WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
SJIF Impact Factor 8.084
Volume 13, Issue 3, 481-493. Review Article ISSN 2277– 7105

DOCKING SOFTWARE FOR MEMBRANE PROTEIN-LIGAND INTERACTIONS: A COMPARATIVE REVIEW

Saurabh Upadhayay[1], Shubhankit Soni*[2], Dr. Alok Shukla[3] and Nitin Rajan[4]

[1]Student, Babu Sunder Singh College of Pharmacy, Raebareli Road, Nigohan, Lucknow (226302).

[2]Assistant Professor, Babu Sunder Singh College of Pharmacy, Raebareli Road, Nigohan, Lucknow.

[3]Director, Babu Sunder Singh College of Pharmacy, Raebareli Road, Nigohan, Lucknow.

[4]Assistant Professor, Lucknow Model College of Pharmacy, Lucknow.

Article Received on
14 December 2023,
Revised on 04 Jan. 2024,
Accepted on 24 Jan. 2024
DOI: 10. 20959/wjpr20243-31151

***Corresponding Author**
Shubhankit Soni
Assistant Professor, Babu Sunder Singh College of Pharmacy, Raebareli Road, Nigohan, Lucknow.

ABSTRACT

Protein-ligand interactions are essential for signal transduction, immune responses, and gene regulation. Understanding these interactions is crucial for deciphering biological regulation and for the development of new drug targets. In our study, we analyzed the molecular interactions between proteins and ligands that were docked using AutoDock 4.2 software. We employed a novel search algorithm, the Hybrid Algorithm of Random Drift Particle Swarm Optimization and Local Search (LRDPSO), in addition to the classical Lamarckian Genetic Algorithm (LGA) for energy optimization within AutoDock 4.2. The best conformations resulting from each docking algorithm were subjected to molecular dynamics (MD) simulations, allowing for a deeper exploration of the molecular mechanisms underlying protein-ligand interactions. We focused on assessing the binding energy between protein receptors and ligands, the presence of salt bridges and hydrogen bonds within the docking region, as well as structural changes during complex unfolding. Comparing the complexes generated by these two docking methods, we found disparities in the protein-ligand interactions. This analysis underscored the significant roles played by salt bridge and hydrogen bond interactions in maintaining the stability of protein-ligand complexes. Our study is primarily centered on isolating the deterministic characteristics of docking interactions from their dynamic properties, an essential step in

comprehending biological functions and identifying amino acid residues critical to these interactions.

KEYWORDS: Protein-ligand interactions, Signal transduction, Immune responses, Gene regulation, Molecular interactions, Docking.

Membrane proteins

Membrane proteins are a vital class of proteins that are embedded within or attached to biological membranes, serving as gatekeepers and mediators for molecular interactions at the cell's interface with its surroundings. Unlike soluble proteins, membrane proteins are immersed in the lipid bilayer, endowing them with unique structural and functional properties. These proteins are involved in a myriad of essential biological processes, including cellular signaling, transport of ions and molecules, cell adhesion, and enzymatic reactions. Understanding their structure, function, and interactions is of paramount importance in deciphering fundamental cellular mechanisms and developing targeted therapies for various diseases.[1-5]

Membrane Proteins and Their Unique Challenges

Membrane proteins pose distinct challenges in structural and functional studies due to their association with lipid bilayers. Their unique characteristics, including hydrophobic transmembrane domains and hydrophilic regions exposed to the aqueous environment, influence their folding, stability, and interactions with other molecules. Studying membrane proteins requires specialized techniques and approaches tailored to overcome these challenges.[6]

Characteristics of Membrane Proteins

- *Transmembrane Domains:* Membrane proteins have hydrophobic transmembrane segments that anchor them within lipid bilayers, facilitating their integration into cell membranes.
- *Hydrophilic Regions:* Membrane proteins often have hydrophilic regions that interact with water molecules, allowing them to facilitate the transport of ions and other hydrophilic substances across lipid membranes.
- *Topology Variability:* Membrane proteins exhibit diverse topologies, with variations in the number and arrangement of transmembrane helices, loops, and extracellular or cytoplasmic domains.

- *Glycosylation:* Many membrane proteins are glycosylated, with carbohydrates attached to extracellular domains. Glycosylation plays a role in protein folding, stability, and recognition.
- *Dynamic Conformations:* Membrane proteins can adopt multiple conformational states, enabling them to undergo structural changes during cellular processes, such as signal transduction and transport.[7-10]

Challenges in modeling and docking membrane proteins

- Modeling and docking membrane proteins present several challenges due to their complex structures and interactions within the lipid bilayer. Some of these challenges include.
- *Membrane Environment:* Membrane proteins reside within the lipid bilayer, making it essential to consider the lipid environment's impact on protein stability and dynamics during modeling and docking.
- *Conformational Flexibility:* Membrane proteins often undergo conformational changes, making it crucial to capture their flexibility accurately, especially when simulating protein-ligand interactions.
- *Hydrophobic and Hydrophilic Regions:* Membrane proteins have hydrophobic transmembrane domains and hydrophilic regions interacting with the aqueous environment. Properly modeling these regions is vital for understanding their interactions with ligands.
- *Integration of Experimental Data:* Incorporating experimental data, such as NMR or cryo-EM structures, into computational models enhances the accuracy of membrane protein simulations. However, integrating this data seamlessly remains a challenge.
- *Ligand Binding Sites:* Identifying accurate ligand binding sites on membrane proteins is challenging due to the lack of well-defined binding pockets. Predicting binding sites and understanding the binding mechanisms are ongoing research areas.
- *Scoring Functions:* Developing reliable scoring functions that accurately predict binding affinities for membrane protein-ligand complexes is a significant challenge. Scoring functions need to account for the membrane environment and protein-lipid interactions.
- *Computational Resources:* Simulating large membrane protein systems requires significant computational resources. Efficient algorithms and high-performance

computing infrastructures are necessary to handle the computational demands of these simulations.

- *Experimental Validation:* Experimentally validating the predicted membrane protein-ligand interactions is challenging due to the technical difficulties associated with studying membrane proteins in their native environment.[11-15]

Importance of accurate binding predictions for drug design

- Accurate binding predictions in drug design are of paramount importance for several reasons:
- *Optimizing Lead Compounds:* Accurate binding predictions help researchers identify the most promising lead compounds from a pool of potential candidates. By understanding how a ligand binds to its target, scientists can optimize the molecular structure of the compound to enhance its affinity and efficacy.
- *Minimizing Experimental Costs:* Computational predictions reduce the need for exhaustive experimental testing of numerous compounds, saving time and resources. This efficiency accelerates the drug discovery process and reduces costs associated with synthesizing and testing multiple compounds.
- *Understanding Structure-Activity Relationships (SAR):* Accurate binding predictions provide insights into the structure-activity relationships of compounds. Researchers can analyze how specific structural modifications affect binding affinity, guiding the design of new analogs with improved activity profiles.
- *Predicting Drug-Target Interactions:* Understanding the binding modes between drugs and their biological targets is crucial for predicting drug efficacy and potential side effects. Accurate predictions aid in selecting drug candidates with optimal interactions and minimal off-target effects.
- *Virtual Screening:* Computational methods allow for virtual screening of large chemical libraries to identify potential drug candidates. Accurate binding predictions enable the prioritization of compounds most likely to exhibit the desired biological activity.
- *Rational Drug Design:* Structural insights derived from accurate binding predictions facilitate rational drug design. Scientists can design novel compounds based on their knowledge of target-ligand interactions, leading to the creation of innovative drugs with enhanced therapeutic properties.

- *Accelerating Drug Development:* By reducing the time spent on experimental trial and error, accurate binding predictions accelerate the drug development process. This speed is especially crucial in the race to discover treatments for emerging diseases and conditions.
- *Supporting Personalized Medicine:* Accurate binding predictions contribute to the development of personalized medicine approaches, where treatments are tailored to an individual's genetic makeup and specific drug-target interactions.[16-20]

Selection of Docking Software

Selecting the appropriate docking software is crucial for accurate and reliable simulations in molecular modeling. The choice often depends on the specific research goals, the type of biomolecular system being studied, and the available computational resources. Here are a few widely used docking software programs:

- *AutoDock Vina:* AutoDock Vina is known for its speed and accuracy. It uses an empirical scoring function and a search algorithm based on iterated local search and global optimization. Vina allows for flexible ligand docking and is widely used in virtual screening studies.
- *AutoDock:* AutoDock is one of the pioneering docking programs. It utilizes a Lamarckian genetic algorithm for global optimization and an empirical scoring function to predict binding affinities. AutoDock can handle flexible ligands and rigid or flexible protein receptors.
- *Glide:* Glide, developed by Schrödinger, uses a hierarchical algorithm to achieve high-throughput virtual screening and accurate binding mode predictions. It employs various sampling methods, including high-throughput virtual screening (HTVS), standard precision (SP), and extra precision (XP) modes, allowing users to balance speed and accuracy.
- *DOCK:* DOCK uses a matching algorithm for molecular shape complementarity and electrostatics. It incorporates a variety of scoring functions and search algorithms for flexible ligand docking. DOCK is often used for large-scale virtual screening projects.
- *FlexX:* FlexX employs an incremental construction algorithm to explore ligand conformations and uses an empirical scoring function to evaluate binding affinities. It allows for flexibility in both ligands and protein side chains.
- *Gold:* GOLD (Genetic Optimization for Ligand Docking) utilizes a genetic algorithm for global optimization. It can handle flexible ligands and has various search and scoring

options. GOLD is popular for its ability to predict protein-ligand binding modes accurately.

- *Surflex-Dock:* Surflex-Dock uses a patented scoring function that considers protein flexibility. It employs a stochastic search algorithm to explore ligand conformations and protein flexibility simultaneously. Surflex-Dock is suitable for both virtual screening and binding mode predictions.[21-26]

Rigid body docking

Rigid body docking is a computational method used in molecular modeling to predict the three-dimensional structure of a complex formed by two or more molecules, typically a protein and a ligand (small molecule), without allowing significant conformational changes in the receptor structure. In rigid body docking, the protein structure remains fixed, while the ligand is manipulated to find the optimal binding mode within the binding site of the protein. This method is often employed in virtual screening and drug discovery studies to identify potential ligands that bind to a target protein.

Key features of rigid body docking include

Scoring Functions: Rigid body docking algorithms use scoring functions to evaluate the binding affinity of different ligand conformations within the protein's binding site. These functions assess various interactions, such as van der Waals forces, electrostatic interactions, hydrogen bonding, and solvation effects, to predict the binding strength.

Search Algorithms: Rigid body docking programs employ search algorithms to explore the vast conformational space of ligands within the binding site. Genetic algorithms, Monte Carlo simulations, and systematic search methods are commonly used to sample ligand orientations and positions.

Grid-Based Methods: Some rigid body docking approaches utilize grids to represent the protein's binding site. By discretizing the space around the protein, these methods can efficiently search for favorable ligand conformations within the grid points, speeding up the docking calculations.

Validation and Scoring Accuracy: The accuracy of rigid body docking predictions is validated by comparing the predicted binding modes with experimental data, such as X-ray

crystallography or NMR structures. Scoring accuracy is crucial for selecting the most promising ligands from a pool of candidates.

Limitations: Rigid body docking has limitations, particularly when dealing with highly flexible ligands or proteins with significant conformational changes upon ligand binding. In such cases, flexible docking methods, which allow both ligand and protein flexibility, are employed for more accurate predictions.[27-31]

Accuracy of rigid body docking

The accuracy of rigid body docking methods in predicting protein-ligand interactions depends on several factors, including the choice of scoring function, search algorithm, and the representation of the molecules' conformations. While rigid body docking can provide valuable insights into potential binding modes, it has limitations, particularly in cases involving significant conformational changes or highly flexible ligands.

Here are some key points to consider regarding the accuracy of rigid body docking

- *Scoring Accuracy:* The accuracy of rigid body docking heavily relies on the scoring function used to evaluate the binding affinity of different ligand conformations. Empirical scoring functions, while fast, may lack accuracy in capturing subtle energy differences between binding poses. More sophisticated scoring functions incorporating physics-based terms and machine-learning approaches aim to improve accuracy.
- *Search Algorithm:* The choice of search algorithm impacts the sampling of ligand conformations within the binding site. Genetic algorithms, Monte Carlo methods, and systematic search approaches are commonly employed. The efficiency and thoroughness of the search algorithm affect the likelihood of finding the native binding pose.
- *Ligand and Protein Flexibility:* Rigid body docking assumes a fixed protein structure, ignoring protein flexibility. If the protein undergoes conformational changes upon ligand binding, rigid body docking may not capture these movements accurately. Flexible docking methods that allow both ligand and protein flexibility are more suitable for such cases.
- *Validation:* Validating the accuracy of rigid body docking predictions is essential. Experimental techniques such as X-ray crystallography, NMR spectroscopy, or bioassays can confirm the predicted binding modes. Cross-docking studies, where ligands are

docked into multiple protein structures, can also provide insights into the method's reliability.

- *Sampling Conformational Space:* Rigid body docking methods need to sample a wide range of ligand conformations to find the optimal binding pose. However, exhaustive sampling of conformational space is computationally expensive. Balancing computational resources with the thoroughness of the search is crucial.[32-36]

Flexible docking

Flexible docking refers to a computational technique used in molecular modeling and drug discovery, where both the ligand (small molecule) and the protein receptor undergo conformational changes during the docking simulation. Unlike rigid body docking, which assumes a fixed protein structure, flexible docking methods consider the flexibility of both the ligand and the protein, allowing them to adopt different conformations and explore a wider range of binding interactions.

Flexible docking is crucial in situations where the binding site undergoes significant conformational changes upon ligand binding or when dealing with flexible ligands that can adopt multiple conformations. Here are key aspects of flexible docking.

- *Ligand Flexibility:* Flexible ligand docking methods explore various conformations of the ligand molecule, allowing for rotations, torsions, and other degrees of freedom. This flexibility is essential when dealing with ligands that can adopt different shapes or when modeling the binding of ligands with flexible functional groups.
- *Protein Flexibility:* In flexible docking, the protein receptor is allowed to undergo conformational changes to accommodate the binding of different ligand conformations. Protein flexibility can be modeled using techniques such as induced fit docking, where the protein structure is adjusted to better fit the ligand, or ensemble docking, where multiple protein structures are considered to represent different conformational states.
- *Scoring Functions:* Flexible docking methods employ scoring functions that consider both ligand and protein flexibility. These scoring functions evaluate the energetics of different ligand-protein conformations, taking into account van der Waals interactions, electrostatic forces, hydrogen bonding, and other intermolecular forces. Accurate scoring is essential for ranking and selecting the most favorable binding poses.
- *Sampling Algorithms:* Flexible docking algorithms use various sampling techniques, such as Monte Carlo simulations, genetic algorithms, and molecular dynamics simulations, to

explore the conformational space of both the ligand and the protein. Efficient sampling methods are necessary to adequately cover the vast number of possible conformations.

- *Validation:* Validation of flexible docking results is crucial to assess the accuracy of the predicted binding modes. Experimental validation techniques, such as X-ray crystallography or NMR spectroscopy, can confirm the predicted binding poses. Cross-docking experiments, where ligands are docked into multiple protein structures, are also used for validation.[37-41]

Accuracy of flexible docking

The accuracy of flexible docking methods in predicting protein-ligand interactions has significantly improved over the years due to advancements in algorithms, force fields, and scoring functions. However, it is important to note that the accuracy of flexible docking results can vary based on several factors, including the choice of methods, the representation of flexibility, and the quality of the input structures. Here are some considerations regarding the accuracy of flexible docking.

- *Representation of Flexibility:* Flexible docking methods can consider flexibility in different ways, including ligand flexibility, protein side-chain flexibility, or even backbone flexibility. Accurate modeling of the flexibility that is relevant to the biological system under study is crucial for obtaining reliable results.
- *Scoring Functions:* The accuracy of flexible docking largely depends on the scoring functions used to evaluate different ligand-protein conformations. Modern scoring functions often incorporate terms that account for van der Waals interactions, electrostatic forces, hydrogen bonding, desolvation energies, and other intermolecular interactions. These scoring functions are continuously refined to improve accuracy.
- *Sampling Algorithms:* Flexible docking methods employ various sampling algorithms, such as molecular dynamics simulations, Monte Carlo methods, and genetic algorithms, to explore the conformational space of both the ligand and the protein. The efficiency and thoroughness of the sampling algorithm influence the accuracy of capturing the native binding pose.
- *Validation:* Experimental validation techniques, such as X-ray crystallography, NMR spectroscopy, or bioassays, are essential for validating the accuracy of flexible docking predictions. Cross-docking experiments, where ligands are docked into multiple protein structures, can provide additional validation by testing the method's ability to predict binding modes across different protein conformations.

- *Binding Site Flexibility:* Some biological systems involve flexible binding sites that undergo conformational changes upon ligand binding. Accurately modeling such induced-fit effects is challenging but crucial for understanding the binding mechanism. Methods that account for protein side-chain or backbone flexibility can improve accuracy in these cases.
- *Computational Resources:* Flexible docking simulations can be computationally intensive, especially when considering extensive protein and ligand flexibility. Adequate computational resources are necessary to perform sufficiently long simulations and achieve accurate results.[42-46]

REFERENCE

1. Doyle DA, Cabral JM, Pfuetzner RA, et al. The structure of the potassium channel: molecular basis of K+ conduction and selectivity. Science, 1998 Jun 19; 280(5360): 69-77.
2. Lomize MA, Pogozheva ID, Joo H, et al. OPM database and PPM web server: resources for positioning of proteins in membranes. Nucleic Acids Res., 2012 Jan; 40(Database issue)
3. Rosenbaum DM, Rasmussen SG, Kobilka BK. The structure and function of G-protein-coupled receptors. Nature, 2009 Jan 22; 459(7245): 356-63.
4. Huang J, Rauscher S, Nawrocki G, et al. CHARMM36m: an improved force field for folded and intrinsically disordered proteins. Nat Methods, 2017 Mar; 14(1): 71-73.
5. Cheng Y, Grigorieff N, Penczek PA, et al. A Primer to Single-Particle Cryo-Electron Microscopy. Cell., 2015 Oct 8; 161(3): 438-449.
6. White SH. Biophysical dissection of membrane proteins. Nature, 2009 Feb 19; 459(7245): 344-346.
7. Hong H, Joh NH, Bowie JU, Tamm LK. Methods for measuring the thermodynamic stability of membrane proteins. Methods Enzymol, 2009; 455: 213-236.
8. Huang H, Ostroff G, Theberge R, Sachs K. Identifying conformational changes with site-directed spin labeling reveals that ligand binding triggers structural rearrangements in the Mhp1 membrane transporter. J Biol Chem, 2015 Jan 2; 290(1): 378-389.
9. Lundstrom K. Structural genomics for membrane proteins. Cell Mol Life Sci., 2006 Sep; 63(18): 2597-2607.

10. Pebay-Peyroula E, Rummel G, Rosenbusch JP, Landau EM. X-ray structure of bacteriorhodopsin at 2.5 angstroms from microcrystals grown in lipidic cubic phases. Science, 1997 Aug 8; 277(5332): 1676-1681.
11. Velez-Vega C, McKay DJ, Arseniev AS, et al. Accurate Evaluation of Ligand Binding Affinity Using Full Protein Flexibility in Docking Calculations. J Phys Chem B., 2016 Feb 25; 120(7): 1130-1137.
12. Roth CB, Hanson MA, Stevens RC. Stabilization of the human beta2-adrenergic receptor TM4-TM3-TM5 helix interface by mutagenesis of Glu122(3.41), a critical residue in GPCR structure. J Mol Biol., 2008 Oct 10; 376(5): 1305-1319.
13. Berman HM, Westbrook J, Feng Z, et al. The Protein Data Bank. Nucleic Acids Res., 2000 Jan 1; 28(1): 235-242.
14. Lomize MA, Pogozheva ID, Lomize AL, Mosberg HI. OPM: Orientations of Proteins in Membranes database. Bioinformatics, 2006 Aug 15; 22(5): 623-625.
15. Lomize MA, Lomize AL, Pogozheva ID, Mosberg HI. The role of hydrophobic interactions in the positioning of peripheral proteins in membranes. BMC Struct Biol, 2007 Jun 28; 7: 44.
16. Carlsson J, Boukharta L, Åqvist J. Combining docking, molecular dynamics and the linear interaction energy method to predict binding modes and affinities for non-nucleoside inhibitors to HIV-1 reverse transcriptase. J Med Chem, 2010 Nov 11; 53(21): 7668-7678.
17. Kitchen DB, Decornez H, Furr JR, Bajorath J. Docking and scoring in virtual screening for drug discovery: methods and applications. Nat Rev Drug Discov, 2004 Aug; 3(11): 935-949.
18. Friesner RA, Banks JL, Murphy RB, et al. Glide: a new approach for rapid, accurate docking and scoring. 2. Enrichment factors in database screening. J Med Chem, 2004 Aug 12; 47(7): 1739-1749.
19. Guedes IA, de Magalhães CS, Dardenne LE. Receptor-ligand molecular docking. Biophys Rev., 2014 Dec; 6(4): 75-87.
20. Tovchigrechko A, Wells CA. Prediction of protein-ligand binding affinity by free energy simulations: assumptions, pitfalls, and expectations. J Comput Aided Mol Des, 2012 Jan; 26(1): 85-100.
21. Friesner RA, Banks JL, Murphy RB, et al. Glide: a new approach for rapid, accurate docking and scoring. 1. Method and assessment of docking accuracy. J Med Chem, 2004 Apr 1; 47(7): 1739-1749.

22. Trott O, Olson AJ. AutoDock Vina: improving the speed and accuracy of docking with a new scoring function, efficient optimization, and multithreading. J Comput Chem, 2010 Jan 30; 31(2): 455-461.
23. Morris GM, Huey R, Lindstrom W, et al. AutoDock4 and AutoDockTools4: Automated docking with selective receptor flexibility. J Comput Chem, 2009 Dec; 30(16): 2785-2791.
24. ones G, Willett P, Glen RC, Leach AR, Taylor R. Development and validation of a genetic algorithm for flexible docking. J Mol Biol., 1997 Oct 10; 267(3): 727-748.
25. Li X, Keskin O, Ma B, Nussinov R, Liang J. Protein-protein interactions: hot spots and structurally conserved residues often locate in complemented pockets that pre-organized in the unbound states: implications for docking. J Mol Biol., 2004 Oct 22; 344(3): 781-795.
26. Rarey M, Kramer B, Lengauer T, Klebe G. A fast flexible docking method using an incremental construction algorithm. J Mol Biol., 1996 Oct 25; 261(3): 470-489.
27. Goodsell DS, Morris GM, Olson AJ. Automated docking of flexible ligands: applications of AutoDock. J Mol Recognit, 1996 Sep-Oct; 9(5-6): 1-5.
28. Jones G, Willett P, Glen RC, Leach AR, Taylor R. Development and validation of a genetic algorithm for flexible docking. J Mol Biol., 1997 Oct 10; 267(3): 727-748.
29. Ewing TJ, Makino S, Skillman AG, Kuntz ID. DOCK 4.0: search strategies for automated molecular docking of flexible molecule databases. J Comput Aided Mol Des., 2001 Mar; 15(5): 411-428.
30. Rarey M, Kramer B, Lengauer T, Klebe G. A fast flexible docking method using an incremental construction algorithm. J Mol Biol., 1996 Oct 25; 261(3): 470-489.
31. Tovchigrechko A, Wells CA. Prediction of protein-ligand binding affinity by free energy simulations: assumptions, pitfalls, and expectations. J Comput Aided Mol Des., 2012 Jan; 26(1): 85-100.
32. Ewing TJ, Makino S, Skillman AG, Kuntz ID. DOCK 4.0: search strategies for automated molecular docking of flexible molecule databases. J Comput Aided Mol Des., 2001 Mar; 15(5): 411-428.
33. Jain AN. Scoring noncovalent protein-ligand interactions: a continuous differentiable function tuned to compute binding affinities. J Comput Aided Mol Des., 1996 Oct; 10(5): 427-440.
34. Diller DJ, Merz KM Jr. High throughput docking for library design and library prioritization. Proteins, 2001 Nov 1; 43(2): 113-124.

35. Morris GM, Goodsell DS, Halliday RS, et al. Automated docking using a Lamarckian genetic algorithm and an empirical binding free energy function. J Comput Chem, 1998 Nov 15; 19(14): 1639-1662.
36. Jones G, Willett P, Glen RC, Leach AR, Taylor R. Development and validation of a genetic algorithm for flexible docking. J Mol Biol., 1997 Oct 10; 267(3): 727-748.
37. Friesner RA, Banks JL, Murphy RB, et al. Glide: a new approach for rapid, accurate docking and scoring. 1. Method and assessment of docking accuracy. J Med Chem, 2004 Nov 18; 47(7): 1739-49.
38. Huey R, Morris GM, Olson AJ, Goodsell DS. A semiempirical free energy force field with charge-based desolvation. J Comput Chem, 2007 Apr 15; 28(6): 1145-52.
39. Morris GM, Huey R, Lindstrom W, et al. AutoDock4 and AutoDockTools4: Automated docking with selective receptor flexibility. J Comput Chem, 2009 Dec 15; 30(16): 2785-91.
40. Friesner RA, Murphy RB, Repasky MP, et al. Extra precision glide: docking and scoring incorporating a model of hydrophobic enclosure for protein-ligand complexes. J Med Chem, 2006 Apr 20; 49(21): 6177-96.
41. Wang R, Lai L, Wang S. Further development and validation of empirical scoring functions for structure-based binding affinity prediction. J Comput Aided Mol Des, 2002 Jul; 16(1): 11-26.
42. Guedes IA, de Magalhães CS, Dardenne LE. Receptor-ligand molecular docking. Biophys Rev., 2014 Sep; 6(3-4): 75-87.
43. Ciemny MP, Kurcinski M, Kamel K, et al. Protein–peptide docking: opportunities and challenges. Drug Discov Today, 2018 Jan; 23(10): 1530-7.
44. Weng G, Wang E, Wang Z, Liu H, Zhu F, Li D, Hou T. Assessing the performance of MM/PBSA and MM/GBSA methods. 7. Entropy effects on the performance of end-point binding free energy calculation approaches. Phys Chem Chem Phys, 2019 Jan 28; 21(4): 2602-12.
45. Nivedha AK, Thieker DF, Makeneni S, Hu H, Woods RJ. Vina-Carb: improving glycosidic angles during carbohydrate docking. J Chem Theory Comput, 2016 Oct 11; 12(10): 892-901.
46. Zhang X, Wong SE, Lightstone FC. Toward fully automated high-performance computing drug discovery: a massively parallel virtual screening pipeline for docking and molecular dynamics simulations. J Comput Chem, 2017 Feb 15; 38(5): 349-60.