MolScreen

Polo Lam, Ph.D. Senior Research Scientist MolSoft LLC

MolScreen

- Objective: Selfcontained prediction models for *Mol*Soft ICM *Screen*ing
- Currently: ~3280 models for ~1300 targets (continual expansion/ improvement)



Usage

- Compounds -> Which Targets?
- Target -> What compounds?
- Profiling: Multi-Targets vs Multi-Cpds
- Drug Re-purposing

2 Categories of Models in ICM

- ADMET (mcp), Property Models
 - CACO2, hERG, HALFLIFE, LD50, CYP, Tox21, etc
 - Properties like, Regression/Classification
- 5 Different types of Activity Models
 - ~3280 models against ~1300 targets
 - Fingerprint (kcc, eca), 3D Atomic Properties Field (dfz), 4D Docking/3D-QSAR (dpc), 3D APF/3D-QSAR (dfa)

ADMET (Miscellaneous Chemical Property mcp) Models

- Currently 38 models, mostly from PubChem data
- All validated by external test set (20% of data set aside)
- Regression Models, Mean external test set Q2: 0.7
 - CACO2, PAMPA permeability
 - LD50 (mg/kg), Half-life (hr)
- Classification Models, Median external test set AUC: 84%
 - hERG, PGPinhibitor, PGPsubstrate, PAINS
 - Cytochrome P450 1A2, 2C19, 2C9, 2D6, 3A4
 - 25 Tox21 Classifier, including Estrogen Agonist/Antagonist, Genotoxicity, Aromatase, etc

5 Types of Activity Models in ICM



Docking/3D-QSAR (dpc)

2D QSAR/Fingerprint (kcc)

- kcc: Kernel Chemical fingerprint Classification/Activity
- Currently: 999 mammalian models
- Training set: ChEMBL Ki, IC50, EC50, Drugbank assignment
- Median size: 245 ligands
- All Models' Validation: 20% of ChEMBL set aside as external set vs Approved drugs decoy
- Median external Q²: 0.52
- Median external AUC: 97%



2D QSAR/Fingerprint (kcc) Method

Training:

- Cluster Actives by fingerprint
- Add 40k ChEMBL actives decoy
- Kernel function to each cluster -> probability score (kcc/MolClass Score)
- Partial Least Square Regression for each cluster + Kernel Regression (kca/MolpKd Score)
- MolScore: combine MolpKd and MolSimilarity to known binders



Make Custom kcc Model

 Input: 2D table w/ Activity column (pKd/uM,nM etc)

	🧐 🛛 Make Chemical Classification (kcc) Model 🛛 🗙
i	Local Table / ChEMBL Data \
	Model Name ANM3 🗸
	Chemical Table LIG 🗢
	Activity Column pkd 😫
	Activity Unit pKd
1	🗹 Auto pKa Charge
	<u>O</u> k <u>C</u> ancel

2D QSAR/Fingerprint (kcc) Output

T_tmp\/msLigandMode



Performance 2D QSAR/fingerprint

hERG: External test set vs decoy: 3505 compounds



2D QSAR/Fingerprint (eca)

- eca: Extended Kernel Chemical fingerprint Activity
- Currently: 409 mammalian models
- Training set: ChEMBL Ki, IC50, EC50, Drugbank assignment
- Median size: 211 ligands
- All Models' Validation: 25% of ChEMBL set
- Median external Q²: 0.65
- Median external AUC: 95%



2D QSAR/Fingerprint (eca) Method

Differences between kcc and eca Method:

- ChEMBL coverage for some targets might be spotty
- kcc only use data from that target
- eca use data from related targets
- kcc has lower FP rate, lower sensitivity for some not well covered targets
- eca has higher sensitivity, higher FP rate **Training:**
- Find all related targets
- Kernel Regression (MolpKd Score)
- MolScore: combine MolpKd and MolSimilarity to known binders



3D Atomic Property Field (dfz)

- dfz: Docking to ligand Field Z-score prediction model
- Currently: 504 mammalian models
- Pocketome ligands/custom alignment as APF template
- ChEMBL cpds for validation
- Median AUC: 92%, 139 cpds vs decoy
- Superseded by superior dfa and dpc models
- dfz as backup when ligand data is insufficient



Giganti, D. *et al.* Comparative evaluation of 3D virtual ligand screening methods: impact of the molecular alignment on enrichment. *J Chem Inf Model* **50**, 992–1004 (2010).

Docking/3D QSAR (dpc) model

- dpc: Docking to Pocket Classification/Activity
- Currently: 343 mammalian models w/ AUC> 80%
- Training set: ChEMBL Ki, IC50, EC50, Drugbank assignment
- Median size: 307 ligands
- Median external Q²: 0.53
- Median external AUC: 95%



Docking/3D QSAR (dpc) Method

Training:

- Pocketome -> Clustering of pocket residues
- 4D Docking w/ cocrystallized ligand as APF template
- Docking Score -> Probability score (dpc/MolClass score)
- 3D QSAR training of Activity-> (dpa/MolpKd)
- MolScore: combine MolpKd and MolSimilarity to known binders



Make Custom dpc Model

 From Either: 1. Docking Project; 2. Protein object (+Pocketome); 3. Pure Pocketome

3	Make Docking/SAR (dpc) Model	×
/	From Docking Project \/ From Receptor Object \/ From Pocketome Entry \	
	Model Name ANM3	
	Project Directory /home/pololam/icm/project/Nov 🖨 Browse	
	Receptor object 🛛 🗙 Graphical Selection (2 obj) 🗸	
	Optional Pocketome Entry ANM3_HUMAN_209_531	
	Chemical Table LIG 🗢	
	Activity Column mean	
	Activity Unit pKd 🗢	
	✓ Auto pKa Charge	
	f Hint	
	If optional Pocketome entry is specified, selected representative will be added to user supplied receptor object Docking project and dpc model will be written in the Project Directory, previous version will be overwritten	
	<u>O</u> k <u>C</u> ancel	

APF/3D QSAR (dfa) Model

- dfa: Docking to Ligand Field Classification/Activity
- Currently: 612 mammalian models w/ AUC > 80%
- Training set: ChEMBL Ki, IC50, EC50, Drugbank assignment
- Median size: 270 ligands
- Median external Q²: 0.65
- Median external AUC: 96%



APF/3D QSAR (dfa) Method

Training:

- Also from Pocketome -> 4D
 Docking + Ligand APF template
- Cpd align to ligand template -> cluster by 3D poses
- APF Score -> Probability Score (dfc/MolClass score)
- 3D-QSAR training for each cpd cluster (dfa/MolpKd score)
- MolScore: combine MolpKd and MolSimilarity to known binders



Make Custom dfa Model

Either: 1. 2D mol-> Align to 3D poses 2.
 Docking Project/Protein Object/Pocketome

3	Make APF/SAR (dfa) Model ×
1	From Ligand 3D Poses \/ From Docking Project \/ From Receptor Object \/ From Pocketome Entry \
	Model Name ANM3 🖌
	Project Directory /home/pololam/icm/project/Nov 🗢 Browse
	Chemical Table LIG 🗢
	Activity Column mean
	Activity Unit pKd 🗢
	✓ Auto pKa Charge
	Hint
	If Ligand table is 3D, poses will be used as ligand template. If it is 2D, ligand will be aligned in 3D first using APF method dfa model will be written in the Project Directory, previous version will be overwritten
	<u>O</u> k <u>C</u> ancel

Improving MolpKd: MolScore (3.4M approved drugs – Model pairs)



Sensitivity: 72%, Precision 13%

New MolScore, cutoff: 3., top 1% AUC: 86%, NSA: 69% Sensitivity: 55%, Precision 45%

Usage Consideration

- **kcc/eca** fingerprint model:
 - Very fast (thousands of cpds in min)
 - Highly accurate if Tanimoto Similarity <= 0.2
- dfa APF/3D-QSAR model:
 - Accuracy extend beyond fingerprint similarity
 - Flexible, w/ or w/o protein structure
- **dpc** Docking/3D-QSAR model:
 - Accurate Docking pose due to 4D docking w/ Ligand APF template
 - Rationalize Ligand/Pocket interactions

Custom Learning Models Considerations

- Learn Global 2D kcc model
 - Suitable for differentiating actives from random cpds due to added decoy
- Learn Local 4D/2D dfa/dpc model
 - Suitable for improving SAR series
 - Local model
 - Shorten training time
 - Might not differentiate against random cpds