

Molecular Fields in QSAR

Eugene V. Radchenko Department of Chemistry, Lomonosov Moscow State University Structure-activity relationships

- «Structure of a compound determines its properties, including biological activity» A = f(S)
 - Follows from structural theory of organic chemistry
 - Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationships (QSAR)
 - Quantitative Structure-Property Relationships (QSPR)
- Mutually complementing approaches
 - Structure-based: models of the biotarget structure and its interactions with ligands
 - Ligand-based: data on known ligands and their activities usually analyzed using statistical learning techniques

Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationships

- Model is derived from analysis of available experimental activity data for compounds comprising a training set
- Allows to predict (estimate) activity for new compounds
- Needs sufficiently broad applicability domain

3

Desirable: interpretation / explanation of a model wrt mechanism of action and structural features significant for activity



Molecular Fields in QSAR

Structure representation: descriptors

$$A = f(S) = f(D_1, D_2, D_3, \ldots)$$

- Statistical learning usually needs numerical data
- Molecular (structural) descriptors numerical parameters describing certain features and facets of the structure of a compound
- Generally, the full diversity of chemical space would require infinite number of descriptors
- Only need description sufficient for a specific problem



Molecular (structural) descriptors

$$A = f(S) = f(D_1, D_2, D_3, ...)$$

- Numerical parameters representing certain features and facets of the structure of a compound
- Almost unlimited diversity of potentially available descriptors
- Desirable: connection to mechanism of action, interpretability
- Classification of descriptors
 - Topological
 - Physico-chemical
 - Substructural
 - Superstructural
 - > 3D structural

Physico-chemical descriptors

ID Steric descriptors

- Molecular mass
- Taft's substituent constant E_s
- Molecular dimensions
- Moments of inertia
- Molecular volume
- Molecular surface area (true 3D or topology-based estimate)
- Polar surface area PSA
- Molecular shape
- Substituent STERIMOL parameters
 - L substituent length along connecting bond
 - ▶ B1 minimum width perpendicular to bond
 - ▶ B5 maximum width perpendicular to bond



3D QSAR

- Desire for direct QSAR analysis of the 3D molecular structures and interactions
- Especially for activities mediated by specific ligandbiotarget binding
- Comparative Molecular Field Analysis (CoMFA)
 - De facto standard 3D QSAR method
 - R. Cramer et al., 1988
 - Implemented in SYBYL software, patent now expired
 - Molecular mechanics force fields adequately model intermolecular interactions
 - Uniform descriptor matrix can be obtained by sampling molecular interaction fields over rectangular 3D grid

CoMFA: alignment

- Alignment of ligand 3D structures
- Requires chemical / mechanistic consistency
- The most problematic step in CoMFA study
- Manual alignment by common substructure – requires consistent conformations
- Automatic 'field fit' alignment proposed but never actually used
- External alignments
 - X-ray data for ligand-target complexes
 - Pharmacophore-based alignment
 - Docking-based alignment pose and conformation uncertainty



CoMFA: descriptors

- Electrostatic and steric intermolecular interaction energies (molecular interaction fields) sampled in nodes of a rectangular 3D grid
- Probe atom (commonly CH₃⁺)

$$E = \frac{1}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon} \sum_i \frac{q_i q_p}{d_{ip}}$$

$$S = \sum_{i} \left[-\frac{A_{ip}}{d_{ip}^6} + \frac{B_{ip}}{d_{ip}^{12}} \right]$$



CoMFA: analysis

- Statistical modeling: partial least squares regression (PLSR)
- Predictive models
- Activity maps
- Design of better structures
- Interpretation, comparison to target structure





Steric: green – favorable, yellow – unfavorable interaction Electrostatic: favorable red – negative, blue – positive charge



CoMFA: alignment problem

- Difficult and tedious
- Especially for flexible structures
- Formal rules/procedures
- Quasi-topological ("topological in 3D") models
- Topomer CoMFA
 - Standard conformations/rules for various groups
 - E.g., fully extended alkyl chains
- Template CoMFA
 - Conformation templates based on X-ray data
 - + Standard rules
 - Promising preliminary results but no broad application

- Additional molecular fields
 - Local lipophilicity: Molecular Lipophilic Potential (MLP)

$$MLP = \sum f_i \ e^{-d_{ip}/2}$$

Orbital densities (HOMO, LUMO)

Comparative Molecular Similarity Indices Analysis (CoMSIA)

- G. Klebe et al., 1994
- Softer field descriptors, no singularities, less sensitive to misalignment
- Gaussian functions for similarity to probe index

$$A_F = -\sum f_i f_p e^{-\alpha d_{ip}^2}$$

- Additional fields
 - Electrostatic
 - Steric
 - Hydrophobic
 - Hydrogen bond donor
 - Hydrogen bond acceptor

3D QSAR future

- CoMFA patent expired
- Development halted, product discontinued by Certara
- Basic CoMFA workflow (no topomer/template features) can be performed in other software (with varying usability)
 - Open3DQSAR
 - Schrödinger
 - Cresset

Superstructural approaches in QSAR

- Topological methods, free from 3D alignment problems
- Account for mutual arrangement of fragments and local structural features
- Molecular Field Topology Analysis (MFTA)
- Structural (2D) formulas alignment → molecular supergraph uniform frame of reference to compare local properties



MFTA: descriptors

- Local physico-chemical properties reflect various ligandtarget interactions
 - Electrostatic: effective atomic charge ${\it Q}$
 - Steric: atom/environment van der Waals radius R, Re
 - ▶ Group lipophilicity *Lg*
 - Hydrogen bond donor/acceptor ability Hd, Ha

MFTA: descriptor matrix

- Descriptor matrix
 - Occupied supergraph positions atomic descriptors
 - Unoccupied positions neutral values



Red: positive Blue: negative

MFTA: analysis

- Statistical modeling: partial least squares regression (PLSR)
- Predictive models
- Activity maps descriptor influence on activity
- Comparison to biotarget structure
- Design of better structures



Some references

- 1. Cramer R.D., Patterson D.E., Bunce J.D. <u>Comparative molecular field analysis (CoMFA). 1. Effect of</u> <u>shape on binding of steroids to carrier proteins</u>, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1988, **110** (18), 5959–5967.
- 2. Cramer R.D. Topomer CoMFA: A design methodology for rapid lead optimization, J. Med. Chem., 2003, 46 (3), 374–388.
- 3. Cramer R.D., Wendt B. Template CoMFA: The 3D-QSAR grail?, J. Chem. Inf. Model., 2014, 54 (2), 660–671.
- 4. Cramer R.D. <u>Template CoMFA generates single 3D-QSAR models that, for twelve of twelve biological targets, predict all ChEMBL-tabulated affinities</u>, *PLoS One*, 2015, **10** (6), e0129307.
- 5. Klebe G., Abraham U., Mietzner T. <u>Molecular similarity indices in a comparative analysis (CoMSIA)</u> of drug molecules to correlate and predict their biological activity, J. Med. Chem., 1994, **37** (24), 4130–4146.
- 6. Palyulin V.A., Radchenko E.V., Zefirov N.S. <u>Molecular Field Topology Analysis method in QSAR</u> studies of organic compounds, J. Chem. Inf. Comp. Sci., 2000, **40** (3), 659–667.
- 7. Radchenko E.V., Palyulin V.A., Zefirov N.S. <u>Molecular Field Topology Analysis in drug design and virtual screening</u>, *Chemoinformatics Approaches to Virtual Screening*, ed. A. Varnek and A. Tropsha, RSC, 2008, 150–181.
- 8. Radchenko E.V., Makhaeva G.F., Palyulin V.A., Zefirov N.S. <u>Chemical similarity, shape matching and</u> <u>QSAR</u>, *Computational Systems Pharmacology and Toxicology*, RSC, Cambridge, 2017, 120–173.
- 9. Radchenko E.V., Palyulin V.A., Zefirov N.S. <u>Molecular Field Topology Analysis (MFTA) in the design of neuroprotective compounds</u>, *Computational Modeling of Drugs Against Alzheimer's Disease*, Springer, 2018, 139–159.