

Supplementary Table S1. Dataset composition and class-stratified split assignment for the two-stage LSSA deep-learning classifier

This Supplementary Table reports the dataset composition and data-splitting strategy of the two convolutional neural network (CNN) classifiers developed in this study. Tables S1a and S1c summarize the per-species × per-concentration vial counts for Model 1 and Model 2 reference strain datasets, respectively. Tables S1b and S1d summarize the class-level stratified split assignments (training, 60%; validation, 15%; holdout test, 25%) used to develop and evaluate each model. Cross-validation was performed within the 75% train-plus-validation pool using a stratified 5-fold cross-validation. Vial-level fold assignments were not formally archived in the training logs of the present study; this limitation has been added to the reporting checklist for future work.

Table S1a. Model 1 dataset composition (n = 320 vials, per-species × per-concentration vial counts)

Species	10 ² CFU/mL	10 ³ CFU/mL	10 ⁴ CFU/mL	10 ⁵ CFU/mL	Total
<i>C. albicans</i> ATCC 15043	40	40	40	40	160
<i>N. glabratus</i> KCTC 7219 ^{a)}	10	10	10	10	40
<i>C. tropicalis</i> KCTC 7212	10	10	10	10	40
<i>C. parapsilosis</i> ATCC 22019	10	10	10	10	40
<i>P. kudriavzevii</i> ATCC 6258 ^{b)}	10	10	10	10	40
Total	80	80	80	80	320

^{a)}Formerly *Candida glabrata*; reclassified as *Nakaseomyces glabratus*.

^{b)}Formerly *Candida krusei*; reclassified as *Pichia kudriavzevii*.

Note on in-vial concentrations: Concentration values (10², 10³, 10⁴, 10⁵ CFU/mL) refer to the working suspension concentrations used to prepare the inocula, as confirmed by concurrent SDA culture. A *Candida* suspension of 0.5 McFarland standard (approximately 2×10⁶ CFU/mL) was prepared, and 25 μL of a 10-fold serial dilution was added to 5 mL of LB broth to prepare working solutions with final concentrations of 10², 10³, 10⁴, and 10⁵ CFU/mL. Two milliliters of each of these solutions were measured using the Bacometer.

Table S1b. Model 1 class-stratified split assignment (3-class classifier)

Class	Composition	Total	Train (60%)	Val (15%)	Hold-out test (25%)
Negative (<10 ³ CFU/mL)	<i>C. albicans</i> 80 + non- <i>albicans</i> 80	160	96	24	40
Positive — <i>C. albicans</i> (≥10 ⁴)	<i>C. albicans</i> only	80	48	12	20
Positive — Non- <i>albicans</i> (≥10 ⁴)	4 non- <i>albicans</i> species	80	48	12	20

Total	—	320	192	48	80
--------------	---	------------	------------	-----------	-----------

Stratification was performed at the class level. Stratified five-fold cross-validation was applied to the 75% train-plus-validation pool (n=240). The holdout test partition (n=80) was isolated before fold assignment and used exclusively for the final performance estimation reported in Fig. 2(A).

Table S1c. Model 2 dataset composition (n = 80 vials, per-species × per-concentration vial counts)

Species	10⁴ CFU/mL	10⁵ CFU/mL	Total
<i>C. albicans</i> ATCC 15043	20	20	40
<i>C. tropicalis</i> KCTC 7212	20	20	40
Total	40	40	80

Model 2 was trained on a fully independent dataset acquired in separate experimental sessions from the Model 1 dataset. No vial used for Model 1 training, validation, or testing was used for Model 2 development.

Table S1d. Model 2 class-stratified split assignment (binary classifier)

Class	Total	Train (60%)	Val (15%)	Hold-out test (25%)
<i>C. albicans</i>	40	24	6	10
<i>C. tropicalis</i>	40	24	6	10
Total	80	48	12	20

Stratification was performed at the class level. Stratified five-fold cross-validation was applied to the 75% train-plus-validation pool (n=60). The hold-out test partition (n=20) was isolated before fold assignment and used exclusively for the final performance estimation. The cascade evaluation results reported in Fig. 2(B) (n=36) used reference strain samples independent of both the Model 1 and Model 2 training sets.

Notes on data splitting and reproducibility

1. Stratification unit: Data splitting was performed with class-level stratification (three classes for Model 1 and two classes for Model 2) and not species- or concentration-level stratification. Because the class labels are defined by concentration thresholds ($<10^3$ vs. $\geq 10^4$ CFU/mL), class-level stratification inherently preserves the concentration distribution across partitions.
2. Cross-validation: Stratified 5-fold cross-validation was applied within the train-plus-validation pool, preserving the class proportions in each fold.
3. Hold-out test isolation: The 25% hold-out test partition was set aside before any cross-validation fold assignment and used exclusively for the final performance evaluation.
4. Inter-model dataset independence: The Model 1 (n = 320) and Model 2 (n = 80) datasets were acquired in independent experimental runs and were entirely non-overlapping.
5. Reproducibility limitation: Vial-level fold assignment was not formally archived in the training logs of the present study. The full training code and per-vial fold assignment will be archived in a public repository upon acceptance.