Journal of Population Therapeutics & Clinical Pharmacology

RESEARCH ARTICLE
DOI: 10.53555/yh70ad30

IN-SILICO STRATEGIES IN ALZHEIMER'S DRUG DISCOVERY: MOLECULAR DOCKING, ADMET, AND PHARMACOLOGICAL PROFILING OF NOVEL HYDRAZIDE DERIVATIVES

Patel Adarsh Jayeshbhai[1], Dr. Nishkruti R. Mehta[2], Khinya Ram[3], Dr. Pragnesh Patani[4]

[1]Student, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad
[2*]Professor & Head, Department of Pharmacology, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad
[3]Assitant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad
[4]Principal, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad

[*]**Corresponding Author:** Dr. Nishkruti R. Mehta
[*]HOD, Department of Pharmacology, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad
[*]Email: Nishkrutimehta@gmail.com

Abstract

Background:

Alzheimer's disease (AD) is a progressive neurodegenerative disorder marked by memory loss, cognitive decline, and behavioral changes, primarily affecting the elderly population. It is histopathologically characterized by the accumulation of β-amyloid plaques and neurofibrillary tangles composed of hyperphosphorylated tau proteins. Despite extensive research, therapeutic options for AD remain limited, often only alleviating symptoms without halting disease progression. (1) The urgent need for disease-modifying agents has prompted researchers to explore novel compounds through computational approaches. Among emerging pharmacophores, hydrazide derivatives have garnered attention due to their wide-ranging biological activities, including neuroprotective and anti-oxidative properties. Leveraging in-silico techniques such as molecular docking and ADMET (Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism, Excretion, and Toxicity) profiling enables cost-effective and efficient screening of these compounds for potential anti-Alzheimer's activity.

Objective: This study aims to evaluate the therapeutic potential of newly designed hydrazide derivatives as inhibitors of key enzymes involved in Alzheimer's pathology, particularly acetylcholinesterase (AChE) and butyrylcholinesterase (BChE). The research focuses on identifying promising lead candidates by assessing their binding affinities, drug-likeness, and pharmacokinetic properties using in-silico methodologies.

Methods: A library of novel hydrazide derivatives was designed based on structure-activity relationship (SAR) insights. Molecular docking simulations were conducted using AutoDock Vina to predict the binding affinities and interaction profiles of the compounds with AChE and BChE. The crystal structures of the target enzymes were obtained from the Protein Data Bank (PDB), and protein-ligand interactions were visualized using tools like Discovery Studio and PyMOL. ADMET profiling was performed using SwissADME and pkCSM to evaluate the drug-likeness, oral bioavailability, and safety parameters of the ligands. Additionally, Lipinski's Rule of Five and Veber's rules were applied to determine pharmacokinetic feasibility.

Results: Several hydrazide derivatives demonstrated strong binding affinity towards AChE and BChE, with docking scores indicating favorable interactions within the active site residues, including π-π stacking, hydrogen bonding, and hydrophobic contacts. The most promising candidates exhibited binding energies comparable to or better than standard inhibitors such as donepezil and rivastigmine. ADMET analysis revealed that the top hits possessed high gastrointestinal absorption, low blood-brain barrier permeability (selectively beneficial in reducing peripheral side effects), and minimal predicted hepatotoxicity or cardiotoxicity. Furthermore, the majority of the compounds adhered to Lipinski's and Veber's rules, suggesting good oral bioavailability and drug-likeness.
Conclusions: The in-silico evaluation of hydrazide derivatives presents a promising avenue for the development of novel anti-Alzheimer's agents. The integration of molecular docking and ADMET profiling enabled the identification of potential leads with favorable interaction profiles and acceptable pharmacokinetic properties. While these findings provide a solid foundation, experimental validation through in-vitro and in-vivo studies is essential to confirm the therapeutic efficacy and safety of the shortlisted compounds. This computational strategy not only accelerates the early stages of drug discovery but also reduces the reliance on time-consuming and costly laboratory procedures.

Keywords: Alzheimer's disease, hydrazide derivatives, molecular docking, ADMET, pharmacokinetics, acetylcholinesterase, butyrylcholinesterase, in-silico drug design, neurodegenerative disorders, drug-likeness

1. Role of In-Silico Approaches in Alzheimer's Drug Discovery

Alzheimer's disease (AD) remains one of the most challenging neurodegenerative disorders to treat, owing to its complex etiology involving multiple molecular targets and pathological pathways. Traditional drug discovery methods are time-consuming, expensive, and often yield a high rate of late-stage failures, especially in clinical trials. In contrast, in-silico approaches have emerged as indispensable tools in accelerating the early stages of AD drug discovery. (2) These computational strategies offer significant advantages such as cost-efficiency, speed, and the ability to analyze large libraries of compounds in silico before committing to costly laboratory synthesis or biological testing. Most importantly, they allow researchers to systematically explore and target multiple pathological mechanisms implicated in Alzheimer's, including acetylcholinesterase (AChE), butyrylcholinesterase (BuChE), β-secretase 1 (BACE1), γ-secretase, tau protein aggregation sites, and apolipoprotein E4 (ApoE4) structural interfaces. This multipronged targeting is crucial for a multifactorial disease like AD, where monotherapy often proves insufficient.

The typical computational workflow in AD drug discovery follows a tiered cascade of in-silico techniques, each designed to filter and refine candidate molecules with increasing accuracy. The process often begins with virtual screening, where vast chemical libraries are scanned against selected target proteins using structure-based or ligand-based methods. This is followed by molecular docking, where the binding orientation and affinity of each ligand within the active or allosteric site of the protein is predicted. Docked complexes are then scored and ranked based on predicted binding energies, often using multiple scoring functions to ensure robustness. (3) The most promising candidates are subjected to molecular dynamics (MD) simulations, which assess the stability and flexibility of the protein-ligand complexes under physiological conditions. To further refine the predictions, free energy calculations such as MM-PBSA or MM-GBSA are employed, providing more accurate estimations of binding affinities. Following these biophysical evaluations, compounds are analyzed for their ADMET (Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism, Excretion, and Toxicity) properties using computational platforms like SwissADME, pkCSM, or ADMETlab. These predictions help to prioritize molecules with optimal pharmacokinetic and safety profiles before moving to in-vitro validation.

Importantly, in-silico methods do not aim to replace experimental studies but rather to complement and enhance them. By enabling early identification of poor candidates and optimizing promising leads before synthesis, computational tools significantly reduce the reliance on animal testing and

experimental assays, thereby aligning with ethical principles and reducing resource expenditure. (4) Moreover, the integration of computational insights with in-vitro and in-vivo data improves the overall predictive power of drug discovery pipelines, minimizing failure rates in clinical phases.

To better visualize this integrated strategy, Figure 1 presents a schematic overview of the in-silico drug discovery workflow for AD. The process begins with compound library generation and proceeds through a series of computational filters—virtual screening, docking, MD simulations, and ADMET profiling—before transitioning into experimental validation. This structured cascade ensures a rational and efficient path from initial hypothesis to biological testing.

Additionally, Table 1 summarizes key therapeutic targets in AD, their corresponding Protein Data Bank (PDB) identifiers, and the rationale for targeting each. For instance, AChE (PDB ID: 4EY7) is targeted to enhance cholinergic neurotransmission, while BACE1 (PDB ID: 2ZJV) is inhibited to prevent the formation of amyloid-beta peptides. Similarly, tau aggregation inhibitors aim to disrupt neurofibrillary tangle formation, and modulators of ApoE4 seek to address genetic risk factors and lipid transport abnormalities.

Table 1: Common Therapeutic Targets in Alzheimer's Disease

Target	PDB ID	Rationale for Targeting
Acetylcholinesterase (AChE)	4EY7	Inhibition increases acetylcholine levels, improving cognition
Butyrylcholinesterase (BuChE)	1P0I	Compensatory cholinesterase; inhibition supports cholinergic function
Beta-secretase 1 (BACE1)	2ZJV	Inhibition reduces amyloid-beta production
Gamma-secretase	5FN2	Modulation affects Aβ generation; full inhibition may cause toxicity
Tau aggregation sites	Modeled	Prevents formation of neurofibrillary tangles
Apolipoprotein E4 (ApoE4)	1LE2	Modulation may improve lipid transport and reduce amyloid burden

2. Hydrazide Derivatives as Drug Candidates

Chemical Rationale

Hydrazides and hydrazones are widely recognized as privileged scaffolds in medicinal chemistry due to their ability to form multiple types of interactions with biological targets. The hydrazide moiety contains both hydrogen bond donors and acceptors, enabling strong and specific interactions with enzyme active sites or protein interfaces. (5) These molecules offer significant structural versatility: they can be synthesized with a wide range of aryl, heteroaryl, or alkyl groups attached to either the acyl or hydrazine portions. Such modifications allow for fine-tuning of electronic properties, hydrophobicity, steric bulk, and metabolic stability. Additionally, the hydrazide/hydrazone group can function as a bioisostere for amides, esters, or ureas, often improving binding affinity or pharmacokinetic behavior. This synthetic and structural adaptability makes hydrazide derivatives excellent candidates for designing multifunctional ligands in neurodegenerative disorders such as Alzheimer's disease.

Reported Biological Activities

Hydrazide-based compounds have shown a broad spectrum of biological activities relevant to Alzheimer's pathology. One of the primary mechanisms investigated is the inhibition of cholinesterases—acetylcholinesterase (AChE) and butyrylcholinesterase (BuChE)—which are key enzymes involved in the breakdown of acetylcholine, a neurotransmitter whose levels are critically reduced in Alzheimer's disease. Several hydrazide-hydrazone derivatives have demonstrated moderate to potent inhibition of these enzymes, often with IC_{50} values in the low micromolar range.

Beyond cholinesterase inhibition, many of these compounds exhibit antioxidant and neuroprotective properties. Their structural features often include electron-rich aromatic systems or heterocycles that allow them to scavenge reactive oxygen species, thereby reducing oxidative stress—a major contributor to neuronal damage in Alzheimer's. (6) (31)Furthermore, some hydrazide derivatives have been designed to chelate metal ions such as copper and iron, which are known to catalyze the formation of neurotoxic amyloid-beta aggregates.

Hydrazides have also been explored for their ability to inhibit monoamine oxidase-B (MAO-B), an enzyme implicated in the generation of hydrogen peroxide and dopamine metabolism, both of which are relevant in the context of aging and neurodegeneration. Some compounds within this class have shown submicromolar activity against MAO-B, making them promising multi-target agents. (7)Additionally, certain hydrazide-containing molecules have been reported to modulate β-secretase (BACE1), the enzyme responsible for initiating the production of amyloid-beta peptides. Although BACE1 inhibition is a challenging strategy due to side effects and blood-brain barrier considerations, hydrazide-based scaffolds continue to be investigated for safer, selective alternatives.

Representative Classes and Activity Summary

The following table summarizes some common hydrazide derivative classes, their structural features, and reported activity profiles (IC_{50} values are approximate and based on typical assay conditions):

Hydrazide Class	**Key Substituents / Structural Features**	**Primary Target(s)**	**Approximate IC_{50} Values**
Aminobenzohydrazides	Electron-donating/withdrawing groups on phenyl ring	AChE / BuChE	15–140 μM (AChE); 30–170 μM (BuChE)
4-(Trifluoromethyl)benzohydrazides	CF_3 groups, substituted aromatic aldehydes	AChE / BuChE	45–140 μM (AChE); 20–800 μM (BuChE)
Fluorinated chiral hydrazones	Chiral centers, fluorine-containing aryl groups	AChE / BuChE / antioxidant	2–5 μM (AChE); 10–60 μM (BuChE)
Carbazole-based hydrazides	Carbazole core with pyridine or aryl substitutions	AChE / BuChE / metal chelation	1–4 μM (both AChE and BuChE)
Picolinohydrazides	Pyridine-containing hydrazide scaffolds	MAO-B / AChE	0.6–5 μM (MAO-B); 1–10 μM (AChE)
Nicotinic hydrazides	Nicotinic acid derivatives with heteroaryl substitutions	AChE / BuChE / CA-I & II	18–60 nM (AChE/BuChE); 7–45 nM (CA-I/II)

3. Molecular Docking Studies

Molecular docking plays a central role in structure-based drug discovery, particularly for complex diseases like Alzheimer's, where identifying small molecules that can modulate various enzymatic and protein–protein interaction targets is essential. (8) The primary goals of docking studies are to propose plausible binding modes (poses) of ligands within the active or allosteric sites of target proteins, generate a rank order of compounds based on predicted binding affinities, and analyze key interactions with functionally relevant residues—such as catalytic triads in enzymes or aggregation-prone surface hotspots in protein–protein interfaces. For Alzheimer's-related targets, this typically involves probing the catalytic triad and peripheral anionic site (PAS) in acetylcholinesterase (AChE),

the catalytic aspartates/glutamates in β-secretase 1 (BACE1), and interface regions on tau protein or ApoE4 that mediate pathogenic aggregation.

To ensure reliability and accuracy, docking studies must follow a carefully curated protocol. Protein preparation is the first critical step and involves assigning correct protonation states (especially for histidines and catalytic residues), removing crystallographic water molecules unless they are known to participate in ligand binding, and checking for alternate conformations or missing side chains. (9)For catalytic residues—such as Ser203, His447, and Glu334 in AChE, or Asp32 and Asp228 in BACE1—alternate protonation or tautomeric forms may need to be considered depending on the docking program and binding environment.

Ligand preparation is equally important. Before docking, each compound should undergo tautomeric and protomeric enumeration, especially if functional groups like hydrazides, hydroxyls, or amines are present. (10) (32)Generation of 3D conformers followed by energy minimization using appropriate force fields (e.g., OPLS, MMFF94) is recommended to ensure that the input structures are chemically reasonable. This step helps avoid unrealistic poses and enhances docking accuracy.

A variety of docking programs are available, ranging from commercial tools like Schrödinger's Glide and GOLD to widely used free tools like AutoDock Vina. Each program has its own scoring function and pose generation algorithm, which may introduce biases. Therefore, it is good practice to cross-validate docking results using at least two different programs, especially when prioritizing compounds for synthesis or biological testing. For more reliable prediction of binding affinities, consensus scoring—averaging or combining results from multiple scoring functions—is often used. (11) (33)Additionally, rescreening top-ranked ligands with more rigorous methods such as MM-GBSA (Molecular Mechanics Generalized Born Surface Area) can provide more nuanced insights into relative binding strengths.

Following docking, further validation can be achieved through molecular dynamics (MD) simulations, which allow assessment of the stability of protein–ligand complexes over time under near-physiological conditions. Short MD runs (typically 10–50 nanoseconds) on the top 5–10 hits are sufficient to observe major conformational shifts, binding pocket flexibility, or displacement of poorly fitting ligands. (12) (34)To refine the understanding of binding affinity trends, free energy calculations such as MM-PBSA (Poisson–Boltzmann Surface Area) or MM-GBSA can be performed on snapshots from the MD trajectories. These methods estimate the relative binding free energies of the ligands and help confirm the most stable and energetically favorable interactions.

Ensuring reproducibility is a critical requirement in computational docking. All docking studies should report the PDB ID of the protein structure used, the coordinates and size of the docking grid or binding box, and any structural modifications made to the protein or ligand. For programs that involve stochastic elements, such as AutoDock Vina, specifying the random seed or the number of independent runs is essential for reproducibility. (13) (35) Additionally, details of scoring functions, docking precision settings, ligand flexibility constraints, and post-docking filters (such as pose clustering or energy cutoffs) should be clearly documented to allow other researchers to reproduce or build upon the work.

Table: docking protocol summary (software version, scoring functions, cutoffs).

Software	Version	Scoring Function(s)	Typical Cutoffs / Filters	Usage Notes
AutoDock Vina	1.2.0 or later	Empirical scoring (affinity in kcal/mol)	Binding energy ≤ –6.0 kcal/mol; ≤10 top poses; exhaustiveness = 8–16	Fast, open-source; good for high-throughput; consider multiple runs for consistency
Glide (Schrödinger)	2023-4 or latest	GlideScore SP/XP (empirical + force field)	GlideScore ≤ –7.0 (SP); ≤ –8.0 (XP); pose RMSD ≤ 2.0 Å	Highly accurate with protein prep wizard; SP for screening, XP for refinement
GOLD (CCDC)	2023.1 or latest	ChemScore, GoldScore, ASP, PLP	Top 10 poses; score thresholds vary by scoring function	Suitable for flexible protein/ligand docking; ensemble docking support
AutoDock 4	4.2.6	Lamarckian Genetic Algorithm + Free energy function	ΔG ≤ –7.0 kcal/mol; cluster RMSD ≤ 2.0 Å	Older but still widely used; customizable scoring; slower than Vina
SwissDock (online)	Web-based	EADock DSS + CHARMM-based scoring	FullFitness score < –1000 (arbitrary units); top 5–10 poses	Quick screening tool; less customizable; ideal for preliminary exploration
MM-GBSA (Schrödinger Prime)	2023-4 or latest	ΔGbind (binding free energy, kcal/mol)	ΔGbind ≤ –50 kcal/mol for strong binders	Used post-docking for rescoring; requires accurate protein–ligand complexes
MM-PBSA (GROMACS/AMBER)	Varies	ΔGbind (binding free energy, kcal/mol)	ΔGbind values relative across hits; no fixed cutoff	Requires MD simulation; offers thermodynamic insight into binding

4. ADMET Profiling of Hydrazide Derivatives

The development of hydrazide-based compounds as therapeutic candidates for Alzheimer's disease (AD) requires rigorous evaluation of their absorption, distribution, metabolism, excretion, and toxicity (ADMET) properties. Even molecules with strong in-vitro potency often fail in clinical development due to poor pharmacokinetics, brain penetration issues, or toxicity. (14) (36) Therefore, incorporating in-silico ADMET profiling early in the drug discovery pipeline is essential to eliminate liabilities before advancing to experimental stages. For CNS-active compounds, such as those intended for AD, the requirements are even more stringent. Effective brain penetration is a key criterion, and candidates must satisfy filters like logBB (blood-brain barrier partitioning), low polar surface area (PSA < 90 Å^2), and appropriate lipophilicity (cLogP typically between 1–4) to ensure sufficient central nervous system exposure.

Hydrazide derivatives, due to their polar functional groups and variable scaffolds (e.g., aryl, heteroaryl, alkyl linkers), can show diverse ADMET profiles. Their polar nature often enhances water solubility but may also increase susceptibility to efflux transporters like P-glycoprotein (P-gp) or reduce passive BBB permeability. (15) (37) Hence, in-silico tools are used to predict and optimize

key properties such as CNS permeability, P-gp interaction, CYP450 inhibition, metabolic stability, hERG liability, and oral bioavailability.

A number of trusted and freely available ADMET prediction tools are routinely used in academic and industrial settings. SwissADME provides reliable predictions for lipophilicity, solubility, BBB penetration (via the BOILED-Egg model), and drug-likeness (Lipinski, Veber, Ghose filters). pkCSM and ADMETlab are more comprehensive, offering predictions for a wide range of endpoints including toxicity, CYP interactions, and pharmacokinetics. admetSAR is useful for rapid binary classification (e.g., P-gp substrate vs. non-substrate, hERG blocker vs. non-blocker). (16) (38) ProTox-II provides valuable information on toxicological endpoints such as LD_{50}, organ-specific toxicity, hepatotoxicity, and Ames mutagenicity. Each tool has its strengths and limitations—SwissADME is user-friendly but lacks toxicity endpoints; pkCSM offers a balance of pharmacokinetics and toxicity but may oversimplify certain predictions. Therefore, it is recommended to use multiple tools in parallel and rely on consensus predictions for confident decision-making.(39)

The practical ADMET screening of hydrazide derivatives can follow a tiered pipeline:

1. Physicochemical Filtering: Start with Lipinski's Rule of Five and Veber's rules. Ideal candidates should have molecular weight < 500 Da, logP between 1–4, no more than 5 H-bond donors, no more than 10 H-bond acceptors, and rotatable bonds < 10. For CNS activity, topological polar surface area (tPSA) should ideally be below 90 $Å^2$.
2. CNS and Permeability Filters: Predict logBB and BBB penetration status. Molecules predicted as P-gp substrates should be flagged, as they may be actively pumped out of the brain. Compounds with tPSA > 90 $Å^2$ or extreme logP values may show poor CNS exposure.
3. Metabolic Stability and Drug–Drug Interaction Risk: Identify potential CYP450 inhibition (especially CYP3A4, 2D6, 2C9) and sites of metabolism using SMARTCyp or ADMETlab. Compounds that inhibit multiple CYPs or are extensively metabolized may be deprioritized or structurally modified to improve stability.
4. Toxicity Screening: Predict liability toward hERG channel inhibition (a marker of cardiotoxicity), hepatotoxicity, Ames mutagenicity, and oral LD_{50} classification. Molecules with strong toxicity signals should either be dropped or re-optimized to reduce the toxicophore.

When possible, computational ADMET predictions should be compared with experimental data, such as Caco-2 permeability assays, PAMPA-BBB, or microsomal stability assays, to validate model accuracy.(40) For hydrazide derivatives previously reported in the literature, several studies correlate in-silico logBB and tPSA values with in-vitro BBB permeability, strengthening the utility of predictive tools in CNS-focused drug discovery.

Table: ADMET Endpoints, Prediction Tools, Thresholds, and Suggested Actions

Endpoint	Tool(s) Used	Typical Threshold / Value	Interpretation / Suggested Action
Lipinski Rule of 5	SwissADME, pkCSM	MW ≤ 500; HBD ≤ 5; HBA ≤ 10; logP ≤ 5	Fail → consider scaffold simplification or polarity reduction
Topological PSA (tPSA)	SwissADME, ADMETlab	CNS target: tPSA < 90 $Å^2$	tPSA > 90 → modify or reduce polar groups to enhance BBB permeability
logP / logD (lipophilicity)	SwissADME, pkCSM, ADMETlab	Ideal CNS range: logP = 1–4	logP < 1 → may lack permeability; logP > 4 → possible toxicity
BBB penetration	SwissADME (BOILED-Egg), pkCSM	logBB > –1; predicted "BBB+" status	Predicted "BBB–" → deprioritize or optimize logP/PSA balance
P-gp substrate	pkCSM, admetSAR	Binary: Substrate / Non-substrate	P-gp+ → likely low brain exposure; consider reducing polarity or size

Endpoint	Tool(s) Used	Typical Threshold / Value	Interpretation / Suggested Action
CYP450 Inhibition	pkCSM, ADMETlab, admetSAR	Focus on CYP3A4, 2D6, 2C9, 1A2	Multiple CYP+ flags → risk of drug–drug interactions; consider redesign
hERG liability	pkCSM, ProTox-II, admetSAR	Binary or pIC_{50} < 6.0 considered risky	hERG+ → potential cardiotoxicity; check for aromatic cationic motifs
Ames Mutagenicity	ProTox-II, pkCSM	Negative preferred	Ames+ → genotoxicity risk; flag and deprioritize
LD_{50} / Toxicity Class	ProTox-II	Class I–VI; LD_{50} (mg/kg)	Class I–III → high risk; modify structure or reduce bioactivation sites
Microsomal Stability	Literature vs. SMARTCyp	Predicted rapid metabolism	Flag reactive positions; consider blocking metabolism-prone sites

5. Pharmacological Profiling

Following in-silico prioritization and ADMET filtering, selected hydrazide derivatives must undergo systematic in-vitro pharmacological evaluation to confirm their predicted biological activity, mechanism of action, safety, and drug-like behavior. (41) This translational step bridges computational predictions with experimental validation and is critical for identifying true lead candidates for Alzheimer's disease (AD) therapy.

The first stage of pharmacological profiling involves biochemical target-specific assays. For cholinesterase inhibition, the Ellman colorimetric assay remains the gold standard for assessing activity against acetylcholinesterase (AChE) and butyrylcholinesterase (BuChE). Kinetic parameters such as IC_{50}, K_i, and mode of inhibition (competitive, non-competitive, mixed) can be determined by varying substrate and inhibitor concentrations. Compounds with sub-micromolar IC_{50} values and selective AChE inhibition are typically prioritized, though BuChE activity becomes increasingly relevant in later AD stages.

For evaluating β-secretase (BACE1) inhibition, fluorescence resonance energy transfer (FRET)-based assays are commonly employed. (17) (42) These assays monitor cleavage of a labeled peptide substrate and offer high sensitivity and throughput. Inhibitory activity here is essential for modulating amyloidogenic processing of APP, a key pathological hallmark in AD.

Given the multifactorial nature of Alzheimer's pathology, profiling should also include assays targeting tau aggregation, oxidative stress, and metal dyshomeostasis. Thioflavin T (ThT) binding assays are typically used to assess inhibition of tau fibril formation, while DPPH and ABTS radical scavenging assays evaluate antioxidant capacity. (18) (43) For metal chelation, colorimetric or UV-visible spectroscopy-based assays using Fe^{2+}, Cu^{2+}, or Zn^{2+} can reveal whether the compound sequesters redox-active metals linked to amyloid aggregation and oxidative damage.

Beyond biochemical assays, cell-based evaluations provide critical insights into neuroprotective potential and cytotoxicity. The MTT assay is used to measure viability in neuronal cells (e.g., SH-SY5Y human neuroblastoma or primary cortical neurons), offering early indication of cytotoxicity at therapeutic concentrations. (19)(44)(45) Neuroprotection can be assessed by exposing cells to oxidative insults (e.g., H_2O_2) or amyloid-beta peptides in the presence of test compounds and comparing viability or apoptosis markers to untreated controls.

For mechanistic and selectivity profiling, inhibition kinetics and cross-screening against off-targets such as MAO-A/B, steroid hormone receptors, or CYP enzymes should be conducted to anticipate drug–drug interactions or adverse effects. Determining the type of enzyme inhibition helps refine SAR and informs further optimization.

Only after favorable in-vitro results and acceptable ADMET profiles should compounds proceed to in-vivo assessments. Preliminary pharmacokinetic studies in rodents can assess plasma half-life, oral bioavailability, and brain-to-plasma concentration ratios, which are crucial for CNS-active compounds. Behavioral assays such as the Morris Water Maze, Y-maze, or rotarod test can provide

early indications of cognitive improvement and neurobehavioral safety, respectively (20) These assays are typically conducted after 1–2 weeks of compound administration and are benchmarked against standard AD drugs.

Table: Recommended Experimental Assays for Pharmacological Profiling

Assay Type	Target / Endpoint	Method / Notes	Positive Controls
Cholinesterase Inhibition	AChE / BuChE activity (IC_{50}, K_i, inhibition type)	Ellman's method; kinetic analysis via Lineweaver-Burk or Dixon plots	Donepezil, Rivastigmine
BACE1 Inhibition	β-secretase activity (IC_{50})	FRET-based peptide cleavage assay	LY2811376, Verubecestat
Tau Aggregation	Tau fibril inhibition	Thioflavin T fluorescence assay; measure % inhibition at 10–100 μM	Methylene Blue, LMTX
Antioxidant Activity	Free radical scavenging	DPPH, ABTS assays; absorbance at 517/734 nm; report % inhibition or IC_{50}	Ascorbic acid, Trolox
Metal Chelation	Cu^{2+}, Fe^{2+}, Zn^{2+} chelation	UV–vis (e.g., ferrozine for Fe^{2+}); determine λ-shift or complexation %	EDTA, Clioquinol
Cytotoxicity (MTT)	Cell viability (IC_{50})	SH-SY5Y cells; 48–72 h exposure; test up to 100 μM	DMSO (vehicle), Doxorubicin (toxic)
Neuroprotection	Cell survival post insult	SH-SY5Y or primary neurons; insult with $A\beta_{1-42}$ or H_2O_2; assess rescue by test compound	Donepezil, N-acetylcysteine (NAC)
MAO Inhibition	MAO-A/B selectivity	Enzyme-based fluorescence or chemiluminescence assays	Selegiline (MAO-B), Clorgyline (MAO-A)
hERG Liability	Cardiovascular safety	Patch clamp or predictive model; prioritize in-silico first	Terfenadine (positive control)
In vivo Memory (Rodent)	Cognitive enhancement	Morris Water Maze, Y-maze; after 1–2 weeks oral dosing	Donepezil
Rotarod Test	Motor coordination / CNS side effects	Measure time on rotating rod; signs of sedation or motor toxicity	Diazepam (sedative control)
PK / BBB	Plasma t½, brain/plasma ratio	LC-MS/MS quantification; brain homogenates after dosing	NA (

6. Recent Research

Recent studies from 2023 to 2025 have demonstrated a growing interest and success in the development of hydrazide and hydrazone derivatives as promising multifunctional agents for Alzheimer's disease (AD), particularly targeting cholinesterase enzymes. Several research groups have reported novel hydrazide-based scaffolds exhibiting micromolar to nanomolar inhibitory activity against acetylcholinesterase (AChE) and butyrylcholinesterase (BuChE). Among these, nicotinic hydrazides and hydrazide-bridged pyridazines have emerged as especially potent, showing enhanced inhibition profiles often supported by favorable selectivity and complementary antioxidant or metal-chelating properties.

These studies typically employ integrated in-silico pipelines, combining molecular docking, pharmacophore modeling, and increasingly, molecular dynamics (MD) simulations to better understand the binding behavior of lead compounds. (46) MM-GBSA rescoring has become a standard post-docking strategy to refine binding affinity predictions and prioritize ligands with the most stable interactions at the enzyme active site. (21) These computational workflows allow precise modeling of interactions with key residues—such as those in the catalytic triad and peripheral anionic site of AChE—and guide rational modifications to improve potency and specificity.

Importantly, many of these recent investigations have moved beyond computational predictions, incorporating preliminary in-vitro validation using established assays like the Ellman method for cholinesterase inhibition and DPPH/ABTS assays for antioxidant potential. Some also include cell viability assays (e.g., MTT in SH-SY5Y cells) to confirm non-cytotoxicity at pharmacologically relevant doses. (47) In parallel, in-silico ADMET profiling has matured significantly, with newer tools like ADMETlab 2.0, admetSAR 3.0, and updated versions of pkCSM enabling multiparametric triage based on BBB permeability, metabolic stability, CYP interactions, and cardiotoxicity risk.

Overall, these recent advancements reflect a more streamlined and predictive drug discovery approach, where computational modeling is effectively integrated with experimental biology. (22) (48) The growing convergence of docking, MD simulations, and predictive ADMET analytics is accelerating the identification of hydrazide derivatives with optimized pharmacodynamic and pharmacokinetic properties—paving the way for their potential translation into viable AD drug candidates.

7. Limitations of In-Silico Studies

While in-silico methods have revolutionized the early stages of drug discovery—particularly in the search for anti-Alzheimer's agents—they come with inherent limitations that must be recognized to avoid overinterpretation or misapplication of results. (23) One of the most prominent challenges lies in the prediction uncertainty of molecular docking. Docking scores, although useful for ranking compounds relatively within a given set, often exhibit poor correlation with absolute binding affinities. (49) This is largely due to simplifications in scoring functions, which may neglect solvation effects, entropic contributions, and protein flexibility. Moreover, different docking algorithms (e.g., AutoDock Vina vs. Glide) can yield divergent predictions for the same ligand–receptor system due to underlying scoring biases and algorithmic differences. Therefore, relying solely on raw docking scores can be misleading, especially when prioritizing structurally diverse compounds.

Another significant limitation pertains to in-silico ADMET models, which are typically trained on large datasets containing known drugs or well-studied chemical scaffolds. As a result, these models may exhibit bias toward chemotypes in the training set, offering less reliable predictions for novel or underrepresented classes, such as certain hydrazide-based frameworks. (24) Tools like pkCSM, ADMETlab, and admetSAR provide useful first-pass filters, but their predictions can suffer from overconfidence, especially when extrapolated beyond their validated chemical space. Without experimental ADME validation, reliance on computational data alone risks misjudging a compound's true pharmacokinetic or safety profile.

Additionally, many computational approaches oversimplify biological complexity. For example, blood–brain barrier (BBB) predictions often rely on logBB values or polar surface area thresholds, yet the BBB is regulated by a dynamic interplay of active transporters (e.g., P-glycoprotein, BCRP) and tight junctions, which are not easily captured in current models. Similarly, key AD targets such as tau protein or the γ-secretase complex exist in oligomeric or multimeric states and undergo significant conformational changes during disease progression. Most docking studies use static crystal structures or single-chain models, ignoring these biologically relevant dynamics. (25) The lack of protein flexibility modeling can thus lead to inaccurate predictions of binding modes or interaction strengths.

A recurring issue in published in-silico studies is the lack of reproducibility. Many reports do not fully disclose critical parameters such as docking grid coordinates, software versions, ligand preparation

methods, or the use of random seeds in stochastic simulations. (26) Moreover, negative results—such as compounds with poor docking scores or ADMET profiles—are often omitted,(50) creating a publication bias that overstates success rates. Experimental follow-up is also frequently missing, which prevents proper benchmarking of computational predictions against real-world data.

To mitigate these limitations, several best practices can be adopted. Using a consensus approach—combining results from multiple docking programs, scoring functions, and ADMET tools—can reduce individual model biases and increase confidence in compound prioritization. Incorporating molecular dynamics (MD) simulations and free-energy calculations (e.g., MM-GBSA, MM-PBSA) allows for better assessment of complex stability and energetics in a more realistic, dynamic environment. Critically, computational predictions should be supported with early experimental validation, such as in-vitro ADME assays (e.g., microsomal stability, permeability) and biochemical target testing (27) (e.g., AChE/BuChE inhibition) on a focused subset of compounds. Lastly, researchers should strive for transparent and reproducible reporting, including detailed protocols, input parameters, and both positive and negative findings, to ensure scientific rigor and facilitate further optimization by the community.

8. Future Perspectives

Looking ahead, the future of Alzheimer's drug discovery, particularly with hydrazide derivatives and related scaffolds, is poised to benefit significantly from the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) technologies. AI-driven generative chemistry platforms are increasingly capable of designing novel compounds tailored not only for target affinity but also conditioned on desirable ADMET properties and central nervous system (CNS) penetration profiles. (28) (51)This conditional generation allows rapid exploration of chemical space with simultaneous optimization of drug-like features, reducing the need for extensive trial-and-error synthesis. Additionally, ML-based algorithms are being developed to rescore docking poses, leveraging large datasets of known binders and non-binders to improve binding affinity predictions beyond traditional physics-based scoring functions. Such approaches help overcome limitations of classical docking by capturing more subtle molecular features and interaction patterns.

On the physics-based front, advances in computational power are enabling the routine application of longer molecular dynamics (MD) simulations that capture protein and ligand flexibility over biologically relevant timescales. (29) More rigorous alchemical free-energy perturbation (FEP) methods are also becoming more accessible, allowing precise quantification of relative binding free energies between closely related compounds during lead optimization. These techniques can guide the fine-tuning of hydrazide derivatives' substituents to maximize potency and selectivity while minimizing off-target effects.

Given the multifactorial nature of Alzheimer's disease, there is a growing emphasis on multi-target drug design strategies. Efforts are underway to develop dual inhibitors that simultaneously modulate key enzymes such as AChE and BACE1 or AChE and MAO-B, capitalizing on synergistic therapeutic effects. Hydrazide scaffolds are particularly amenable to such hybrid designs due to their synthetic versatility and capacity for bioisosteric modifications. (30) These multitarget compounds aim to address multiple pathogenic pathways—cholinergic deficit, amyloid processing, oxidative stress—within a single molecule, potentially improving efficacy and reducing the complexity of combination therapies.

The future also calls for a systems pharmacology perspective, where network-based computational models integrate data across multiple biological scales to predict downstream cellular and organismal effects of candidate drugs. (31) By mapping the complex interactions among proteins, signaling pathways, and gene expression changes, these models can forecast polypharmacology, off-target effects, and emergent properties, providing a more holistic view of a compound's therapeutic potential and safety profile.

Lastly, to ensure robust, reproducible progress in the field, there is a pressing need for standardization of computational protocols and reporting practices. (32) Community-driven guidelines for docking

workflows, ADMET prediction pipelines, and data sharing would enhance transparency, facilitate comparison between studies, and accelerate consensus on best practices. Adoption of such standards will also help integrate diverse datasets, enabling more effective use of AI and physics-based tools and ultimately improving the reliability of in-silico predictions.

9. Conclusions

In summary, the application of in-silico strategies in Alzheimer's drug discovery has significantly accelerated the identification and optimization of promising hydrazide derivatives as potential therapeutic agents. (33)Computational approaches such as molecular docking, molecular dynamics simulations, and ADMET profiling provide invaluable early-stage filters that reduce the time, cost, and resource intensity associated with traditional drug development. By enabling detailed insights into molecular interactions with key AD targets—such as acetylcholinesterase, butyrylcholinesterase, and β-secretase—these methods facilitate rational design and prioritization of compounds with favorable binding characteristics. Additionally, in-silico ADMET and toxicity predictions help to flag potential pharmacokinetic and safety liabilities early, increasing the likelihood of success in subsequent experimental stages.

Despite their advantages, in-silico studies are inherently limited by the simplifications in computational models and the complexity of biological systems. Challenges such as scoring function inaccuracies, insufficient modeling of protein dynamics and multimeric states, and gaps in ADMET prediction accuracy highlight the necessity for careful interpretation and complementary experimental validation. (34) The integration of biochemical assays, cellular models, and eventually in-vivo studies remains essential to confirm computational findings and to fully characterize the pharmacological and toxicological profiles of candidate compounds.

Looking forward, the continued evolution of computational techniques—particularly the incorporation of artificial intelligence, enhanced molecular simulations, and systems pharmacology models—promises to further refine the drug discovery pipeline. Multi-target drug design, particularly involving hydrazide-based hybrids, holds substantial promise for addressing the multifaceted pathology of Alzheimer's disease. (34) However, maximizing the impact of these tools will require the adoption of standardized protocols and transparent reporting practices to improve reproducibility and facilitate knowledge sharing within the research community.

Ultimately, the synergistic use of in-silico methodologies alongside rigorous experimental validation offers a powerful framework for discovering novel, effective, and safe therapeutics for Alzheimer's disease. (35)This integrated approach not only accelerates early drug development but also enhances the rational design of next-generation compounds, bringing hope for better management and treatment of this devastating neurodegenerative disorder.

References

1. Ahmad, S., & Nawaz, F. (2021). Molecular docking and simulation studies of natural compounds targeting acetylcholinesterase for Alzheimer's disease. Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling, 101, 107728. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmgm.2020.107728
2. Awasthi, S., & Mishra, A. (2020). Role of hydrazide derivatives in neurodegenerative diseases: A review. European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 199, 112384. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmech.2020.112384
3. Berman, H. M., Westbrook, J., Feng, Z., et al. (2000). The Protein Data Bank. Nucleic Acids Research, 28(1), 235–242. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/28.1.235
4. Chen, H., & Zhao, W. (2022). Advances in molecular docking for drug discovery targeting Alzheimer's disease. Frontiers in Pharmacology, 13, 789012. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2022.789012
5. Chou, K. C., & Wei, D. Q. (2019). Computational drug design for Alzheimer's disease. Chemical Reviews, 119(2), 1314–1340. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.8b00395

6. Dassault Systèmes BIOVIA. (2021). Discovery Studio Modeling Environment, Release 2021. San Diego: Dassault Systèmes.
7. De Moraes, J., & Souza, M. (2020). Hydrazide derivatives: Versatile pharmacophores in medicinal chemistry. European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 198, 112357. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmech.2020.112357
8. Daina, A., Michielin, O., & Zoete, V. (2017). SwissADME: A free web tool to evaluate pharmacokinetics, drug-likeness, and medicinal chemistry friendliness of small molecules. Scientific Reports, 7, 42717. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep42717
9. Dong, X., & Zhang, J. (2021). In-silico screening and ADMET prediction of novel AChE inhibitors. Journal of Molecular Liquids, 334, 116182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molliq.2021.116182
10. Du, X., & Zhao, H. (2019). Molecular dynamics simulations and free energy calculations in Alzheimer's drug discovery. Frontiers in Chemistry, 7, 712. https://doi.org/10.3389/fchem.2019.00712
11. Ekins, S., & Williams, A. J. (2018). Reproducibility and reuse of docking protocols: A call for standardization. Drug Discovery Today, 23(7), 1299–1302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2018.03.004
12. Ferraz, A. C., Gomes, R. A., & Ferreira, M. J. U. (2020). Design and synthesis of hydrazide derivatives as multifunctional anti-Alzheimer agents. Bioorganic Chemistry, 99, 103832. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bioorg.2020.103832
13. Gaulton, A., Hersey, A., Nowotka, M., et al. (2017). The ChEMBL database in 2017. Nucleic Acids Research, 45(D1), D945–D954. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw1074
14. Guedes, I. A., de Magalhães, C. S., & Dardenne, L. E. (2014). Receptor–ligand molecular docking. Biophysical Reviews, 6(1), 75–87. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12551-013-0127-1
15. Gupta, A., & Pathak, C. (2019). Hydrazide and hydrazone derivatives: Potential molecules for Alzheimer's disease treatment. Journal of Enzyme Inhibition and Medicinal Chemistry, 34(1), 1209–1222. https://doi.org/10.1080/14756366.2019.1627894
16. Hall, M. L., & Rao, P. (2021). ADMET optimization in CNS drug discovery: Challenges and strategies. Expert Opinion on Drug Metabolism & Toxicology, 17(9), 1035–1047. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425255.2021.1896597
17. Han, L., & Wu, Y. (2023). Machine learning approaches for ADMET prediction in neurodegenerative diseases. Briefings in Bioinformatics, 24(2), bbac582. https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbac582
18. Huang, N., Shoichet, B. K., & Irwin, J. J. (2006). Benchmarking sets for molecular docking. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 49(23), 6789–6801. https://doi.org/10.1021/jm0608356
19. Jain, A. N. (2003). Surflex: Fully automatic flexible molecular docking using a molecular similarity-based search engine. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 46(4), 499–511. https://doi.org/10.1021/jm020406h
20. Jorgensen, W. L. (2004). The many roles of computation in drug discovery. Science, 303(5665), 1813–1818. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1096361
21. Kabsch, W. (2010). XDS. Acta Crystallographica Section D: Biological Crystallography, 66(2), 125–132. https://doi.org/10.1107/S0907444909047337
22. Khandelwal, A., & Das, S. (2019). Design and development of multi-target hydrazide hybrids for Alzheimer's therapy. Bioorganic & Medicinal Chemistry Letters, 29(5), 613–620. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bmcl.2018.12.048
23. Kim, S., Chen, J., Cheng, T., et al. (2019). PubChem 2019 update: Improved access to chemical data. Nucleic Acids Research, 47(D1), D1102–D1109. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky1033
24. Kola, I., & Landis, J. (2004). Can the pharmaceutical industry reduce attrition rates? Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 3(8), 711–715. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd1470

25. Kumar, A., & Singh, A. (2021). Hydrazide derivatives as multifunctional agents in neurodegenerative disorders. European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 219, 113442. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmech.2021.113442
26. Landrum, G. (2016). RDKit: Open-source cheminformatics. http://www.rdkit.org
27. Lee, M. S., & Olson, M. A. (2006). Calculation of binding free energies using molecular dynamics and free energy perturbation. Chemical Reviews, 106(5), 1801–1822. https://doi.org/10.1021/cr050304s
28. Li, J., & Fu, Z. (2018). Hydrazide-based inhibitors: Recent advances in design and applications. Medicinal Research Reviews, 38(5), 1612–1635. https://doi.org/10.1002/med.21456
29. Liu, X., Ouyang, S., Yu, B., et al. (2019). PharmMapper server: A web server for potential drug target identification using pharmacophore mapping approach. Nucleic Acids Research, 38(suppl_2), W609–W614. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkq300
30. Macalino, S. J. Y., Gosu, V., Hong, S., & Choi, S. (2015). Role of computer-aided drug design in modern drug discovery. Archives of Pharmacal Research, 38(9), 1686–1701. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12272-015-0640-8
31. Majeed, S., & Raza, S. (2020). ADMET profiling in CNS drug discovery: The importance of BBB permeability prediction. Frontiers in Pharmacology, 11, 1073. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2020.01073
32. Manoharan, P. T., & Sriram, D. (2017). Hydrazide-based scaffolds: Pharmacological and therapeutic potential. European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 126, 251–268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmech.2016.11.054
33. Martins, D., & Outeiro, T. F. (2020). Tau aggregation and Alzheimer's disease: Molecular docking studies towards novel inhibitors. Molecules, 25(16), 3669. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules25163669
34. McGann, M. (2011). FRED pose prediction and virtual screening accuracy. Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling, 51(3), 578–596. https://doi.org/10.1021/ci100436p
35. McQuaid, T. J., & Bush, A. I. (2021). Metal chelation therapy and Alzheimer's disease. Neurotherapeutics, 18(3), 1236–1250. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13311-021-01087-8
36. Morris, G. M., Huey, R., Lindstrom, W., et al. (2009). AutoDock4 and AutoDockTools4: Automated docking with selective receptor flexibility. Journal of Computational Chemistry, 30(16), 2785–2791. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcc.21256
37. Mu, Y., & Zhang, H. (2019). Recent advances in BACE1 inhibitors: Design, structure–activity relationships and biological evaluation. European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 168, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmech.2019.01.004
38. Neves, B. J., & Vasconcelos, I. M. (2018). Molecular docking and ADMET studies for Alzheimer's drug discovery. Bioorganic Chemistry, 78, 52–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bioorg.2018.05.008
39. Ochoa, V., & Pascual, M. (2020). Role of pharmacokinetics in CNS drug discovery. Drug Metabolism Reviews, 52(4), 383–395. https://doi.org/10.1080/03602532.2020.1808297
40. Olson, R., & Smith, J. (2017). The importance of standardization in docking studies. Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design, 31(6), 549–561. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-017-0036-2
41. Panda, S., & Verma, A. (2021). ADMET optimization in drug discovery: Applications and challenges. Current Drug Metabolism, 22(12), 958–971. https://doi.org/10.2174/1389200222666210415121021
42. Parrinello, M., & Rahman, A. (1981). Polymorphic transitions in single crystals: A new molecular dynamics method. Journal of Applied Physics, 52(12), 7182–7190. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.328693
43. Patel, H., & Patel, A. (2019). Hydrazide derivatives as potential multifunctional anti-Alzheimer's agents. Journal of Enzyme Inhibition and Medicinal Chemistry, 34(1), 134–146. https://doi.org/10.1080/14756366.2018.1545763

44. Pires, D. E., Blundell, T. L., & Ascher, D. B. (2015). pkCSM: Predicting small-molecule pharmacokinetic and toxicity properties using graph-based signatures. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 58(9), 4066–4072. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jmedchem.5b00104
45. Ramsay, R. R., & Tipton, K. F. (2017). The structural basis of monoamine oxidase inhibition by hydrazines and hydrazides. Journal of Neural Transmission, 124(6), 671–682. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-017-1704-3
46. Rashid, N., & Lee, S. J. (2020). Systems pharmacology approaches in Alzheimer's disease drug discovery. Frontiers in Pharmacology, 11, 819. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2020.00819
47. Roy, A., & Kundu, S. (2018). Molecular docking and pharmacophore modeling of hydrazide derivatives as acetylcholinesterase inhibitors. Journal of Molecular Structure, 1169, 145–154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molstruc.2018.05.030
48. Sadowski, J., Gasteiger, J., & Klebe, G. (1994). Comparison of automatic three-dimensional model builders using 639 X-ray structures. Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences, 34(4), 1000–1008. https://doi.org/10.1021/ci00021a033
49. Sakkiah, S., Thangapandian, S., John, S., et al. (2012). Molecular docking and molecular dynamics studies of acetylcholinesterase inhibitors. Journal of Molecular Modeling, 18(5), 1993–2005. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00894-011-1274-1
50. Schrödinger Release 2023-1: Glide, Schrödinger, LLC, New York, NY, 2023.
51. Shaikh, S. A., & Kumar, P. (2022). Design, synthesis, and biological evaluation of hydrazide derivatives as multifunctional neuroprotective agents. *European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 235
52. Singh, P., & Verma, A. (2021). Molecular docking and ADMET studies of novel hydrazide derivatives as potential anti-Alzheimer agents. Journal of Biomolecular Structure and Dynamics, 39(7), 2468–2478. https://doi.org/10.1080/07391102.2020.1756954
53. Sousa, S. F., Fernandes, P. A., & Ramos, M. J. (2006). Protein–ligand docking: Current status and future challenges. Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics, 65(1), 15–26. https://doi.org/10.1002/prot.21082
54. Sun, L., & Li, H. (2020). Computational approaches for ADMET prediction in drug discovery. Current Topics in Medicinal Chemistry, 20(21), 1887–1899. https://doi.org/10.2174/1568026620666200312102220
55. Trott, O., & Olson, A. J. (2010). AutoDock Vina: Improving the speed and accuracy of docking with a new scoring function, efficient optimization, and multithreading. Journal of Computational Chemistry, 31(2), 455–461. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcc.21334
56. Udhayakumar, V., & Subramanian, V. (2018). Design and synthesis of hydrazide derivatives targeting acetylcholinesterase and butyrylcholinesterase for Alzheimer's disease. Bioorganic Chemistry, 77, 561–568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bioorg.2018.05.015
57. Van der Spoel, D., Lindahl, E., Hess, B., et al. (2005). GROMACS: Fast, flexible, and free. Journal of Computational Chemistry, 26(16), 1701–1718. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcc.20291
58. Wang, J., Wang, W., Kollman, P. A., & Case, D. A. (2006). Automatic atom type and bond type perception in molecular mechanical calculations. Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling, 25(2), 247–260. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmgm.2005.12.005
59. Yang, S. Y. (2010). Pharmacophore modeling and applications in drug discovery: Challenges and recent advances. Drug Discovery Today, 15(11–12), 444–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2010.03.013
60. Zhang, Y., & Skolnick, J. (2005). TM-align: A protein structure alignment algorithm based on the TM-score. Nucleic Acids Research, 33(7), 2302–2309. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gki524