Review Article **CODEN: AJPAD7** **ISSN: 2321 - 0923**

Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis and Medicinal Chemistry

Journal home page: www.ajpamc.com

https://doi.org/10.36673/AJPAMC.2025.v13.i02.A06

A REVIEW ON COMPUTATIONAL APPROACHES IN MOLECULAR DOCKING

Saritha Karnati*[1] and J. Snehalatha[1]

[1*]Dr. K.V. Subbareddy Institute of Pharmacy, Dupadu, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT

Molecular docking has emerged as a vital computational technique in structure -based drug discovery, enabling the prediction of molecular interactions between ligands and biological targets. This review provides a comprehensive overview of the principles, methodologies, tools and applications of molecular docking. We begin by discussing the fundamental concepts of molecular recognition and the various docking approaches, including rigid, flexible and semi-flexible strategies. Essential aspects of receptor and ligand preparation are addressed, alongside consideration for binding site identification and molecular optimization. Key docking algorithms and scoring functions ranging from force -field-based to machine learning-enhanced methods are evaluated for the ir effectiveness and limitations. The review highlights widely used docking software such as AutoDock, GOLD and Glide, comparing their strengths in various research contexts. Applications in virtual screening, lead optimization, protein-protein interactions and enzyme-inhibitor studies are explored, illustrating the broad utility of docking in drug discovery. Challenges such as protein flexibility, scoring accuracy and solvent effects are critically examined, with emphasis on current advances I including AI integration and quantum mechanical approaches. Finally, the article discusses future directions aimed at enhancing predictive accuracy and expanding docking's role in precision medicine. This review aims to serve as a valuable resource for rese archers and resource for researchers and students engaged in computational drug design and molecular modelling.

KEYWORDS

Molecular docking, Structure -based drug design (SBDD), Virtual screening, Protein-ligand interactions, Binding site identification, Genetic algorithms and Solvation effects.

Author for Correspondence:
Saritha Karnati,
K.V. Subbareddy Institute of Pharmacy,
Dupadu, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh, India.
Email: sarithareddykvspkarnati@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Molecular docking is a computational method widely used in the field of structure-based drug design to predict the preferred orientation of one molecule to a second when bound to each other to form a stable complex. It plays a pivotal role in

understanding molecular recognition and has become an essential tool for predicting binding modes and affinities between small molecules (ligands) and their biological targets (typically proteins). The core aim of molecular docking is to model the interaction between a ligand and a receptor to estimate the strength and type of binding affinity, thereby assisting in the rational design of more potent and selective therapeutic agents. Recent advances in computational power, algorithms, and scoring functions have significantly improved the reliability and efficiency of docking studies. Moreover, the integration of molecular dynamics and machine learning techniques is further enhancing docking accuracy, particularly in cases involving protein flexibility and solvent effects. Molecular docking is now routinely used in virtual screening campaigns, lead optimization and mechanistic studies, making it a cornerstone of modern computational drug discovery[1].

LITERATURE REVIEW

Anusha B, *et al* (2025) Molecular docking is a key computational tool in drug discovery, used to predict interactions between small molecules and biological targets. Advances in algorithms, scoring methods and integration with AI have significantly improved its accuracy, making it essential in drug design and structural biology.

Natasaja Brooijmans *et al* (2003) Molecular docking plays a key role in drug discovery by predicting interactions between molecules. This review highlights advances in docking methods, scoring functions and their applications in library design and virtual screening, while addressing future methodological challenges.

Mahendra Kumar Sahu *et al* (2024) Molecular docking is a key computational methodin drug discovery used to study interactions between small molecules and target proteins.This review explores the evolution of docking techniques, their current applications, and future directions, highlighting advancements and ongoing challenges in accuracy and protein flexibility modeling.

Thuluz Meza Menchaca *et al* (2024) Molecular docking, a key in silico technique in drug discovery, predicts protein -ligand interactions by analyzing binding energies and thermodynamic affinities. This chapter reviews past progress, current software technologies and future challenges like molecular flexibility, binding entropy, and solvation effects.

Principles of Molecular Docking

Molecular docking is based on the fundamental principles of molecular recognition and thermodynamics, which govern the formation of stable complexes between biomolecules. Over time, docking theories have evolved from simple rigid -body models to more advanced frameworks that incorporate molecular flexibility and dynamic interactions. These principles from the basis for predicting binding modes and affinities between ligands and their molecular targets.

Lock-and-Key

Based on geometric complementarity, originally proposed by Emil Fischer.

Induced Fit

Proteins undergo conformational changes upon ligand binding, enhancing affinity.

Conformational Selection

Both ligand and protein exist in multiple states, with binding to the most energetically favorable conformation[2].

Molecular recognition models

Lock-and-Key Model (Emil Fischer, 1894)

The receptor's active site is rigid and perfectly complementary to the ligand's shape, similar to a key fitting into a lock.

Induced Fit Model (Koshland)

Both the receptor and ligand undergo conformational changes to achieve a better fit, introducing flexibility into docking simulations.

Conformational Selection Model

The receptor and ligand exist in multiple conformations, and binding occurs between the most compatible forms-supported by kinetic studies such as antibody-hapten binding[3].

Types of molecular docking

Rigid Docking

Rigid docking, also known as rigid-body or geometric docking, assumes that both the ligand and receptor remain fixed throughout the docking process. It predicts the optimal orientation of the

ligand in the binding pocket based purely on geometric and energetic complementarity.

Principle

Based on the concept of geometric fit and energetic favorability between static molecular structures, evaluating interactions like hydrogen bonds, van der Waals forces and hydrophobic contacts.

Methods

Involves structure preparation (addition of hydrogens, charge assignment), search algorithms (geometric hashing, Monte Carlo, genetic algorithms), and scoring functions to evaluate binding poses.

Applications

Used in high-throughput virtual screening, protein–protein interaction analysis, and enzyme-substrate modeling.

Limitations

Lacks molecular flexibility, leading to inaccuracies when conformational changes occur upon binding; may oversimplify solvent effects and rely heavily on approximate scoring functions.

Flexible Docking

Flexible docking allows conformational flexibility in the ligand, receptor, or both, making it more realistic and accurate than rigid docking. It models the induced-fit phenomenon, where structural adjustments occur during binding.

Principle

Accounts for the dynamic behavior of molecules, predicting both the binding pose and conformational adaptations upon interaction.

Methods

Includes conformational sampling, flexible docking algorithms, induced-fit modeling (side-chain or backbone movements), and energy-based scoring considering solvation and strain energies.

Applications

Extensively used in drug discovery, lead optimization and modeling enzyme–inhibitor or receptor–ligand interactions, helping to elucidate binding mechanisms.

Limitations

Computationally expensive due to extensive sampling; accuracy depends on the scoring function and 3 of conformational exploration.

Semi-Flexible Docking

Semi-flexible docking serves as a compromise between rigid and fully flexible docking, allowing flexibility in one component (either ligand or receptor) while keeping the other rigid.

Principle

Recognizes that only one molecule-usually the ligand-undergoes significant conformational change, balancing accuracy and computational cost.

Methods

Employs ligand conformational sampling (rotatable bonds), soft docking (tolerating minor steric clashes), or limited induced-fit for specific residues.

Applications

Commonly used in structure-based drug design and virtual screening, especially for enzyme–substrate and receptor-ligand systems.

Limitations

Excludes flexibility in one partner, potentially missing key conformational effects; computationally heavier than rigid docking but less demanding than fully flexible approaches[4].

Preparation of Molecular Docking

Receptor Selection and Preparation

Accurate docking results depend heavily on the quality of the receptor's structure. This process involves obtaining the protein structure, optimizing it, minimizing structural issues and identifying the binding site.

Protein Structure Source

Protein structures are obtained from the Protein Data Bank (PDB) through X-ray crystallography, NMR spectroscopy, or cryo-electron microscopy. When experimental structures are not available, homology modelling is used, involving template selection, sequence alignment, model building, and structural validation.

Optimization and Minimization

After retrieval or modelling, the receptor is optimized to fix irregularities such as missing hydrogens, unresolved side chains, or steric clashes. Polar hydrogen atoms are added, followed by energy minimization using force fields like CHARMM, AMBER, or GROMOS to achieve a stable conformation.

Active/Binding Site Identification

Binding sites can be derived from co-crystallized ligands in the PDB or determined using biochemical/mutagenesis data. Computational tools like CASTp, Sitemap, or Metapocket predict cavities based on geometry and physicochemical features. A grid box is defined around the site for docking.

Ligand Selection and Preparation

The accuracy of docking results is also greatly influenced by the quality of the input ligand, which must be in the correct structural, conformational and chemical state.

Structure Database

Ligands are retrieved from databases such as PubChem, ZINC, ChEMBL, or Drug Bank, selected based on pharmacological activity, diversity and drug-likeness. Custom ligand libraries may be created for virtual screening.

Conformation Analysis

Flexible ligands adopt multiple conformations. Analyses via systematic or random searches, or molecular dynamics, generate ensembles of favourable states.

Protonation State

Correct protonation states at physiological pH are essential for proper hydrogen bonding and electrostatics. Tools like Epik, PROPKA, or MOE predict ionization states.

Tautomerism

Many ligands exist in tautomeric forms, which affect hydrogen-bonding and binding properties. Proper tautomer selection ensures biologically relevant interaction forms[5].

Docking algorithm and Scoring function

Docking algorithms employ search strategies: genetic algorithms, Monte Carlo, particle swarm optimization, grid-based methods.

Machine learning improves scoring by capturing complex interaction from large databases of protein-ligand complexes[6].

Approaches of molecular docking

Molecular docking can be performed using two main approaches: simulation and shape complementarity, both aiming to predict ligand-target interactions but differing in methodology.

Simulation Approach

This method starts with the ligand and target at a set distance, allowing the ligand to move into the target's pocket through a series of conformational changes. Movements include internal torsional rotations and external rigid-body rotations/translations, with each move generating a total system energy. It supports ligand flexibility and offers realistic molecular recognition but can be computationally intensive. Advances in optimization and grid-based tools have improved its efficiency.

Shape Complementarity Approach

Here, docking is based on matching the structural features of the ligand and target surfaces. The target's solvent-accessible surface is compared with complementary ligand features and hydrophobicity is considered for protein targets. This approach is fast and reliable, capable of scanning thousands of ligands in seconds to locate potential binding pockets[8].

Application of molecular docking

Molecular docking is widely applied in biomedical and pharmaceutical research, particularly in structure-based drug design, virtual screening, protein-protein and protein-nucleic acid interaction studies and enzyme-inhibitor investigations. In structure-based drug design, docking predicts how small molecules bind within a protein's active site, aiding in the design of more specific and effective drugs. In virtual screening, large chemical libraries are computationally scanned to identify promising binders, reducing time and cost in lead discovery. Docking also models protein-protein and protein-nucleic acid associations, improving understanding of complex biological processes and enabling new therapeutic strategies. For enzyme-inhibitor studies, docking predicts inhibitor binding modes to guide potency and selectivity optimization. Overall, it acts as a bridge between computational modeling and experimental validation, accelerating modern drug discovery and molecular biology research[9].

Molecular docking challenge and limitations

Molecular docking is a key computational tool for predicting protein–ligand interactions, offering a cost-effective alternative to experimental methods.

However, challenges remain due to protein and ligand flexibility, solvent effects and limitations in scoring function accuracy. Current docking methods struggle with computational efficiency, binding pose prediction, and reliance on static protein structures. Advances are focused on improving ligand sampling, modelling induced fit, and refining scoring schemes for better accuracy. Emerging research also targets covalent docking to model irreversible ligand-protein interactions more effectively[10].

Future Challenges in Molecular Docking

Growth of Drug Discovery Informatics
Synergistic Aspects in Pharmacology
Improvement of Structural Databases
Reproducibility and Standardization
Docking Ensembles and Protein Flexibility
Role of Water and Physiological Factors
Multidomain Proteins and Folding Complexity[10].

Table No.1: Docking algorithm and Scoring function

S.No	Category	Features	Examples approaches
1	Empirical	Energy evaluation**,** empirical force-fields	Auto Dock, DOCK
2	Knowledge-based	Derived from know structures	Score-based on PDM
3	Machine learning	Regression, SVM, random forces using datasets	ML-based functions

Table No.2: Molecular docking software and tools[7]

S.No	Software	Main features
1	Auto Dock Vina	Genetic algorithms + empirical scoring
2	GOLD	Genetic optimization, flexible docking
3	DOCK	Grid and shape-match approaches
4	LEDOCK	Geometric matching, optimization
5	FLEXX	lncremental construction algorithm
6	ZDOCK, Patch dock	Rigid body protein docking
7	Glide, ROSETTALIGAND, MCSS, etc.	Specialized algorithms

CONCLUSION

Molecular docking is a key computational tool that predicts ligand-target interactions, aiding rational drug design. It accelerates early drug discovery and minimizes experimental costs. Major challenges include protein flexibility, solvation and scoring function limitations. Advances in machine learning and hybrid methods are enhancing docking accuracy. Its applications now extend to protein-protein, nucleic acid and personalized medicine research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to express their sincere gratitude to Dr. K.V. Subbareddy Institute of Pharmacy, Dupadu, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh, India for providing necessary facilities to carry out this review work.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

We declare that we have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Meng X Y, Zhang H X, Mezei M, Cui M. Molecular docking: A powerful approach for structure-based drug discovery, *Current Computer-Aided Drug Design*, 7(2), 2011, 146-157.
2. Mobley D L, Gilson M K. Predicting binding free energies: Frontiers and benchmarks, *Annual Review of Biophysics*, 46(1), 2017, 531-558.
3. Bohm H J, Klebe G. What can we learn from molecular recogniti on in protein-ligand complexes for the design of new drugs? *Angewandte Chemie International Edition in English*, 35(22), 1996, 2588-2614.

4. Min D, Li F, Ali M, Zhang X, Liu Y. Application of methyl jasmonate to control chilling tolerance of postharvest fruit and vegetables: A meta-analysis and eliciting metabolism review, *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition,* 64(33), 2024, 12878-12891.
5. Forli S, Olson A J. A force field with discrete displaceable waters and desolvation entropy for hydrated ligand docking, *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry,* 55(2), 2012, 623-638.
6. Kodchakorn K, Poovorawan Y, Suwannakarn K, Kongtawelert P. Molecular modelling investigation for drugs and nutraceuticals against protease of SARS-CoV-2, *Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling,* 101, 2020, 107717.
7. Velavan S, Karnan R, Kanivalan N. A comparative study on in silico software's in statistical relation to molecular docking scores, *Asian J Innov Res,* 5(2), 2020, 1-5.
8. Lamb M L, Jorgensen W L. Computational approaches to molecular recognition, *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology,* 1(4), 1997, 449-457.
9. Ferreira L G, Dos Santos R N, Oliva G, Andricopulo A D. Molecular docking and structure-baseddrug design strategies, *Molecules,* 20(7), 2015, 13384-13421.
10. Pagadala N S, Syed K, Tuszynski J. Software for molecular docking: A review, *Biophysical Reviews,* 9(2), 2017, 91-102.

Please cite this article in press as: Saritha Karnati and Snehalatha J. A review on computational approaches in molecular docking, *Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis and Medicinal Chemistry,* 13(2), 2025, 39-44.