

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Osho, V. and Ojo, O. and Sharifi, M. and Ghafourian, T. (2013) Evaluation of QSAR and ligand enzyme docking for the identification of ABCB1 substrates. In: UK QSAR & Chemoinformatics Group Meeting, April 2013, Unilever, Bedford.

DOI

Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/42820/>

Document Version

Presentation

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries


For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>




Evaluation of QSAR and ligand enzyme docking for the identification of ABCB1 substrates



V. Osho, O. Ojo, M. Sharifi and T. Ghafourian
Medway School of Pharmacy, Chatham Maritime, Kent ME4 4TB

Introduction

The ABC transporter superfamily is one of the largest and abundant families of proteins. The ABC transporter P-glycoprotein (ABCB1, P-gp), a polyspecific protein has demonstrated its function as a transporter of hydrophobic drugs as well as transporting lipids, steroids and metabolic products. Its role in multidrug resistance (MDR) and pharmacokinetic profile of clinically important drug molecules has been widely recognised. Figure below shows **X-Ray crystal structures of P-glycoprotein** that are available in the Protein Data Bank (PDB) with various binding sites of this polyspecific transporter enzyme.



3G5U without a co-crystallised ligand

3G60 co-crystallised with QZ59-RRR

3G61 co-crystallised with two molecules of QZ59-SSS

In this study, QSAR and enzyme-ligand docking methods were explored in order to classify substrates and non-substrates of P-glycoprotein.

Methods

Dataset: The p-gp inhibition class published by Matsson et al (2009) [1] consisting of 54 inhibitors ($IC_{50} < 50 \mu M$) and 69 non-inhibitors. Dataset was split randomly into a training set of 98 compounds for building models and a validation set of 25 for testing the model accuracy.


Molecular Descriptors: ACD Labs/Log D Suite Version 12.0 and Molecular Operating Environment (MOE), 2012.10 were used to calculate molecular properties.

Docking: Docking of compounds was carried out using the Dock application in MOE software. Compounds were docked into the X-ray structures of mouse P-gp 3G5U and 3G61 [2] extracted from Protein Data Bank. Docking experiments included four different binding sites on 3G5U protein [2].


Statistical Analysis: Results from docking experiments (scores) and molecular descriptor calculations were analysed using data mining tools including CART, boosted trees and Support Vector Machine (Statistica 11.0).

Results

Docking scores




An example docking pose: Chlorprothixene docked to P-gp 3G61



Significance of docking scores using selected CART, iCART and SVM models; ACC= Accuracy; MCC= Mathews Correlation Coefficient

| Model | Parameters given | Parameters selected by analysis | Training Set | | Validation Set | |
|----------------|---|---|--------------|------|----------------|------|
| | | | Acc | MCC | Acc | MCC |
| CART 1 | Docking scores | Docking scores at QZ59rrr and QZ59lower | 0.71 | 0.49 | 0.64 | 0.35 |
| CART 2 | Docking scores + molecular descriptors | Various molecular descriptors | 0.96 | 0.91 | 0.48 | 0.12 |
| iCART 1 | QZ59rrr (manually selected) + molecular descriptors | QZ59rrr, log D ₂ , log D ₁₀ | 0.83 | 0.66 | 0.81 | 0.61 |
| iCART 2 | QZ59lower (manually selected) + molecular descriptors | QZ59lower, log D ₂ , log D ₁₀ , Q_VSA_HYD | 0.85 | 0.71 | 0.81 | 0.61 |
| SVM | QZ59rrr, log D ₂ , log D ₁₀ | QZ59rrr, log D ₂ , log D ₁₀ | 0.76 | 0.5 | 0.81 | 0.65 |

Optimization of CART, SVM and Boosted trees



ACC= Accuracy ; MCC= Mathews Correlation Coefficient; SE= Sensitivity; SP= Specificity

Selected Models:

| Model | Train set | | Validation set | |
|-------|-----------|------|----------------|------|
| | ACC | MCC | ACC | MCC |
| CART | 0.94 | 0.88 | 0.80 | 0.63 |
| BT | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.77 |
| SVM | 0.85 | 0.69 | 0.80 | 0.60 |

Conclusion

Docking performance was better using the 3G61 structure of P-gp. The most important feature for binding to P-gp was lipophilicity. Use of lipophilicity and docking scores in Support Vector Machine leads to the most accurate prediction model in comparison with the models based on docking scores only. On the other hand, optimization of CART, SVM and BT without the use of docking scores may produce similar or better results (in case of boosted trees). A model generated using BT was identified as the best model, with a prediction accuracy of 88%, Mathews correlation coefficient of 0.77 and Youden's J index of 0.80 for the test set.

References

- Aller et al (2009). *Science*; 323(5922): p1718-22.
- Matsson et al (2009). *Pharmaceutical Research*; 26(8): p1816-31.