Anti-COVID-19 terpenoid from marine sources: a docking, ADMET and molecular dynamics study

Nayim Sepay^{a,*}, Aishwarya Sekar^b, Umesh C Halder^{a,*}, Abdullah Alarifi^c, Mohd Afzal^c

^aDepartment of Chemistry, Jadavpur University, Kolkata-70032, India. ^bDepartment of Bioinformatics, Stella Maris College (Autonomous), Chennai, Tamilnadu-600 086, India.

^cCatalytic Chemistry Research Chair, Department of Chemistry, College of Science, King Saud University, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia.

Methods

The study focused on the SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro}, i.e. PDB ID: 5r7y, 5r7z, 5r80, 5r81, 5r82, 5r83, 5r84, 6lu7 and 6y7m for *in silico* studies to find some SARC-CoV-2 Mpro inhibitors from a library of natural products. The three dimensional structure of SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} enzymes were collected from the RCSB website. 1

Density Functional Theory

The energy minimized structures of all the NPs were obtained with the help of the density functional theory (DFT). The optimization of ground state geometries of the NPs with B3LYP functional at 6-311G level of theory in gaseous state. The job have been performed with the Gaussian 09W Revision D.01 program² on the Windows platform.

Molecular docking

Energy minimized structure of all the investigated NPs which was obtained from DFT optimization were used for docking simulations with the SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} (PDB ID: 6lu7) protein structure. The docking studies was performed using AutoDock 4.2.0 applications through Autodock tools at the Windows platform.³ The MGL Tools was utilized in the preparation of the structure of the NPs and the proteins in appropriate formats which were required for the calculations. In the case of $SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro}$ enzyme with the NPs, the partial atomic charges (Gasteiger charges) have been allocate after putting hydrogens to all the atoms of the protein as well as the NPs, separately. Here, the NPs structures allowed as flexible moiety and the SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} enzyme structure kept as rigid during the docking studies. The ten conformers of NPs inside the active site of the SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} enzyme having minimum potential energy were obtained through subsequent 20 000 precise docking step with 1000 exhaustiveness parameter inside the 60 x 60 x 60 \AA ³ grid box using a Lamarckian genetic algorithm.

Protein structure modelling.

The protein crystal structure data of all the SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} enzymes were downloaded from Protein Data Bank (PDB ID: 5r7y, 5r7z, 5r80, 5r81, 5r82, 5r83, 5r84, 6lu7 and 6y7m). The protein structures utilized in all the further studies were prepared by Discovery studio 2017 R2 client. The pictures of the protein used here was made with MolSoft-ICM browser, Meastro 11.1, Samson core and Discovery studio 2017 R2 client. The SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} protein-NPs docked complex with lowest potential energy structures also analyzed by the aforesaid software.

Molecular Electrostatic Potential (MEP) Analysis

The energy minimized structures of the NPs gained from DFT were further utilized for MEP calculations. The same functional used for DFT has also been employed to generate the electrostatic potential map throughout the atomic framework of the NPs molecules. Here, the basis set was 6-31g with the 0.03 iso values. All these calculations were performed on the Windows version of Gaussian 09W software with D1 revision.²

ADME study

The SwissADME web server was utilized for all the ADME calculations⁴ of the NPs showed top most binding affinity toward SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} . The server have a strong data base to predict physicochemical properties like lipophilicity, water solubility, drug likeness, pharmacokinetics and medicinal properties with high accuracy.

Toxicity

The probability of Cardiac toxicity for all the NPs having high binding score in docking studies were calculated by Pred-hERG which is the only web-accessible computational server for this toxicity.⁵ All the other type of toxicity of these NPs and FDA approved anti-viral drugs have been predicted using PROTOX-II.⁶ In this case, we have considered the acute toxicity, organ toxicity, toxicological endpoint, nuclear receptor signaling pathways and stress response pathway.

Molecular Dynamics simulation

Understanding the stability of protein upon ligand binding is significantly improved by molecular dynamics simulation studies. Molecular dynamics simulation of the SARS CoV2 Main Protease and the ligand **T3** (from marine sponges) was performed with Groningen Machine for Chemical Simulation (GROMACS) version 2020.2. Topology parameters for protein and ligand were generated With GROMOS96 54a7 force field and Ligand topology was obtained from the PRODRG2 server. The protein -ligand system was embedded in a cubic box of approximate size with periodic boundary conditions using a simple point charge water solvation model (38012 water molecules)⁷. The overall system was neutralized by adding 4 Na^+ ions in solution and the SHAKE algorithm was used to constrain all bond lengths involving hydrogen atoms. Particle Mesh Ewald method with a cutoff of 12 Å was applied to treat the long range electrostatic interactions. The processed system was suitably minimized followed by the NPT and NVT ensemble equilibration steps at a uniform temperature and pressure of 300 K and 1 bar, respectively maintained for each system with Parrinello−Rahman barostat. The trajectories were saved at every 2 fs time step and the production MD simulation of the protein-ligand complex was performed for 95 nanoseconds⁸.

Figure S1: The H41 and C145 amino acid residue inside the active site of SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro}.

Figure S2: The peptide based ligand attached inside the active site of SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} with a covalent bond by C145 through (a) conjugated addition to α , β -unsaturated ester and (b) nucleophilic addition to active ketone.

Figure S3: The small ligands found inside the crystal structure of SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro}.

Figure S4: The small ligands-SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} enzyme interactions found inside the active site of the protein shows hydrophobic preference over hydrophilicity.

Alkaloids

Me-N

 $A13$

M

A15

M

Terpenoids

Figure S6: The structures of natural terpenoids **T1-T17**.

Polyphenols

Figure S7: The structures of polyphenolic NPs **P1-P9**.

Peptides

Figure S8: The structures of peptide based NPs (**Pep1**-**Pep4**) and small ligands crystallized with the SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} enzyme.

Figure S9: Overly of crystal structure and docked structure of SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} enzyme with (a) **N3** and (b) **Pep0** ligand

(a) Alkaloids

Number of rotatable bond = NRB

Continued…

A10

A11

A13

A₁₅

A18

A20

Continued…

(b) Terpenoids

 $\overline{11}$

 $T₃$

T₆

T₈

Ĺ

 $NRB = 3$

HO

T₉

 $NRB = 15$ HO **T12**

Continued…

(c) Polyphenolic

P4

P5

(d) Peptides

Figure S10: Molecular electrostatic potential surface and number of rotatable bonds of (a) Alkaloids, (b) Terpenoids, (c) Polyphenols and (d) Peptids.

Figure S11: The four sites inside the active site of SARC-CoV-2 MPro enzyme

Figure S12: Docking poses and the binding interactions at the active site of SARC-CoV-2 M^{pro} enzyme of (a) **T1**, (b)**T2**, (c)**T4**, (d)**T10**, (e)**T14** as well as (f)**T16** and overlying docked structures of (g) **T3**, **T14**, **T1**, **T2**, **T4**, **T10** and **T16** at the active site of protein. The pictures also show that His41 and C145 interact the NPs.

	A7	T3	T14	T1	T2	T4	T10	T16	
iLOGP	3.35	4.31	4.05	4.31	4.31	4.31	5.2	3.89	
XLOGP3	4.12	3.51	5.57	3.51	3.51	3.51	9.17	3.37	
WLOGP	3.98	4.33	6.17	4.33	4.33	4.33	8.36	3.73	
MLOGP	2.08	2.49	4.9	2.49	2.49	2.49	6.15	3.27	
Silicos-IT Log P	3.86	3.54	5.54	3.54	3.54	3.54	7.19	3.98	
Consensus Log P	3.48	3.63	5.25	3.63	3.63	3.63	7.21	3.65	
ESOL Log S	-4.9	-4.79	-6.33	-4.79	-4.79	-4.79	-9.13	-4.04	
ESOL	3.98E-	7.96E-	2.47E-	7.96E-	7.96E-	7.96E-	4.51E-	$3.53E-$	
Solubility (mg/ml)	03	03	04	03	03	03	07	02	
ESOL	$1.25E-$	$1.61E-$	4.72E-	$1.61E-$	$1.61E-$	$1.61E-$	7.49E-	9.08E-	
Solubility	05	05	07	05	05	05	10	05	
(mol/l)									
ESOL Class	M.S.	M.S.	P.S.	M.S.	M.S.	M.S.	P.S.	M.S.	
Ali Log S	-5.1	-5.33	-6.99	-5.33	-5.33	-5.33	-10.83	-4.58	
Ali Solubility (mg/ml)	$2.52E-$ 03	2.30E- 03	5.37E- 05	2.30E- 03	2.30E- 03	2.30E- 03	8.97E- 09	1.03E- 02	
Ali Solubility (mol/l)	7.88E- 06	4.63E- 06	$1.03E-$ 07	$4.63E-$ 06	$4.63E-$ 06	4.63E- 06	1.49E- 11	$2.64E -$ 05	
Ali Class	M.S.	M.S.	P.S.	M.S.	M.S.	M.S.	Insolu.	M.S.	
Silicos-IT LogSw	-6.34	-3.33	-5.81	-3.33	-3.33	-3.33	-8.01	-3.3	
Silicos-IT	1.47E-	$2.32E-$	8.06E-	2.32E-	2.32E-	2.32E-	5.85E-	1.93E-	
Solubility (mg/ml)	04	01	04	01	01	01	06	01	
Silicos-IT	4.60E-	4.69E-	1.54E-	4.69E-	4.69E-	4.69E-	9.71E-	4.98E-	
Solubility (mol/l)	07	04	06	04	04	04	09	04	
Silicos-IT class	P.S.	Solu.	M.S.	Solu.	Solu.	Solu.	P.S.	Solu.	

Table S2: Predicted data of lipophilicity and water solubility of the NPs

Solu. = Soluble, M.S. = Moderately soluble, P.S. = Poorly soluble, Insolu. = Insoluble.

	A7	T3	T14	T1	T2	T4	T10	T16
GI	High	High	High	High	High	High	Low	High
absorption								
BBB	Yes	N _o	Yes					
permeant								
CYP1A2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N _o	N _o
inhibitor								
CYP2C19	Yes	N _o						
inhibitor								
CYP2C9	Yes	N _o						
inhibitor								
CYP2D6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N _o	Yes
inhibitor								
CYP3A4	Yes	Yes	N _o	Yes	Yes	Yes	N _o	Yes
inhibitor								

Table S3: Predicted data of pharmacokinetics, drug likeness and medicinal chemistry of the NPs

Table S4: Predicted data of cardiotoxicity of NPs compounds⁵

Compo- und	Prediction / Potency	Confi- dence	Applicability domain (AD)	Probabilty Map
A7	Non- cardiotoxic (-)	50%	N _o (Value= 0.23 and $limit = 0.26$)	
T3	Non- cardiotoxic (-)	50%	N _o (Value= 0.19 and $limit = 0.26$)	

Table S5: Predicted data of toxicity of NPs compounds⁶

Tox21-Stress response pathways								
Nuclear factor (erythroid-derived 2)-like 2/antioxidant responsive element (nrf2/ARE)	0.59	0.90	0.95	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.56	0.90
Heat shock factor response element (HSE)	0.59	0.90	0.95	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.56	0.90
Mitochondrial Membrane Potential (MMP)	0.55	0.84	0.69	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.64	0.59
Phosphoprotein (Tumor Suppressor) p53	0.81	0.81	0.93	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.92	0.81
ATPase family AAA domain containing protein 5 (ATAD5)	0.87	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94
Toxicity Target -- -- -- --								
Weak Active, Strong Active, Weak Inactive, Strong Inactive								

Table S6: Predicted data of toxicity of some FDA approved anti-viral drugs⁶

- 1. <https://www.rcsb.org/>
- 2. Gaussian 09, Revision D.01, M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, G. Scalmani, V. Barone, B. Mennucci, G. A. Petersson, H. Nakatsuji, M. Caricato, X. Li, H. P. Hratchian, A. F. Izmaylov, J. Bloino, G. Zheng, J. L. Sonnenberg, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T. Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao, H. Nakai, T. Vreven, J. A. Montgomery, Jr., J. E. Peralta, F. Ogliaro, M. Bearpark, J. J. Heyd, E. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, V. N. Staroverov, R. Kobayashi, J. Normand, K. Raghavachari, A. Rendell, J. C. Burant, S. S. Iyengar, J.Tomasi, M. Cossi, N. Rega, J. M. Millam, M. Klene, J. E. Knox, J. B. Cross, V. Bakken, C. Adamo, J. Jaramillo, R. Gomperts, R. E. Stratmann, O. Yazyev, A. J. Austin, R. Cammi, C. Pomelli, J. W. Ochterski, R. L. Martin, K. Morokuma, V. G. Zakrzewski, G. A. Voth, P. Salvador, J. J. Dannenberg, S. Dapprich, A. D. Daniels, Ö. Farkas, J. B. Foresman, J. V. Ortiz, J. Cioslowski, and D. J. Fox, Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2009.
- 3. Sousa; S. F.; Fernandes, P. A.; Ramos, M. J. Protein-ligand docking: current status and future challenges. *Proteins*. **2006**, *65*, 15-26.
- 4. Daina, A.; Michielin, O.; Zoete, V., SwissADME: a free web tool to evaluate pharmacokinetics, drug-likeness and medicinal chemistry friendliness of small molecules, *Scientific Reports*, **2017**, *7*, 42717
- 5. <http://predherg.labmol.com.br/>
- 6. http://tox.charite.de/protox_II/index.php?site=compound_input
- 7. Mishra, P., Günther, S. New insights into the structural dynamics of the kinase JNK3. Sci Rep 8, 9435 (2018).<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-27867-3>
- 8. Hospital, A., Goñi, J. R., Orozco, M., & Gelpí, J. L. (2015). Molecular dynamics simulations: advances and applications, Advances and applications in bioinformatics and chemistry : AABC , 8, 37–47. https://doi.org/10.2147/AABC.S70333