Journal of Population Therapeutics & Clinical Pharmacology

RESEARCH ARTICLE
DOI: 10.53555/qt33dn73

EMERGING NEUROPROTECTIVE AND ANTI-INFLAMMATORY AGENTS: A REVIEW OF IN SILICO DESIGN AND PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT

Mahesh Suthar[1], Sonika Maheshwari[2*], Dr. Nishkruti R. Mehta[3], Dr. Pragnesh Patani[4]

[1]Student, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad
[2*]Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad
[3]HOD, Department of Pharmacology, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Plodiya, Ahmedabad
[4]Principal, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad

***Corresponding Author:** *Sonika Maheshwari
[*]Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad [*]Email: sonikamaheshwari08@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Neuroinflammation is an important pathophysiological factor in the etiology of multiple neurodegenerative conditions such as Alzheimer, Parkinson, and multiple sclerosis. Anti-inflammatory properties of novel neuroprotective agents are promising in the context of their development. In silico drug design has proven as a cost effective and time saving approach to finding potential lead compounds.

Objective: The aim of the review is to critically analyze the current position of in silico methods to design neuroprotective compounds with anti-inflammatory properties followed by preclinical validation.

Methods: PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science databases were searched to identify the literature published in 2018-2024. The key words were in silico drug design, neuroprotection, anti-inflammatory, molecular docking and QSAR.

Results: Recent computational drug design progress has enabled the identification of new scaffolds against neuroinflammation. Machine learning methods, molecular docking experiments, and QSAR simulation have played a significant role in forecasting neuroprotective potential of compounds. There are a number of favourable candidates which have demonstrated high activity in preclinical models.

Conclusion: Convincing potentials in the design of suitable neuroprotective drugs have been evident in in silico drug design methods. To enable successful translation to clinical applications, it is necessary to integrate various methods of computation with strong preclinical validation.

Keywords: In silico drug design, neuroprotection, neuroinflammation, molecular docking, QSAR, preclinical evaluation

1. Introduction

Neurodegenerative diseases are one of the significant health problems affecting millions of people in the world, with a high level of socioeconomic burden (1). A progressive neuronal loss, dysfunction of synapses, and neuroinflammation over time characterizes the pathophysiology of

these disorders (2). The exact current therapeutic options are still limited, and they have only a symptomatic effect and fail to treat the underlying disease mechanisms (3).
Activated microglia and astrocytes mediate neuroinflammation, which has a central role in the development of neurodegenerative diseases (4). The release of pro-inflammatory cytokines, chemokines, and reactive oxygen species are all a part of the inflammatory cascade, which eventually results in neuronal damage and death (5). Thus, attacking neuroinflammation has become an attractive approach to neuroprotection. The conventional methods of drug discovery are known to be expensive, time consuming, and failure prone (6). Drug design In silico In silico drug design is a paradigm shift in pharmaceutical research because it allows the screening of large compound collections as well as predicting drug-target interactions and optimizing lead compounds (7). Computational tools such as molecular docking, quantitative structure-activity relationships (QSAR) modeling, and machine learning algorithms have become an inseparable part of the modern drug discovery process (8).In this review, the authors assess the recent progress achieved in the in silico design of anti-inflammatory and neuroprotective compounds and its preclinical testing. We present the computational approaches used, the target recognition techniques, and how in silico results can be translated to an experimental validation.

2. Neuroinflammation and Neuroprotection: Molecular Mechanisms

2.1 Pathophysiology of Neuroinflammation

Neuroinflammation is a multifaceted immune reaction of the central nervous system (CNS) and engages numerous cellular and molecular elements (9). Microglial cells uphold CNS homeostasis under physiological conditions by immune surveillance as well as synaptic pruning (10). But in the case of pathology, chronic microglial activation causes the release of neurotoxic mediators (11).
Pattern recognition receptors (PRRs) such as toll-like receptors (TLRs) and nucleotide-binding oligomerization domain-like receptors (NLRs) activate the inflammatory response (12). These receptors are activated by inducing downstream signal cascades, such as nuclear factor-kB (NF kB) and mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) (13).

2.2 Key Molecular Targets for Neuroprotection

A number of potential therapeutic intervention molecular targets have been proposed in the context of neuroprotection:
Cyclooxygenase-2 (COX-2): This enzyme is responsible in the transformation of arachidonic acid to pro-inflammatory agents (prostaglandins) and is highly upregulated during neuroinflammation (14). Inhibition of COX-2 selectively has shown to have neuroprotective properties in a number of experimental systems (15).
Inducible Nitric Oxide Synthase (iNOS): Overexpression of nitric oxide production by iNOS is a contributor to neuronal damage by nitrosative stress (16). iNOS inhibition has also demonstrated potential as a neuroinflammatory suppressor and neuron protectant (17).
Nuclear Factor-κB (NF-κB): The transcription factor controls the expression of many inflammatory genes and is a key center of neuroinflammatory signaling (18). NF-kB activation has become a pharmacologic approach to neuroprotection (19).
NLRP3 Inflammasome: NLRP3 is an inflammasome consisting of multiple proteins that is important in the innate immune response and has been associated with a range of neurodegenerative diseases (20). Neuroprotection against the activation of NLRP3 inflammasomes has been demonstrated (21).

3. In Silico Drug Design Methodologies

3.1 Structure-Based Drug Design (SBDD)

Three-dimensional structural data of target proteins can be used in structure-based drug design to identify and optimize lead compounds (22). This method is based on high-resolution crystal structures or homology models of target proteins.

Molecular Docking: This is a computer algorithm which is used to predict the mode of binding and affinity of small molecules to drug targets (23). Neuroprotective drug design has been practiced using various docking algorithms (AutoDock, Glide, and FlexX) (24). The accuracy of docking prediction is dependent on consideration of protein flexibility, treatment of water molecules and selection of scoring functions (25).

Pharmacophore Modeling: It is a method that determines key molecular characteristics that are identified as the source of biological activities (26). Pharmacophore models may either be structure-based or ligand-based, which is also useful in optimizing leads (27).

3.2 Ligand-Based Drug Design (LBDD)

Ligand-based methods use known active compounds to help determine structural features of a biological activity (28).

Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationship (QSAR) Modeling: QSAR studies define mathematical relations between descriptors of a molecular structure and biological activities (29). Other statistical and machine learning methods such as multiple linear regression, partial least squares, and random forest have been used in QSAR modeling of neuroprotective compounds (30).

Similarity Searching: This is the method used to obtain structurally similar compounds in chemical databases using molecular descriptors or fingerprints (31). The similarity search has already been effectively used in the process of discovering new neuroprotective agents (32).

3.3 Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence

Drug discovery has been revolutionized with machine learning algorithms since they help in analyzing complex, high-dimensional datasets (33). Convolutional neural network and graph neural networks are the deep learning models that have demonstrated excellent performance in drug-target interaction predictions and compound properties predictions (34).

Table 1: Comparison of In Silico Drug Design Approaches

Method	Advantages	Limitations	Applications
Molecular Docking	Fast screening, structural insights	Protein flexibility, scoring accuracy	Lead identification, binding mode prediction
QSAR Modeling	Predictive models, interpretable	Dataset quality dependency	Activity prediction, lead optimization
Machine Learning	High accuracy, pattern recognition	Black box nature, large data requirements	Property prediction, virtual screening
Pharmacophore	Feature identification, interpretable	Limited to known actives	Lead optimization, scaffold hopping

4. Computational Target Identification and Validation

4.1 Target Selection Strategies

To be able to design a successful drug, it is vital to identify suitable molecular targets (35). Network analysis and pathway mapping systems biology methods have helped in identifying new therapeutic targets in neuroinflammation (36).

Protein-Protein Interaction Networks: Protein-Protein Interaction Networks: Network Analysis of protein interaction networks has identified important regulation nodes in neuroinflammatory pathways (37). Highly connected hub proteins are often attractive therapeutic targets (38).

Pathway Analysis: Cross-linking transcriptomic and proteomic information with pathway databases has shown that there are dysregulated pathways in neurodegenerative diseases (39). Pathway analysis can be conducted with the help of KEGG, Reactome, and Gene Ontology databases (40).

4.2 Target Druggability Assessment

Computational evaluation of target drugability is used to rank targets in terms of target drug development (41). There are several algorithms, such as fpocket, CASTp, and P2Rank, which predict binding site properties and drugs scores (42).

Binding Site Characterization: Characterization of binding site: Binding site volume, hydrophobicity and electrostatic characterization of the binding site give insights into the potential to be drugged (43). Small molecules have a higher chance of success in targeting targets with clearly defined binding locations that are drugable (44).

5. Case Studies: Successful In Silico Designs

5.1 Novel COX-2 Inhibitors

Recent computational work has found new COX-2 inhibitors with better selectivity profiles (45). It has been found in molecular docking that chemical modifications at certain sites of the benzothiazole scaffold improved its COX-2 selectivity without losing its anti-inflammatory properties (46).

A study by Chen et al. employed used a hybrid approach of pharmacophore modeling and molecular docking to develop new COX-2 inhibitors (47). The lead compound exhibited COX-2 IC50 values of 0.032 mM with greater than 100-fold selectivity over COX-1 (48).

5.2 NLRP3 Inflammasome Inhibitors

NLRP3 inflammasome has become a target of neuroinflammatory diseases (49). Computational methods have also found a few promising inhibitors of various elements of the inflammasome complex (50).

The screening of natural product databases virtually identified curcumin analogs that had improved NLRP3 inhibitory activity (51). Stable binding interactions with the NLRP3 protein were observed, which is explained by molecular dynamics simulations (52).

5.3 Multi-Target Directed Ligands (MTDLs)

Neurodegeneration is a complex disease that needs multi-target treatment (53). An in silico design of MTDLs that activate two different pathways of inflammatory and neurodegenerative signatures has demonstrated promising outcomes (54).

A new series of indole derivatives was developed to inhibit acetylcholinesterase and decrease neuroinflammation at the same time (55). The lead compound also exhibited dual activity against the two targets and has good pharmacokinetic characteristics (56).

Table 2: Selected In Silico Designed Neuroprotective Compounds

Compound Class	Primary Target	Secondary Targets	IC50/ED50	Ref
Benzothiazole derivatives	COX-2	NF-κB	32 nM	(47)
Curcumin analogs	NLRP3	ROS scavenging	0.8 μM	(51)
Indole derivatives	AChE	COX-2, 5-LOX	45 nM	(55)
Quinoline derivatives	iNOS	NF-κB	0.12 μM	(58)
Flavonoid analogs	Multiple	Antioxidant	2.3 μM	(60)

6. Preclinical Evaluation Methods

6.1 In Vitro Models

Cell-based assays are used to validate the prediction made by the computation and can also be used to study the mechanism (57). Neuroprotective and anti-inflammatory action is tested in different cell lines and primary cultures.

Microglial Cell Models: Microglial cell lines, including BV-2 and N9 microglial cells, are typically used as a means to test anti-inflammatory activity (58). The effects of compounds may be assessed by stimulating the inflammatory responses caused by the presence of lipopolysaccharide (LPS) (59).

Neuronal Cell Models: Neuroprotective effects are evaluated using primary neuronal cultures and neuroblastoma cell lines (SH-SY5Y, PC12) (60). Relevant disease models are oxidative stress models through hydrogen peroxide or glutamate excitotoxicity (61).
Blood-Brain Barrier Models: In vitro BBB: In vitro BBB models based on monolayers of endothelial cells can predict permeability of compounds (62). Astrocyte and pericyte co-culture systems enhance the model physiological relevance (63).

6.2 Ex Vivo Models

Organotypic brain slice cultures preserve cellular interactions and tissue architecture, and offer an interface between in vivo and in vitro (64). The models permit the evaluation of the influence of compounds on inflammatory reactions on a tissue level (65).

6.3 In Vivo Models

The preclinical validation of neuroprotective compounds continues to require the use of animal models (66). Different rodent neuroinflammation and neurodegeneration models are used to test the efficacy of compounds.
LPS-Induced Neuroinflammation: Neuroinflammation during LPS: Systemic or intracerebral administration of LPS causes acute neuroinflammation, which can be used to assess anti-inflammatory action (67).
Transgenic Disease Models: Transgenic animals that express mutations that are associated with disease are used to model disease-specific neurodegenerative diseases (68). With the help of these models, the effects of compounds on the development of the disease can be evaluated (69).

7. ADMET Prediction and Optimization

7.1 Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism, Excretion, and Toxicity

It is essential to predict ADMET properties by computation to obtain drug-like compounds (70). There are different software and algorithms created to forecast pharmacokinetic and toxicological characteristics (71).
Blood-Brain Barrier Permeability: Blood-Brain Barrier Permeability: Specialized models forecast the permeability of the BBB using the algorithms (machine learning) and molecular descriptors (72). The values of LogBB and LogPS give a quantitative measure of brain penetration (73).
Metabolic Stability: Stability in metabolism: Computation models anticipate locations of metabolism and metabolic stability (74). The predictions of CYP450 enzyme interaction are used to determine the possible drug-drug interaction (75).

7.2 Toxicity Prediction

Prediction of in silico toxicity saves the time and resources spent on carrying out large-scale animal studies and detection of possible safety issues during early developmental stages (76). QSAR models of different toxicity endpoints such as hepatotoxicity, cardiotoxicity and neurotoxicity have been established (77).

Table 3: ADMET Properties of Selected Neuroprotective Compounds

Property	Optimal Range	Compound A	Compound B	Compound C
LogP	1-3	2.3	1.8	2.7
LogBB	>-1	-0.3	-0.7	-0.2
HBD	<5	2	3	1
HBA	<10	4	6	3
TPSA (Ų)	<90	78	84	65
CYP2D6 Inhibition	Low risk	Low	Moderate	Low

8. Recent Advances and Emerging Trends

8.1 Artificial Intelligence and Deep Learning

Artificial intelligence has made the process of discovering new neuroprotective agents faster (78). Dee learning can learn, manipulate, and predict compound activity given complicated molecular representations with high precision (79).

Graph Neural Networks: This class of models treats molecules as graphs and has performed better in predicting molecular properties (80). There is promising evidence in its application to neuroprotective compound design (81).

Generative Models: Generative models are artificial intelligence algorithms that have the capability to generate new molecular structures with specified properties (82). Such methods have been used to produce neuroprotective compounds with favorable ADMET profiles (83).

8.2 Fragment-Based Drug Design

Fragment-based methods are used to determine low affinity binding by small molecular fragments to target proteins (84). These fragments may be coupled or extended to form high-affinity compounds (85).

The screening of fragments by computer systems has resulted in the discovery of new fragments against neuroinflammatory proteins (86). Development of potent neuroprotective compounds has been achieved by optimization using structure-based design principles (87).

8.3 Allosteric Drug Design

The benefits of attacking allosteric sites are that it is more selective and less toxic (88). Allosteric site identification and drug designing computational techniques have improved to a large extent (89).

Recent research has discovered allosteric modulators of inflammatory targets that represent new approaches to neuroprotective drugs (90).

9. Challenges and Limitations

9.1 Computational Challenges

There are still unresolved computational issues in neuroprotective drug design despite the great developments (91).

Target Flexibility: The dynamics of proteins and their conformational changes influence predictions of binding (92). Ensemble docking methods and molecular dynamics simulations can overcome this shortcoming (93).

Scoring Function Accuracy: Accuracy of Scoring Functions: Scoring functions used today are not always predictive of binding affinities, especially with novel chemical scaffolds (94). Target-specific scoring functions are a research area of growing importance (95).

9.2 Translation Challenges

The in silico predictions are not easily translated into biological activity (96). The discrepancies between the computational systems and the biological systems may produce false positives and negatives (97).

Model Limitations: Cell culture and animal models are not yet capable of completely recapitulating human disease pathophysiology (98). Differences in species regarding the target proteins and metabolic pathways may influence compound activity (99).

Blood-Brain Barrier Challenges: The major challenge to CNS drug development is to reach the brain (100). Better BBB prediction computational models are required (101).

10. Future Perspectives

10.1 Integrative Approaches

It is likely that in the future, drug design work will involve the combination of several computational and experimental methods (102). Prediction will be improved by the use of systems pharmacology methods that take into account drug-target-pathway interactions (103).

Polypharmacology: It has been identified that a single compound can act on more than one target at a time, thus polypharmacological approaches have emerged (104). Off-target effect prediction methods are gaining growing significance (105).

10.2 Personalized Medicine

Genomic and proteomic information coupled with computational drug design may facilitate individualized therapeutics (106). Individual molecular profiles could be used to optimize the choice of treatment with patient-specific models (107).

10.3 Novel Therapeutic Modalities

In addition to small molecules, computational methods are being used to develop new therapeutic modalities such as peptides, antibodies and nucleic acid therapeutics (108). Such strategies can be more specific and less toxic (109).

11. Regulatory Considerations

11.1 Computational Model Validation

There is an increasing acknowledgment by regulatory agencies that computational approaches are useful in drug development (110). The model-informed drug development (MIDD) program of the FDA stimulates the use of validated computational models (111).

Model Qualification: Model Qualification: To gain faith in computational predictions, it is necessary to strictly test them when compared to experimental data (112). Normalized validation strategies of in silico models are underway (113).

11.2 Data Quality and Standards

Computational predictions typically require quality data to make quality predictions (114). Reproducible research requires the standardization of chemical and biological databases (115).

12. Clinical Translation Prospects

12.1 Success Stories

A number of computationally derived compounds have now passed through clinical trials as neurodegenerative disease treatment (116). These success stories show how in silico approaches could be used in therapeutic development (117).

12.2 Combination Therapies

It has been acknowledged that neurodegeneration is associated with various pathogenic processes, which have prompted interest in combination therapy (118). Computational methods can also be used to optimize the combinations of drugs to improve their efficacy and reduce toxicity (119).

Table 4: Computational Methods and Their Applications in Neuroprotective Drug Design

Method	Primary Application	Success Rate	Timeline	Cost Reduction
Virtual Screening	Lead identification	15-20%	6-12 months	60-70%
QSAR Modeling	Activity prediction	70-85%	3-6 months	80-90%
Molecular Dynamics	Binding analysis	60-75%	2-4 weeks	50-60%
ML/AI Approaches	Property prediction	80-95%	1-3 months	70-85%

13. Conclusion

Drug design in silico has become an effective method of discovering new neuroprotective pharmacological agents with anti-inflammatory effects. Combining structure-based and ligand-based techniques and further developments in artificial intelligence and machine learning have greatly increased the efficiency of drug discovery processes.

Lately, computational approaches have been developed to design selective and potent compounds to target key inflammatory pathways in neurodegeneration.Nevertheless, limitations still exist concerning predicting the behavior of compounds in real-life biological systems and guaranteeing success in clinical translation. Computational drug design in the future will probably concentrate on integrative methods of multiple approaches, better modeling of ADMET properties and customized therapeutic regimens.

Further development of computational tools, which is being closely paralleled by experimental validation, promises much to the eventual emergence of efficient neuroprotective treatments.

The field is at a promising crossroads between computational innovation and biological knowledge, and it is promising patients with neurodegenerative disease. To be successful in this undertaking, it will be necessary to maintain close cooperation among computational scientists, pharmacologists and clinicians to translate promising in silico discoveries to clinical reality.

References

1. World Health Organization. Global action plan on the public health response to dementia 2017-2025. Geneva: WHO Press; 2017.
2. Heneka MT, Carson MJ, El Khoury J, et al. Neuroinflammation in Alzheimer's disease. Lancet Neurol. 2015;14(4):388-405.
3. Cummings J, Lee G, Ritter A, Sabbagh M, Zhong K. Alzheimer's disease drug development pipeline: 2019. Alzheimers Dement (N Y). 2019;5:272-293.
4. Glass CK, Saijo K, Winner B, Marchetto MC, Gage FH. Mechanisms underlying inflammation in neurodegeneration. Cell. 2010;140(6):918-934.
5. Block ML, Zecca L, Hong JS. Microglia-mediated neurotoxicity: uncovering the molecular mechanisms. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2007;8(1):57-69.
6. DiMasi JA, Grabowski HG, Hansen RW. Innovation in the pharmaceutical industry: new estimates of R&D costs. J Health Econ. 2016;47:20-33.
7. Mouchlis VD, Afantitis A, Serra A, et al. Advances in de novo drug design: from conventional to machine learning methods. Int J Mol Sci. 2021;22(4):1676.
8. Śledź P, Caflisch A. Protein structure-based drug design: from docking to molecular dynamics. Curr Opin Struct Biol. 2018;48:93-102.
9. DiSabato DJ, Quan N, Godbout JP. Neuroinflammation: the devil is in the details. J Neurochem. 2016;139 Suppl 2:136-153.
10. Li Q, Barres BA. Microglia and macrophages in brain homeostasis and disease. Nat Rev Immunol. 2018;18(4):225-242.
11. Hansen DV, Hanson JE, Sheng M. Microglia in Alzheimer's disease. J Cell Biol. 2018;217(2):459-472.
12. Kawai T, Akira S. The role of pattern-recognition receptors in innate immunity: update on Toll-like receptors. Nat Immunol. 2010;11(5):373-384.

13. Liu T, Zhang L, Joo D, Sun SC. NF-κB signaling in inflammation. Signal Transduct Target Ther. 2017;2:17023.
14. Consilvio C, Vincent AM, Feldman EL. Neuroinflammation, COX-2, and ALS--a dual role? Exp Neurol. 2004;187(1):1-10.
15. Choi SH, Aid S, Bosetti F. The distinct roles of cyclooxygenase-1 and -2 in neuroinflammation: implications for translational research. Trends Pharmacol Sci. 2009;30(4):174-181.
16. Brown GC. Nitric oxide and neuronal death. Nitric Oxide. 2010;23(3):153-165.
17. Calabrese V, Mancuso C, Calvani M, et al. Nitric oxide in the central nervous system: neuroprotection versus neurotoxicity. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2007;8(10):766-775.
18. Mattson MP, Camandola S. NF-κB in neuronal plasticity and neurodegenerative disorders. J Clin Invest. 2001;107(3):247-254.
19. Kaltschmidt B, Kaltschmidt C. NF-κB in the nervous system. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol. 2009;1(3):a001271.
20. Heneka MT, Kummer MP, Stutz A, et al. NLRP3 is activated in Alzheimer's disease and contributes to pathology in APP/PS1 mice. Nature. 2013;493(7434):674-678.
21. Swanson KV, Deng M, Ting JP. The NLRP3 inflammasome: molecular activation and regulation to therapeutics. Nat Rev Immunol. 2019;19(8):477-489.
22. Anderson AC. The process of structure-based drug design. Chem Biol. 2003;10(9):787-797.
23. Meng XY, Zhang HX, Mezei M, Cui M. Molecular docking: a powerful approach for structure-based drug discovery. Curr Comput Aided Drug Des. 2011;7(2):146-157.
24. Pinzi L, Rastelli G. Molecular docking: shifting paradigms in drug discovery. Int J Mol Sci. 2019;20(18):4331.
25. Ferreira LG, Dos Santos RN, Oliva G, Andricopulo AD. Molecular docking and structure-based drug design strategies. Molecules. 2015;20(7):13384-13421.
26. Güner OF. Pharmacophore perception, development, and use in drug design. La Jolla, CA: International University Line; 2000.
27. Yang SY. Pharmacophore modeling and applications in drug discovery: challenges and recent advances. Drug Discov Today. 2010;15(11-12):444-450.
28. Cherkasov A, Muratov EN, Fourches D, et al. QSAR modeling: where have you been? Where are you going to? J Med Chem. 2014;57(12):4977-5010.
29. Hansch C, Leo A. Exploring QSAR: fundamentals and applications in chemistry and biology. Washington, DC: American Chemical Society; 1995.
30. Ghasemi JB, Safavi-Sohi R, Barbosa EG. 3D-QSAR study of anti-inflammatory activity of dihydropyrimidines by CoMFA and CoMSIA. Med Chem Res. 2012;21:2788-2797.
31. Willett P. Similarity searching using 2D structural fingerprints. Methods Mol Biol. 2011;672:133-158.
32. Maggiora G, Vogt M, Stumpfe D, Bajorath J. Molecular similarity in medicinal chemistry. J Med Chem. 2014;57(8):3186-3204.
33. Chen H, Engkvist O, Wang Y, Olivecrona M, Blaschke T. The rise of deep learning in drug discovery. Drug Discov Today. 2018;23(6):1241-1250.
34. Wu Z, Ramsundar B, Feinberg EN, et al. MoleculeNet: a benchmark for molecular machine learning. Chem Sci. 2018;9(2):513-530.
35. Schenone M, Dančík V, Wagner BK, Clemons PA. Target identification and mechanism of action in chemical biology and drug discovery. Nat Chem Biol. 2013;9(4):232-240.
36. Hopkins AL. Network pharmacology: the next paradigm in drug discovery. Nat Chem Biol. 2008;4(11):682-690.
37. Barabási AL, Gulbahce N, Loscalzo J. Network medicine: a network-based approach to human disease. Nat Rev Genet. 2011;12(1):56-68.
38. Yildirim MA, Goh KI, Cusick ME, Barabási AL, Vidal M. Drug-target network. Nat Biotechnol. 2007;25(10):1119-1126.

39. Khatri P, Sirota M, Butte AJ. Ten years of pathway analysis: current approaches and outstanding challenges. PLoS Comput Biol. 2012;8(2):e1002375.
40. Kanehisa M, Goto S. KEGG: kyoto encyclopedia of genes and genomes. Nucleic Acids Res. 2000;28(1):27-30.
41. Keller TH, Pichota A, Yin Z. A practical view of 'druggability'. Curr Opin Chem Biol. 2006;10(4):357-361.
42. Le Guilloux V, Schmidtke P, Tuffery P. Fpocket: an open source platform for ligand pocket detection. BMC Bioinformatics. 2009;10:168.
43. Hajduk PJ, Huth JR, Fesik SW. Druggability indices for protein targets derived from NMR-based screening data. J Med Chem. 2005;48(7):2518-2525.
44. Hopkins AL, Groom CR. The druggable genome. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2002;1(9):727-730.
45. Blobaum AL, Marnett LJ. Structural and functional basis of cyclooxygenase inhibition. J Med Chem. 2007;50(7):1425-1441.
46. Kalgutkar AS, Crews BC, Rowlinson SW, et al. Biochemically based design of cyclooxygenase-2 (COX-2) inhibitors: facile conversion of nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs to potent and highly selective COX-2 inhibitors. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2000;97(2):925-930.
47. Chen L, Wang Y, Zhang Q, et al. Design and synthesis of novel benzothiazole derivatives as selective COX-2 inhibitors for neuroprotection. J Med Chem. 2020;63(15):8471-8485.
48. Singh B, Kumar A, Malik SK, et al. Synthesis and evaluation of benzothiazole analogs as COX-2 selective inhibitors for the treatment of inflammation and pain. Eur J Med Chem. 2021;209:112907.
49. Swanson KV, Deng M, Ting JP. The NLRP3 inflammasome: molecular activation and regulation to therapeutics. Nat Rev Immunol. 2019;19(8):477-489.
50. Zahid A, Li B, Kombe AJK, Jin T, Tao J. Pharmacological inhibitors of the NLRP3 inflammasome. Front Immunol. 2019;10:2538.
51. Kumar S, Sharma B, Mehra V, et al. In silico identification and experimental validation of natural product inhibitors of NLRP3 inflammasome. J Biomol Struct Dyn. 2021;39(14):5235-5248.
52. Zhang Y, Liu X, Bai J, et al. Structure activity relationship and molecular docking studies on NLRP3 inflammasome inhibitors. J Med Chem. 2017;60(20):8466-8476.
53. Morphy R, Rankovic Z. Designed multiple ligands. An emerging drug discovery paradigm. J Med Chem. 2005;48(21):6523-6543.
54. Cavalli A, Bolognesi ML, Minarini A, et al. Multi-target-directed ligands to combat neurodegenerative diseases. J Med Chem. 2008;51(3):347-372.
55. Rosini M, Simoni E, Bartolini M, et al. Inhibition of acetylcholinesterase, beta-amyloid aggregation, and NMDA receptors in Alzheimer's disease: a promising direction for the multi-target-directed ligands gold rush. J Med Chem. 2014;57(6):2821-2831.
56. Singh M, Kaur M, Kukreja H, et al. Acetylcholinesterase inhibitors as Alzheimer therapy: from nerve toxins to neuroprotection. Eur J Med Chem. 2013;70:165-188.
57. Pammolli F, Magazzini L, Riccaboni M. The productivity crisis in pharmaceutical R&D. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2011;10(6):428-438.
58. Henn A, Lund S, Hedtjärn M, et al. The suitability of BV2 cells as alternative model system for primary microglia cultures or for animal experiments examining brain inflammation. ALTEX. 2009;26(2):83-94.
59. Lull ME, Block ML. Microglial activation and chronic neurodegeneration. Neurotherapeutics. 2010;7(4):354-365.
60. Xie HR, Hu LS, Li GY. SH-SY5Y human neuroblastoma cell line: in vitro cell model of dopaminergic neurons in Parkinson's disease. Chin Med J (Engl). 2010;123(8):1086-1092.

61. Cheung YT, Lau WK, Yu MS, et al. Effects of all-trans-retinoic acid on human SH-SY5Y neuroblastoma as in vitro model in neurotoxicity research. Neurotoxicology. 2009;30(1):127-135.
62. Helms HC, Abbott NJ, Burek M, et al. In vitro models of the blood-brain barrier: an overview of commonly used brain endothelial cell culture models and guidelines for their use. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab. 2016;36(5):862-890.
63. Appelt-Menzel A, Cubukova A, Günther K, et al. Establishment of a human blood-brain barrier co-culture model with brain pericytes and endothelial cells. J Vis Exp. 2017;(129):55756.
64. Gähwiler BH, Capogna M, Debanne D, McKinney RA, Thompson SM. Organotypic slice cultures: a technique has come of age. Trends Neurosci. 1997;20(10):471-477.
65. Cho S, Wood A, Bowlby MR. Brain slices as models for neurodegenerative disease and screening platforms to identify novel therapeutics. Curr Neuropharmacol. 2007;5(1):19-33.
66. McGrath JC, Lilley E. Implementing guidelines on reporting research using animals (ARRIVE etc.): new requirements for publication in BJP. Br J Pharmacol. 2015;172(13):3189-3193.
67. Qin L, Wu X, Block ML, et al. Systemic LPS causes chronic neuroinflammation and progressive neurodegeneration. Glia. 2007;55(5):453-462.
68. Dawson TM, Golde TE, Lagier-Tourenne C. Animal models of neurodegenerative diseases. Nat Neurosci. 2018;21(10):1370-1379.
69. Jucker M. The benefits and limitations of animal models for translational research in neurodegenerative diseases. Nat Med. 2010;16(11):1210-1214.
70. van de Waterbeemd H, Gifford E. ADMET in silico modelling: towards prediction paradise? Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2003;2(3):192-204.
71. Shen J, Cheng F, Xu Y, Li W, Tang Y. Estimation of ADME properties with substructure pattern recognition. J Chem Inf Model. 2010;50(6):1034-1041.
72. Geldenhuys WJ, Mohammad AS, Adkins CE, Lockman PR. Molecular determinants of blood-brain barrier permeation. Ther Deliv. 2015;6(8):961-971.
73. Hitchcock SA, Pennington LD. Structure-brain exposure relationships. J Med Chem. 2006;49(26):7559-7583.
74. Kirchmair J, Williamson MJ, Tyzack JD, et al. Computational prediction of metabolism: sites, products, SAR, P450 enzyme dynamics, and mechanisms. J Chem Inf Model. 2012;52(3):617-648.
75. Veith H, Southall N, Huang R, et al. Comprehensive characterization of cytochrome P450 isozyme selectivity across chemical libraries. Nat Biotechnol. 2009;27(11):1050-1055.
76. Valerio LG Jr. In silico toxicology for the pharmaceutical sciences. Toxicol Appl Pharmacol. 2009;241(3):356-370.
77. Bhhatarai B, Gramatica P, Ghosh S, et al. QSAR modeling of Ames mutagenicity of aromatic amines: a critical review. SAR QSAR Environ Res. 2011;22(5-6):583-618.
78. Lo YC, Rensi SE, Torng W, Altman RB. Machine learning in chemoinformatics and drug discovery. Drug Discov Today. 2018;23(8):1538-1546.
79. Zhavoronkov A, Ivanenkov YA, Aliper A, et al. Deep learning enables rapid identification of potent DDR1 kinase inhibitors. Nat Biotechnol. 2019;37(9):1038-1040.
80. Wu Z, Ramsundar B, Feinberg EN, et al. MoleculeNet: a benchmark for molecular machine learning. Chem Sci. 2018;9(2):513-530.
81. Gilmer J, Schoenholz SS, Riley PF, Vinyals O, Dahl GE. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. Proc Mach Learn Res. 2017;70:1263-1272.
82. Segler MH, Kogej T, Tyrchan C, Waller MP. Generating focused molecule libraries for drug discovery with recurrent neural networks. ACS Cent Sci. 2018;4(1):120-131.
83. Popova M, Isayev O, Tropsha A. Deep reinforcement learning for de novo drug design. Sci Adv. 2018;4(7):eaap7885.
84. Erlanson DA, Fesik SW, Hubbard RE, Jahnke W, Jhoti H. Twenty years on: the impact of fragments on drug discovery. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2016;15(9):605-619.

85. Murray CW, Rees DC. The rise of fragment-based drug discovery. Nat Chem. 2009;1(3):187-192.
86. Chen H, Zhou X, Wang A, et al. Fragment-based drug discovery toward modulators of the innate immune TLR4 receptor. J Med Chem. 2015;58(11):4749-4757.
87. Harner MJ, Frank AO, Fesik SW. Fragment-based drug discovery using NMR spectroscopy. J Biomol NMR. 2013;56(2):65-75.
88. Changeux JP, Christopoulos A. Allosteric modulation as a unifying mechanism for receptor function and regulation. Cell. 2016;166(5):1084-1102.
89. Nussinov R, Tsai CJ. Allostery in disease and in drug discovery. Cell. 2013;153(2):293-305.
90. Wenthur CJ, Gentry PR, Mathews TP, Lindsley CW. Drugs for allosteric sites on receptors. Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol. 2014;54:165-184.
91. Shoichet BK. Virtual screening of chemical libraries. Nature. 2004;432(7019):862-865.
92. Carlson HA, McCammon JA. Accommodating protein flexibility in computational drug design. Mol Pharmacol. 2000;57(2):213-218.
93. Amaro RE, Baudry J, Chodera J, et al. Ensemble docking in drug discovery. Biophys J. 2018;114(10):2271-2278.
94. Warren GL, Andrews CW, Capelli AM, et al. A critical assessment of docking programs and scoring functions. J Med Chem. 2006;49(20):5912-5931.
95. Liu J, Wang R. Classification of current scoring functions. J Chem Inf Model. 2015;55(3):475-482.
96. Scannell JW, Blanckley A, Boldon H, Warrington B. Diagnosing the decline in pharmaceutical R&D efficiency. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2012;11(3):191-200.
97. Kola I, Landis J. Can the pharmaceutical industry reduce attrition rates? Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2004;3(8):711-715.
98. Perrin S. Preclinical research: make mouse studies work. Nature. 2014;507(7493):423-425.
99. Seok J, Warren HS, Cuenca AG, et al. Genomic responses in mouse models poorly mimic human inflammatory diseases. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110(9):3507-3512.
100. Pardridge WM. The blood-brain barrier: bottleneck in brain drug development. NeuroRx. 2005;2(1):3-14.
101. Mensch J, Melis A, Mackie C, et al. Evaluation of various PAMPA models to identify the most discriminating method for the prediction of BBB permeability. Eur J Pharm Biopharm. 2010;74(3):495-502.
102. Zhao S, Iyengar R. Systems pharmacology: network analysis to identify multiscale mechanisms of drug action. Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol. 2012;52:505-521.
103. Hopkins AL. Network pharmacology: the next paradigm in drug discovery. Nat Chem Biol. 2008;4(11):682-690.
104. Reddy AS, Zhang S. Polypharmacology: drug discovery for the future. Expert Rev Clin Pharmacol. 2013;6(1):41-47.
105. Paolini GV, Shapland RH, van Hoorn WP, Mason JS, Hopkins AL. Global mapping of pharmacological space. Nat Biotechnol. 2006;24(7):805-815.
106. Schork NJ. Personalized medicine: time for one-person trials. Nature. 2015;520(7549):609-611.
107. Ashley EA. Towards precision medicine. Nat Rev Genet. 2016;17(9):507-522.
108. Fosgerau K, Hoffmann T. Peptide therapeutics: current status and future directions. Drug Discov Today. 2015;20(1):122-128.
109. Craik DJ, Fairlie DP, Liras S, Price D. The future of peptide-based drugs. Chem Biol Drug Des. 2013;81(1):136-147.
110. Marshall S, Madabushi R, Manolis E, et al. Model-informed drug development: current state and future directions. CPT Pharmacometrics Syst Pharmacol. 2019;8(11):758-767.

111. Milligan PA, Brown MJ, Marchant B, et al. Model-based drug development: a rational approach to efficiently accelerate drug development. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2013;93(6):502-514.
112. Viceconti M, Henney A, Morley-Fletcher E. In silico clinical trials: how computer simulation will transform the biomedical industry. Int J Clin Trials. 2016;3(2):37-46.
113. Eddershaw PJ, Beresford AP, Bayliss MK. ADME/PK as part of a rational approach to drug discovery. Drug Discov Today. 2000;5(9):409-414.
114. Fourches D, Muratov E, Tropsha A. Trust, but verify: on the importance of chemical structure curation in cheminformatics and QSAR modeling research. J Chem Inf Model. 2010;50(7):1189-1204.
115. Williams AJ, Harland L, Groth P, et al. Open PHACTS: semantic interoperability for drug discovery. Drug Discov Today. 2012;17(21-22):1188-1198.
116. Moffat JG, Vincent F, Lee JA, Eder J, Prunotto M. Opportunities and challenges in phenotypic drug discovery: an industry perspective. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2017;16(8):531-543.
117. Paul SM, Mytelka DS, Dunwiddie CT, et al. How to improve R&D productivity: the pharmaceutical industry's grand challenge. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2010;9(3):203-214.
118. Cummings JL, Morstorf T, Zhong K. Alzheimer's disease drug-development pipeline: few candidates, frequent failures. Alzheimers Res Ther. 2014;6(4):37.
119. Jia J, Zhu F, Ma X, et al. Mechanisms of drug combinations: interaction and network perspectives. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2009;8(2):111-128.