STM JOURNALS

Research & Reviews: A Journal of
Dentistry

https://journals.stmjournals.com/rrjod/

ISSN: 2230-8008 (Online)
ISSN: 2348-9561 (Print)
Volume 15, Issue 2, 2024
May—August
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/RRJoD

Review RRJoD

Modern Computer-aided Drug Design Methods: A Review

Mohd. Wasiullah[1], Piyush Yadav[2], Anand Prakash[3], Satish Kumar Yadav[4,*], Sushil Yadav[5]

Abstract

Computer-aided drug design (CADD) has increasingly become an essential component of the drug discovery process, providing innovative solutions that are both time-efficient and cost-effective for identifying potential drug candidates. This review offers a comprehensive examination of contemporary CADD techniques, exploring their fundamental principles, applications, and the inherent advantages and limitations of each method. One of the primary methods discussed is high-throughput screening (HTS), a technique that allows researchers to rapidly evaluate thousands of compounds for potential biological activity against a specific target. HTS is highly effective for identifying initial hits but can be resource-intensive and may not always provide detailed insights into the mechanisms of action. Another significant approach is structure-based drug design (SBDD), which relies on the detailed three-dimensional structures of biological targets to design molecules that can bind effectively and selectively. SBDD enables the rational design of new drug candidates based on structural information but is limited by the availability of high-resolution target structures and the complexity of accurately predicting interactions. Ligand-based drug design (LBDD) focuses on developing drugs based on known ligands and their interactions with the target. LBDD methods, such as quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR) modeling, are useful for predicting the activity of new compounds but may lack the specificity offered by structure-based approaches. The review also covers structure-based virtual screening (SBVS) and ligand-based virtual screening (LBVS). SBVS uses the three-dimensional structure of a target to screen large compound libraries, while LBVS employs known ligand information to identify new potential drug candidates. Both methods are instrumental in narrowing down vast chemical spaces to find promising compounds, though each comes with its own set of challenges, such as the accuracy of binding predictions and the need for extensive computational resources. Additionally, the review highlights the role of various computational tools in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the drug discovery and development pipeline. These tools help streamline processes such as target identification, lead optimization, and preclinical testing, ultimately contributing to the advancement of new therapeutic agents. Overall, this review provides a detailed exploration of modern CADD methods, offering insights into how these techniques improve the drug discovery process while also acknowledging their limitations and future directions.

***Author for Correspondence**
Satish Kumar Yadav
E-mail: slk.pharma@gmail.com

[1]Professor, Principal, Department of Pharmacy, Prasad Institute of Technology, Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh, India
[2]Professor, Academic Head, Department of Pharmacy, Prasad Institute of Technology, Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh, India
[3]Scholar, Department of Pharmacy, Prasad Institute of Technology, Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh, India
[4]Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacy, Prasad Institute of Technology, Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh, India
[5]Lecturer Department of Pharmacy, Prasad Institute of Technology, Jaunpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

Received Date: May 15, 2024
Accepted Date: May 20, 2024
Published Date: June 05, 2024

Citation: Mohd. Wasiullah, Piyush Yadav, Anand Prakash, Satish Kumar Yadav, Sushil Yadav. Modern Computer-aided Drug Design Methods: A Review. Research & Reviews: A Journal of Dentistry. 2024; 15(2): 15–21p.

Keywords: Computer-aided drug design, CADD methods, molecular docking, pharmacophore modeling, virtual screening, molecular dynamics simulations, machine learning, artificial intelligence, drug discovery, challenges, advancements, emerging trends

INTRODUCTION

The discovery and development of new drugs are complex and challenging processes that require

significant time, resources, and expertise. Traditional drug discovery methods often rely on experimental approaches such as high-throughput screening (HTS) of large chemical libraries against biological targets [1]. Although these methods have been successful in identifying potential drug candidates, they can be time-consuming, costly, and labor-intensive. In recent years, computer-aided drug design (CADD) has emerged as a powerful tool to streamline the drug discovery process, offering a more efficient and cost-effective approach than traditional experimental methods [2].

CADD employs computational techniques to identify, optimize, and evaluate potential drug candidates, thereby accelerating the drug discovery pipeline. The application of CADD methods has led to the development of numerous successful drugs for cancer treatment, such as HIV protease inhibitors and tyrosine kinase inhibitors [3]. One of the key advantages of CADD is its ability to screen large chemical libraries, which is impractical for experimental testing. Using computational algorithms, researchers can virtually screen millions of compounds and identify promising lead candidates for further optimization and testing. This approach has significantly reduced the time and cost associated with drug discovery, as it allows researchers to focus on the most promising compounds and eliminate those that are unlikely to succeed [4].

CADD methods can be broadly classified into two categories: structure-based drug design (SBDD) and ligand-based drug design (LBDD). SBDD relies on the three-dimensional (3D) structure of the target protein, which is obtained using experimental techniques such as X-ray crystallography or nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy. By understanding the structural features of the target protein and its binding site, researchers can design molecules that can bind to the target with a high affinity and specificity. SBDD has been successfully applied in the development of numerous drugs such as HIV protease inhibitors and tyrosine kinase inhibitors.

LBDD, on the other hand, focuses on identifying molecules with properties similar to those of known active compounds. This approach is particularly useful when the 3D structure of the target protein is unavailable. LBDD methods, such as pharmacophore modeling and quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR) analysis, can be used to identify novel lead compounds and optimize their properties [5].

In addition to SBDD and LBDD, CADD encompasses other techniques such as molecular docking, virtual screening, and molecular dynamics simulations. Molecular docking is a computational method that predicts the mode of binding of a molecule to a target protein. Virtual screening involves the use of computational algorithms to screen large chemical libraries and to identify potential lead compounds. Molecular dynamics simulations have been used to study the dynamic behavior of proteins and their interactions with ligands, providing insights into the stability and flexibility of protein-ligand complexes [6].

The development of computational tools and software has significantly facilitated the application of CADD methods in drug discovery. Software packages such as Auto Dock, GROMACS, and ZINC have been widely used in virtual screening and molecular docking simulations. These tools have been continuously improved and refined, offering more accurate and efficient algorithms for predicting protein-ligand interactions and identifying potential drug candidates [7].

Despite the significant progress made in CADD, there are still challenges and limitations associated with these methods. For example, the accuracy of CADD predictions depends on the quality of the input data, such as the 3D structure of the target protein and the experimental binding data. Additionally, CADD methods may not always capture the complexity of biological systems such as the effects of protein flexibility, solvent interactions, and allosteric regulation. To address these challenges, researchers are continuously developing new algorithms and computational approaches to improve the accuracy and reliability of the CADD methods [8].

In conclusion, CADD has revolutionized the drug discovery process, offering a more efficient and cost-effective approach than traditional experimental methods. CADD methods, such as SBDD and LBDD, have led to the development of numerous successful drugs and continue to play a crucial role in the identification and optimization of potential drug candidates [9]. The development of computational tools and software has greatly facilitated the application of CADD methods in drug discovery, and ongoing research is aimed at addressing the challenges and limitations of these methods. As CADD continues to evolve and improve, it is expected to play an increasingly important role in the development of new and effective drugs for the treatment of various diseases [10].

METHODOLOGIES

Modern CADD methods encompass a wide range of computational techniques that are used in drug discovery and development. These methods can be broadly classified into two main categories: SBDD, LBDD, HTS, virtual screening, molecular docking, and computational tools [11]. The methodologies of these approaches are discussed in detail below.

Structure-based Drug Design

Structure-based drug design is a powerful approach used in the development of new drugs, leveraging the three-dimensional structures of biological macromolecules, such as proteins or nucleic acids, to guide the design of molecules that can bind to specific target proteins and modulate their activity [12]. SBDD is based on the principle of lock-and-key binding, in which a drug molecule binds to a specific site on the target protein, much like a key fits into a lock. The SBDD methodology involves several key steps:

1. *Target identification and validation:* The process begins by identifying and validating the target protein relevant to the disease of interest. Understanding the biological functions of proteins is crucial [13].
2. *Protein structure determination:* Obtaining the three-dimensional structure of the target protein is essential. Techniques such as X-ray crystallography, NMR spectroscopy, and cryo-electron microscopy have been used for this purpose [14].
3. *Molecular docking:* Computational molecular docking was employed to predict the binding of small molecules to the target protein. A library of small molecules was screened to identify the molecules that best fit the binding site of the target protein.
4. *Structure-activity relationship (SAR) analysis:* SAR analysis was used to optimize the binding of selected molecules to the target protein. By modifying the chemical structure of the molecules and testing their activities, the key features for binding were identified.

SBDD has been successfully applied in various disease areas. For instance, in HIV treatment, SBDD is instrumental in designing protease inhibitors that target the HIV protease enzyme, which is crucial for viral replication. Similarly, in cancer treatment, SBDD has been used to develop drugs that target overexpressed proteins in cancer cells, inhibit their activity, and impede tumor growth [15].

Challenges in SBDD include the limited availability of high-resolution protein structures, the need for accurate computational methods for molecular docking and SAR analysis, and the complexity of protein flexibility and solvation effects on binding sites. Despite these challenges, SBDD continues to be a critical tool in drug discovery, offering advantages such as rapid ligand screening, cost-effectiveness, and the ability to predict stable interactions between molecules and target proteins [16].

Ligand-based Drug Design

Ligand-based drug design is a computational approach in drug discovery that relies on chemical information of known active compounds to identify and optimize new drug candidates. Unlike SBDD, which requires the 3D structure of the target protein, LBDD is independent of target structural information. The key steps in LBDD are as follows:

1. *Data collection:* Gathering data on known active compounds and their biological activities from various sources, such as literature, patents, and databases.
2. *Data pre-processing:* Cleaning and formatting the collected data to remove errors and inconsistencies.
3. *Molecular descriptors calculation:* Numerical values representing the structural and physicochemical properties of molecules were computed using computational methods [17].
4. *QSAR modeling:* QSAR models were developed to relate molecular descriptors to the biological activities of known active compounds. These models can then predict the activities of new compounds.
5. *Virtual screening:* Large chemical libraries are screened using QSAR models to identify compounds with properties similar to those of known actives. Similarity-search algorithms and pharmacophore-based methods are commonly used.
6. *Lead optimization:* The identified hit compounds were optimized through iterative cycles of chemical synthesis and bioactivity screening to improve their potency, selectivity, and pharmacokinetic properties [18].

LBDD approaches include QSAR modeling, pharmacophore modeling, and similarity search. Over the years, advances in statistics, algorithms, and chemo-informatics have significantly improved the efficiency and accuracy of LBDD. Programs can now handle large datasets of molecules and screen millions of compounds quickly. LBDD is particularly useful when the 3D structure of the target protein is not available because it relies on the properties of known active compounds. However, the accuracy of LBDD depends on the quality and availability of data on known activities. LBDD is often combined with SBDD to leverage the strengths of both approaches in drug discovery [19].

APPLICATION

Modern CADD methods have revolutionized the drug discovery process, offering a range of applications that enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of identifying potential drug candidates. Some key applications include the following.

1. *De novo drug design:* CADD enables the design of novel drug candidates from scratch by optimizing their chemical structures for specific biological targets.
2. *Receptor-based Ab Initio pharmacophore modeling:* This approach involves the prediction of pharmacophores based on the receptor structure, aiding in the design of molecules with optimal binding interactions [20].
3. *Dynamic trajectory water pharmacophores:* Utilizing dynamic water molecules in pharmacophore modeling enhances the accuracy of drug design by considering the role of water molecules in ligand-receptor interactions.
4. *Virtual screening:* CADD allows the virtual screening of large chemical libraries to identify potential lead compounds with high binding affinity and specificity.
5. *Molecular docking:* By predicting the binding mode of molecules to target proteins, molecular docking in CADD helps to understand and optimize ligand-receptor interactions [21].

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Challenges

Despite their numerous advantages, Modern CADD methods face certain challenges that impact their implementation and effectiveness. Some key challenges include the following.

1. *Accuracy of predictions:* The accuracy of CADD predictions relies heavily on the quality of input data, such as protein structures and experimental binding data, which can sometimes be limited or inaccurate.
2. *Complexity of biological systems:* Biological systems are highly complex, and CADD methods may struggle to capture all the nuances of protein-ligand interactions, including protein flexibility, solvent effects, and allosteric regulation.

3. *Computational resources:* Running complex simulations and calculations in CADD requires significant computational resources, which can be a limiting factor for researchers with limited access to high-performance computing.
4. *Integration of multidisciplinary data:* Integrating data from various disciplines, such as chemistry, biology, and pharmacology, in CADD can be challenging, requiring expertise in multiple fields for accurate interpretation and analysis.

Limitations

1. *Transition from physical modeling to a virtual environment:* The transition from physical modeling to a virtual environment using computer-aided design (CAD) software can be challenging for engineers, as it requires changes in critical thinking skills and design techniques.
2. *Impact on engineering jobs and education:* The widespread use of CAD software inevitably impacts engineering jobs and education, requiring adaptations in education programs to prepare students for the working world.
3. *Emotional reactions and user experience:* The user experience of CAD software can significantly impact the design process, with unintuitive and frustrating software potentially hindering the design process.

FUTURE ASPECTS OF CADD

The future of CADD methods holds immense potential, with ongoing advancements in various areas set to revolutionize the drug discovery process. Some key future aspects of modern CADD methods include the following.

1. *Integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML):* The incorporation of AI and ML techniques into CADD methods is expected to significantly enhance their accuracy and efficiency. AI algorithms can learn from vast amounts of data, enabling the prediction of binding affinities, identification of novel lead compounds, and optimization of drug properties. ML techniques can also be used to automate complex design processes and to predict potential issues in drug development.
2. *Multi-target drug design and property prediction:* One of the major challenges in CADD is the ability to design drugs that can target multiple biological targets and predict their properties. Future CADD methods will focus on improving multitarget drug design and property prediction, allowing for the development of more effective and safer drugs.
3. *Cloud-based collaboration and accessibility:* Cloud-based CADD platforms will become increasingly prevalent, enabling seamless collaboration among researchers across different locations and devices. Cloud-based solutions provide easy accessibility to CADD tools, eliminating the need for high-end hardware and software installations. This democratizes access to CADD methods, allowing small businesses and individual researchers to leverage advanced capabilities.
4. *Generative design and optimization:* Generative design, which involves using algorithms to explore and generate numerous design options based on specified constraints and goals, will play a significant role in future CADD methods. These systems automatically iterate through countless design variations, considering factors such as target binding, pharmacokinetic properties, and safety. Generative design will lead to the creation of innovative and optimized drug candidates.
5. *Integration with experimental techniques:* Future CADD methods will be increasingly integrated with experimental techniques, such as HTS and structure determination methods. This integration will allow for the validation and refinement of computational predictions, leading to a more efficient and effective drug discovery process.
6. *Personalized medicine and precision dosing:* CADD methods will contribute to the development of personalized medicine by enabling the design of drugs tailored to individual patient characteristics, such as genetic profiles and disease subtypes. Additionally, CADD will aid in precision dosing, where drug doses are optimized based on individual patient factors, improving efficacy, and reducing adverse effects.

As CADD methods continue to evolve and integrate with emerging technologies, they will play an increasingly crucial role in drug discovery and development. The future of CADD holds promise for accelerating the identification of novel drug candidates, optimizing their properties, and ultimately improving patient outcomes.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, CADD has emerged as a powerful tool in the drug discovery process, offering a more efficient and cost-effective approach than traditional experimental methods. CADD methods, including SBDD and LBDD, have been successfully applied in the development of numerous drugs for cancer treatment, such as HIV protease inhibitors and tyrosine kinase inhibitors.

The integration of AI and ML techniques into CADD methods is expected to significantly enhance their accuracy and efficiency. Future CADD methods will focus on improving multitarget drug design and property prediction, allowing for the development of more effective and safer drugs. Cloud-based CADD platforms will become increasingly prevalent, enabling seamless collaboration among researchers and providing easy accessibility for CADD tools.

Generative design and optimization will play a significant role in future CADD methods, automatically iterating through numerous design variations to create innovative and optimized drug candidates. The integration of CADD methods with experimental techniques such as HTS and structure determination methods allows for the validation and refinement of computational predictions, leading to a more efficient and effective drug discovery process.

CADD methods will also contribute to the development of personalized medicine, enabling the design of drugs tailored to individual patient characteristics and precision dosing, where drug doses are optimized based on individual patient factors. As CADD methods continue to evolve and integrate with emerging technologies, they will play an increasingly crucial role in drug discovery and development.

In summary, CADD has revolutionized the drug discovery process, offering a more efficient and cost-effective approach than traditional experimental methods. The future of CADD holds promise for accelerating the identification of novel drug candidates, optimizing their properties, and ultimately improving patient outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Sliwoski G, Kothiwale S, Meiler J, Lowe EW. Computational methods in drug discovery. Pharmacol Rev. 2014;66(1):334–95. doi: 10.1124/pr.112.007336. PMID: 24381236.
2. Kapetanovic IM. Computer-aided drug discovery and development (CADDD): In silico-chemico-biological approach. Chem Biol Interact. 2008;171(2):165–76. doi: 10.1016/j.cbi.2006.12.006. PMID: 17229415.
3. Jorgensen WL. The many roles of computation in drug discovery. Science. 2004;303(5665):1813–8. doi: 10.1126/science.1096361. PMID: 15031495.
4. Irwin JJ, Shoichet BK. Zinc—a free database of commercially available compounds for virtual screening. J Chem Inf Model. 2005;45(1):177–82. doi: 10.1021/ci049714+. PMID: 15667143.
5. Schneider G, Fechner U. Computer-based de novo design of drug-like molecules. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2005;4(8):649–63. doi: 10.1038/nrd1799. PMID: 16056391.
6. Berman HM, Bhat TN, Bourne PE, Feng Z, Gilliland G, Weissig H, Westbrook J. The protein data bank and the challenge of structural genomics. Nat Struct Biol. 2000;7 Suppl:957–9. doi: 10.1038/80734. PMID: 11103999.
7. Wang X, Song K, Li L, Chen L. Structure-based drug design strategies and challenges. Curr Top Med Chem. 2018;18(12):998–1006. doi: 10.2174/1568026618666180813152921. PMID: 30101712.
8. Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai. Experimental Therapeutics Institute: Structure based drug discovery. Available from: https://icahn.mssm.edu/research/ddi/capabilities/drug-discovery

9. REVIVE. Structure-based drug design (SBDD). Global Antibiotic Research and Development Foundation ("GARDP"); 2019. Available from: https://revive.gardp.org/resource/structure-based-drug-design-sbdd/?cf=encyclopaedia
10. Anderson AC. Structure-based functional design of drugs: from target to lead compound. Methods Mol Biol. 2012;823:359–66. doi: 10.1007/978-1-60327-216-2_23. PMID: 22081357; PMCID: PMC3644978.
11. Langer T, Hoffmann RD. Virtual screening: An effective tool for lead structure discovery? Curr Pharm Des. 2001;7(7):509–27. doi: 10.2174/1381612013397861. PMID: 11375766.
12. Ajjarapu S. Computer-aided drug design (CADD): Types, uses, examples, softwares. Microbe Notes. 2023. Available from: https://microbenotes.com/computer-aided-drug-design-cadd/
13. Anwar T, Kumar P, Khan AU. Modern tools and techniques in computer-aided drug design. In: Coumar MS, editor. Molecular docking for computer-aided drug design. New York: Academic Press; 2021. p. 1–30.
14. Williams PA, Cosme J, Ward A, Angove HC, Matak Vinković D, Jhoti H. Crystal structure of human cytochrome P450 2C9 with bound warfarin. Nature. 2003;424(6947):464–8. doi: 10.1038/nature01862. PMID: 12861225.
15. Kitchen DB, Decornez H, Furr JR, Bajorath J. Docking and scoring in virtual screening for drug discovery: Methods and applications. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2004;3(11):935–49. doi: 10.1038/nrd1549. PMID: 15520816.
16. Shoichet BK. Virtual screening of chemical libraries. Nature. 2004;432(7019):862–5. doi: 10.1038/nature03197. PMID: 15602552.
17. Tuccinardi T. Docking-based virtual screening: Recent developments. Comb Chem High Throughput Screen. 2009;12(3):303–14. doi: 10.2174/138620709787581666. PMID: 19275536.
18. Truchon JF, Bayly CI. Evaluating virtual screening methods: Good and bad metrics for the 'early recognition' problem. J Chem Inf Model. 2007;47(2):488–508. doi: 10.1021/ci600426e. PMID: 17288412.
19. Lyne PD, Lamb ML, Saeh JC. Accurate prediction of the relative potencies of members of a series of kinase inhibitors using molecular docking and MM-GBSA scoring. J Med Chem. 2006;49(16):4805–8. doi: 10.1021/jm060522a. PMID: 16884290.
20. Cramer RD, Patterson DE, Bunce JD. Comparative molecular field analysis (CoMFA). 1. Effect of shape on binding of steroids to carrier proteins. J Am Chem Soc. 1988;110(18):5959–67. doi: 10.1021/ja00226a005. PMID: 22148765.
21. Sliwoski G, Kothiwale S, Meiler J, Lowe EW. Computational methods in drug discovery. Pharmacol Rev. 2014;66(1):334-95.

