	0.088 +/- 0.002	0.019 +/- 0.0	0.023 +/- 0.001	0.04 +/- 0.01
White	0.091 +/- 0.002	0.038 +/- 0.0	0.019 +/- 0.001	0.198 +/- 0.023
White_Other	-0.035 +/- 0.002	-0.015 +/- 0.0	0.016 +/- 0.001	0.019 +/- 0.005
Asian	-0.046 +/- 0.003	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.015 +/- 0.001	0.033 +/- 0.003
Indian	-0.028 +/- 0.002	0.001 +/- 0.0	0.012 +/- 0.001	0.014 +/- 0.004
Black	-0.059 +/- 0.002	-0.015 +/- 0.0	0.012 +/- 0.001	0.012 +/- 0.005
Other_ethnicity	-0.037 +/- 0.002	-0.009 +/- 0.0	0.011 +/- 0.001	0.052 +/- 0.004

Irish	-0.007 +/- 0.002	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.01 +/- 0.001	0.015 +/- 0.003
Caribbean	-0.038 +/- 0.002	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.01 +/- 0.001	0.005 +/- 0.003
Other	-0.032 +/- 0.003	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.009 +/- 0.001	0.14 +/- 0.007
African	-0.045 +/- 0.002	-0.013 +/- 0.0	0.009 +/- 0.001	0.001 +/- 0.003
Mixed	-0.035 +/- 0.002	-0.008 +/- 0.0	0.008 +/- 0.001	0.005 +/- 0.001
Pakistani	-0.031 +/- 0.003	-0.013 +/- 0.0	0.007 +/- 0.001	0.002 +/- 0.001
Asian_Other	-0.021 +/- 0.002	-0.004 +/- 0.0	0.007 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.001
Prefer_not_to_answer	0.001 +/- 0.003	0.012 +/- 0.0	0.006 +/- 0.0	0.042 +/- 0.002
White_and_Black_Caribbean	-0.021 +/- 0.003	-0.005 +/- 0.0	0.005 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.001
Mixed_Other	-0.019 +/- 0.003	-0.0 +/- 0.0	0.004 +/- 0.001	0.002 +/- 0.001
Chinese	-0.022 +/- 0.003	-0.003 +/- 0.0	0.004 +/- 0.001	0.006 +/- 0.003
White_and_Asian	-0.017 +/- 0.002	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.004 +/- 0.001	0.001 +/- 0.001
Ethnicity: nan	-0.006 +/- 0.003	0.002 +/- 0.0	0.003 +/- 0.0	0.018 +/- 0.004
White_and_Black_African	-0.013 +/- 0.003	-0.001 +/- 0.0	0.002 +/- 0.0	0.002 +/- 0.001
Black_Other	-0.007 +/- 0.003	-0.0 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.001 +/- 0.0
Do_not_know	-0.004 +/- 0.002	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.008 +/- 0.002
Bangladeshi	-0.014 +/- 0.004	-0.007 +/- 0.0	0.0 +/- 0.0	0.005 +/- 0.001

**Table S6: Comparison between the models trained on scalar features**

Arterial dimension	Number of Predictors (non-demographics)	Elastic Net (R-Squared)	GBM (R-Squared)	Neural Network (R-Squared)
Blood Pressure	3	0.202±0.003	0.222±0.003	0.221±0.003
Carotid Ultrasound	12	0.183±0.015	0.206±0.015	0.201±0.018
Pulse Wave Analysis	8	0.129±0.003	0.229±0.003	0.197±0.072
All Scalars	23	0.313±0.013	0.368±0.014	0.353±0.021

**Table S7: Pearson correlations between the feature importances for different scalar features-based algorithms**

Arterial dimension	Correlation vs. ElasticNet	Correlation vs. GBM	Correlation vs. NeuralNetwork	ElasticNe vs. LightGBM	ElasticNet vs. NeuralNetwork	GBM vs. NeuralNetwork
Blood Pressure	0.671	0.38	0.721	0.821	0.724	0.505
Carotid	0.552	0.912	-0.058	0.779	0.241	0.07

Ultrasound						
Pulse Wave Analysis	0.759	0.366	0.374	0.292	0.014	0.646
All Scalars	0.171	0.35	-0.093	0.566	0.411	0.589

**Table S8: Spearman correlations between the feature importances for different scalar features-based algorithms**

Arterial dimension	Correlation vs. ElasticNet	Correlation vs. GBM	Correlation vs. NeuralNetwork	ElasticNet vs. GBM	ElasticNet vs. NeuralNetwork	GBM vs. NeuralNetwork
Blood Pressure	0.233	0.462	0.227	0.592	0.295	0.516
Carotid Ultrasound	0.477	0.823	0.183	0.473	0.207	0.189
Pulse Wave Analysis	0.487	0.572	0.664	0.628	0.512	0.819
All Scalars	0.28	0.534	0.123	0.52	0.463	0.524

**Table S9: List of biomarkers by subcategories for the Biomarkers Wide Association Study**

See supplementary data

**Table S10: Biomarkers associated with accelerated arterial aging**

See supplementary data

**Table S11: Biomarkers associated with decelerated arterial aging**

See supplementary data

**Table S12: List of clinical phenotypes by subcategories for the Clinical Phenotypes Wide Association Study**

See supplementary data

**Table S13: Clinical phenotypes associated with accelerated arterial aging**

See supplementary data

**Table S14: Clinical phenotypes associated with decelerated arterial aging**

See supplementary data

**Table S15: List of diseases by subcategories for the Diseases Wide Association Study**

See supplementary data

**Table S16: Diseases associated with accelerated arterial aging**

See supplementary data

**Table S17: Diseases associated with decelerated arterial aging**

See supplementary data

**Table S18: List of family history variables by subcategories for the Family History Phenotypes Wide Association Study**

See supplementary data

**Table S19: Family history variables associated with accelerated arterial aging**

Arterial dimension	X-subcategory	Variables
General	FamilyHistory (0%)	
Carotid Ultrasound	FamilyHistory (0%)	
Pulse Wave Analysis	FamilyHistory (0.0%)	



**Table S20: Family history variables associated with decelerated arterial aging**

Arterial dimension	X-subcategory	Variables
General	FamilyHistory (0%)	
Carotid Ultrasound	FamilyHistory (0%)	
Pulse Wave Analysis	FamilyHistory (1.1%)	Illnesses of mother.Alzheimer's disease/dementia (.023)

**Table S21: List of environmental variables by subcategories for the Environmental Wide Association Study**

See supplementary data

**Table S22: Environmental variables associated with accelerated arterial aging**

See supplementary data

**Table S23: Environmental variables associated with decelerated arterial aging**

See supplementary data

**Table S24: List of socioeconomic variables by subcategories for the Socioeconomics Wide Association Study**

See supplementary data

**Table S25: Socioeconomic variables associated with accelerated arterial aging**

See supplementary data

**Table S26: Socioeconomic variables associated with decelerated arterial aging**

See supplementary data

**Table S27: Survival prediction performances**

	demographics	features	PWA	all	demographics+PWA	features+PWA	all+PWA
<b>ElasticNet</b>	69.5+/-0.9	71.0+/-1.0	71.0+/-1.0	71.4+/-0.9			
<b>GBM</b>	69.3+/-1.0	69.7+/-1.0	69.8+/-0.9	70.2+/-1.1			
<b>Neural Network</b>	69.4+/-0.9	70.0+/-1.0	70.2+/-1.0	70.2+/-0.9			
<b>CNN</b>					70.1+/-0.9	67.8+/-1.0	71.1+/-0.9

Demographics refers to the model built on the sole demographic features. Features refers to the scalar features extracted from the pulse wave analysis raw data. PWA refers to the pulse wave analysis time series, with each time step treated as a scalar predictor. For the three CNN models, the first dataset corresponds to the side predictors fed to the side, fully connected neural network. The convolutional neural network is trained on the time series (PWA).

**Table S28: Hyperparameter space for scalar features-based models Bayesian optimization**

Algorithm	Hyperparameter	Scale	Low	High
Elastic net	alpha	loguniform	-10	0
	l1_ratio	uniform	0	1
Gradient Boosted Machine	num_leaves	quniform	5	45
	min_child_samples	quniform	100	500
	min_child_weight	loguniform	-5	4
	subsample	uniform	0.2	0.8
	colsample	uniform	0.4	0.6
	reg_alpha	loguniform	-2	2
	reg_lambda	loguniform	-2	2
	n_estimators	quniform	150	450
Neural network	learning_rate_init	loguniform	-5	-1
	apha	loguniform	-6	3

**Table S29: Nested Cross-Validation pipeline**

[illegible]

**Table S30: Hyperparameters tuning upstream of the cross-validation for images-based models**

See supplementary data

**Table S31: Outer Cross-Validation with inner split pipeline**

The values displayed are validation RMSE values. Lower values are associated with better hyperparameter tuning. When two values are displayed (value1/value2), the second value corresponds to the training RMSE. The architecture used was InceptionV3, with an initial learning rate of 0.001. The model was trained on the data folds 2-9, and validated on the data fold #0. The data fold #1 was set aside as the testing set and was not used.

Data Fold	N=10	Outer CV folds 0	Outer CV folds 1	Outer CV folds 2	Outer CV folds 3	Outer CV folds 4	Outer CV folds 5	Outer CV folds 6	Outer CV folds 7	Outer CV folds 8	Outer CV folds 9
F0	N=10	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Validation on	Test
F1	N=10	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Validation on	Test	Train
F2	N=10	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Validation on	Test	Train	Train
F3	N=10	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Validation on	Test	Train	Train	Train
F4	N=10	Train	Train	Train	Train	Validation on	Test	Train	Train	Train	Train
F5	N=10	Train	Train	Train	Validation on	Test	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train
F6	N=10	Train	Train	Validation on	Test	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train
F7	N=10	Train	Validation on	Test	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train
F8	N=10	Validation on	Test	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train

	10	on									
F9	N= 10	Test	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Train	Validati on

## Supplementary References

1. Van Rossum, G. & Drake, F. L. *The Python Language Reference Manual*. (Network Theory Limited, 2011).
2. Oliphant, T. E. *A guide to NumPy*. vol. 1 (Trelgol Publishing USA, 2006).
3. Walt, S. van der, van der Walt, S., Chris Colbert, S. & Varoquaux, G. The NumPy Array: A Structure for Efficient Numerical Computation. *Computing in Science & Engineering* vol. 13 22–30 (2011).
4. McKinney, W. & Others. Data structures for statistical computing in python. in *Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference* vol. 445 51–56 (Austin, TX, 2010).
5. Hunter, J. D. Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment. *Comput. Sci. Eng.* **9**, 90–95 (2007).
6. Inc, P. T. Collaborative data science. *Montreal: Plotly Technologies Inc Montral* (2015).
7. Clark, A. Pillow Python Imaging Library. *Pillow—Pillow (PIL Fork) 5. 4. 1 documentation* (2018).
8. Virtanen, P. *et al.* SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. *Nature Methods* vol. 17 261–272 (2020).
9. Oliphant, T. E. Python for Scientific Computing. *Computing in Science Engineering* **9**, 10–20 (2007).
10. Millman, K. J., Jarrod Millman, K. & Aivazis, M. Python for Scientists and Engineers. *Computing in Science & Engineering* vol. 13 9–12 (2011).
11. Pedregosa, F. *et al.* Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *the Journal of machine Learning research* **12**, 2825–2830 (2011).
12. Ke, G. *et al.* LightGBM: A Highly Efficient Gradient Boosting Decision Tree. in *Advances in*

- Neural Information Processing Systems 30* (eds. Guyon, I. et al.) 3146–3154 (Curran Associates, Inc., 2017).
13. Chen, T. & Guestrin, C. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* 785–794 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2016).
  14. Bergstra, J., Yamins, D. & Cox, D. D. Hyperopt: A python library for optimizing the hyperparameters of machine learning algorithms. in *Proceedings of the 12th Python in science conference* vol. 13 20 (Citeseer, 2013).
  15. Abadi, M. *et al.* TensorFlow: Large-scale machine learning on heterogeneous systems. (2015).
  16. Chollet, F. & Others. keras. (2015).
  17. Kotikalapudi, R. & Others. keras-vis. 2017. URL <https://github.com/raghakot/keras-vis> (2019).
  18. Alber, M. *et al.* iNNvestigate neural networks. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **20**, 1–8 (2019).
  19. Hossain, S., Calloway, C., Lippa, D., Niederhut, D. & Shupe, D. Visualization of Bioinformatics Data with Dash Bio. in *Proceedings of the 18th Python in Science Conference* 126–133 (2019).
  20. Kohavi, R. & Others. A study of cross-validation and bootstrap for accuracy estimation and model selection. in *Ijcai* vol. 14 1137–1145 (Montreal, Canada, 1995).
  21. Bergstra, J. S., Bardenet, R., Bengio, Y. & Kégl, B. Algorithms for Hyper-Parameter Optimization. in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24* (eds. Shawe-Taylor, J., Zemel, R. S., Bartlett, P. L., Pereira, F. & Weinberger, K. Q.) 2546–2554 (Curran Associates, Inc., 2011).
  22. Bergstra, J., Yamins, D. & Cox, D. Making a Science of Model Search: Hyperparameter

- Optimization in Hundreds of Dimensions for Vision Architectures. in (eds. Dasgupta, S. & McAllester, D.) vol. 28 115–123 (PMLR, 2013).
23. Bergstra, J. & Bengio, Y. Random search for hyper-parameter optimization. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **13**, 281–305 (2012).
  24. Kingma, D. P. & Ba, J. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. *arXiv [cs.LG]* (2014).
  25. Zeiler, M. D. ADADELTA: An Adaptive Learning Rate Method. *arXiv [cs.LG]* (2012).
  26. Hinton, G. Slide 29 of Lecture 6, Geoffrey Hinton coursera's class.  
<http://www.cs.toronto.edu>  
[http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~tijmen/csc321/slides/lecture\\_slides\\_lec6.pdf](http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~tijmen/csc321/slides/lecture_slides_lec6.pdf).
  27. Nair, V. & Hinton, G. E. Rectified Linear Units Improve Restricted Boltzmann Machines. (2010).
  28. Klambauer, G., Unterthiner, T., Mayr, A. & Hochreiter, S. Self-Normalizing Neural Networks. in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30* (eds. Guyon, I. et al.) 971–980 (Curran Associates, Inc., 2017).
  29. Prechelt, L. Early Stopping - But When? in *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade* (eds. Orr, G. B. & Müller, K.-R.) 55–69 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1998).
  30. Hochreiter, S. Untersuchungen zu dynamischen neuronalen Netzen. *Diploma, Technische Universität München* **91**, (1991).
  31. Hochreiter, S., Bengio, Y., Frasconi, P., Schmidhuber, J. & Others. Gradient flow in recurrent nets: the difficulty of learning long-term dependencies. (2001).
  32. Alqaraawi, A., Schuessler, M., Weiß, P., Costanza, E. & Berthouze, N. Evaluating saliency map explanations for convolutional neural networks: a user study. in *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces* 275–285 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2020).



33. Selvaraju, R. R. *et al.* Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision* 618–626 (2017).
34. Zhou, B., Khosla, A., Lapedriza, A., Oliva, A. & Torralba, A. Learning deep features for discriminative localization. in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition* 2921–2929 (2016).
35. Wang, Z. & Yang, J. Diabetic Retinopathy Detection via Deep Convolutional Networks for Discriminative Localization and Visual Explanation. *arXiv [cs.CV]* (2017).
36. Duffy, B. A. *et al.* Regression activation mapping on the cortical surface using graph convolutional networks. (2019).
37. Le Goallec, A. & Patel, C. J. Age-dependent co-dependency structure of biomarkers in the general population of the United States. *Aging* **11**, 1404–1426 (2019).