Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationship of Tricyclic Carbapenems: Application of Artificial Intelligence Methods for Bioactivity Prediction*
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Resistance to antibiotics in bacterial population has widened the interest of scientific community for development of novel therapeutic compounds. Penicillins and cephalosporins which share the β-lactam structural moiety form the most abundant group of antibiotics on the market. Their recently developed tricyclic analogues have shown remarkable bioactivity towards broad spectrum of bacterial species. In a series of 52 tricyclic carbapenems represented by the 180'dimensional «spectrum-like» representation we studied the structure-activity relationships by application of an artificial neural network. The molecular structure representation by spectral intensity values served as inputs into the counter-propagation artificial neural network (CP-ANN). SIMPLEX optimization was carried out to obtain the best ANN model and a genetic algorithm approach was subsequently used to simultaneously minimize the number of variables. Thus, a search for the substituents that predominantly influence the experimental bioactivity was performed.
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The constructed CP-ANN model yielded bioactivity values predictions with a correlation coefficient of 0.88, with their values extended over 4 orders of magnitude. The list of substituents selected by our automatic procedure can be compared with the data obtained by protein crystallography of the $\beta$-lactam inhibitors in complex with D,D-peptidase enzyme.
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INTRODUCTION

Resistance to antibiotics is currently one of the major issues in modern therapy of infectious disease.$^{1,2}$ Since the discovery of penicillin more than half a century ago the $\beta$-lactam structures have played the central role in the most important antibiotics on the market. The nonselective and abundant use of antibiotics has caused the spread of bacterial resistance to antibiotics of penicillin and cephalosporin core structural moieties. Recently discovered carbapenem $\beta$-lactams with additional 5,6 or 7-membered ring fused to the penicillin 5-membered ring as a scaffold which possess interesting and broad spectrum antibiotic activity has prompted us to apply artificial intelligence methodology to study quantitative structure-activity relationship in this series in order to get insight into which structural features of these analogues relate to their bioactivity.

The goal of producing high-affinity ligands to target protein molecules requires the understanding of relationship between chemical structure and their properties called structure-activity relationships (SAR).$^3$ Several methods have been instrumental in explicit understanding of SARs, most notably molecular modeling$^4,5$ and comparative molecular field analysis (COMFA).$^6$ Alternatively, principles of artificial intelligence have been put to valuable use for such purpose.$^7$ In particular, artificial neural networks as source of a model for SAR coupled with the concept of evolutionary programming (genetic algorithms) as model optimisation technique has recently been put for-
ward and used in a variety of examples such as spectroscopy applications, and SAR in various inhibitor-enzyme systems such as protein tyrosine kinase and thrombin. In this work we extend the methodology with two novel algorithmic steps: (i) the spectrum like chemical structure representation was used to provide a uniform variable dimensionality and enhance the ease of variable manipulation by uniform length vector like description of molecules and (ii) SIMPLEX method was used to optimise the ANN model i.e. the selection of variables was optimized. The genetic algorithm approach was used in the final step (iii) to reduce the number of variables and obtain the correlation of substituent position on the molecular scaffold which was correlated with the bioactivity of the series of analogues. These steps are described in more detail in the Methods section below. The resulting ANN models and their variable reduction by the use of GA are given in the Results and Discussion section where we also compare the computed bioactivity values with their experimental counterparts for the test and control set of compounds which were previously not used in either training or testing procedures.

METHODS

The method used in the present work is described below and consists of the following steps:

Data Set Preparation

A complete search of the CAS Registry database was first carried out to identify all tricyclic carbapenems with a measured antibiotic activity. 74 compounds had data on structure and measured antibiotic activity of a total of 65 different bacterial strains was published. The antibiotic activity expressed as MIC (minimal inhibitory concentration) and measured for the bacterial strain Clostridium perfringens 615E was chosen as our data base since the bioactivity data were available for the largest number of, and structurally most diverse set of compounds. In Table I the biological and structural data on 52 compounds were collated.

Structurally, the compounds belong to 12 different tricyclic skeletons represented in Figure 2 which have the ring C (see Figure 1) fused to the carbapenem nucleus and are substituted with substituents R1-R6. The fused ring can have a heteroatom substituted at various positions of this ring (rings C3-C10). In column 2 of Table II the value of index i represents the type of ring C as given in Figure 2.

Chemical Structure Representation

3D structures of compounds can be alternatively represented by the recently introduced spectral representation. Such representation is reversible, unique and uniform and due to its vectorial bit-like nature is particularly suitable for further
use in artificial network models and genetic algorithms which require a uniform number of variables (descriptors) for each chemical structure. The structure of a molecule with \( N \) atoms in three dimensions where \( N \) can vary depending on the compound structure is transformed to a \( m \)-dimensional vector with components of variable intensity but of constant length \( m \). The intensity is a function of position of a given atom relative to the chosen origin and charge on the atom. The compounds in our data set are particularly amenable for use of this representation since a large part of the molecule is identical in all compounds and the structure of the molecules in the set relatively rigid. This property is desirable since it simplifies the choice of the origin and eliminates the need for extensive and error-prone dihedral angle optimization procedures for each compound.

**Compound Structure Optimization**

A standard AM1 method as available in the computer program package Spartan\textsuperscript{39} was utilized to compute the minimal energy geometry of all the molecules.
TABLE I

Antibiotic activity expressed as MIC values in strain *C. perfringens* 615E for the data set of 52 tricyclic carbapenems (Refs 15–34). In column 2 the value of index *i* represents the type of ring C as given in Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>MIC μg mL⁻¹</th>
<th>R₁</th>
<th>R₂</th>
<th>R₃</th>
<th>R₄</th>
<th>R₅</th>
<th>R₆</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>≤0.01</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂F</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>≤0.01</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂I</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>NHCH₂-C₆H₅</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂OCH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂C≡N</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂CH₂OH</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂N=N+=N–</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂N=N+=N–</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>NHCH₂-C₆H₄-p-NO₂</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>NHCH₂-C₆H₄-p-SO₂⁻</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-NHCH₂CH=CH₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>NHCH(CH₃)-C₆H₄-p-NO₂</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂OH</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂CH₂NH₂</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂CH₂N=N+=N–</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>NHCH₂-C₆H₄-p-F</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N(CH₃)CH=NH</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>≤0.12</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N(CH₃)C(=O)NH₂</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>≤0.12</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N(CH₃)C(=O)NHCH₂H₅</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>≤0.12</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N(CH₃)C(=O)NH(t-Bu)</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>≤0.12</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N(CH₃)C(=O)NHCH₂CH₂OH</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂NH₂</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂NHCH=NH</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂NHC(=N=H)CH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₂CH₂N(CH₃)₃</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>NHCH=NCH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>NHCH₂-C₆H₅(m-NO₂-p-Cl)</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mullikan charge distribution was computed in each molecule to supplement the spectral representation of compounds as described above and in Ref. 38. The width of lines in the spectral representation of compounds is dependent on atomic charges.

**Application of an Artificial Neural Network Yields a Nonreduced QSAR Model**

**ANN Training Step**

In house written CP-ANN and genetic algorithm packages\(^40\) were used for these tasks.

The spectral values for the \(m\)-dimensional vector served as inputs for a counter-propagation artificial neural network\(^41\) (CP-ANN). We have chosen \(m = 180\) in order to compromise between the number of atoms in the compounds of the series \((N < 60)\) and the number of variables used for correlation of bioactivity with structure.
This method was demonstrated previously to give better results than the similar back-propagation ANN if the number of items in the database is small as is the case with a small number of molecules \( n = 52 \) in our data set.

The leave-one-out cross-validation (LOO CV) test trained the network using the data for \( n-1 \) compounds and predicted the experimental antibiotic activity value for the \( n \)-th compound. This procedure was repeated \( n \) times yielding the list of \( n \) predictions. These predictions were ordered by difference between the experimental and computed bioactivity \( \Delta \). The first 22 compounds with largest absolute value of \( \Delta \) were put in the training set taking into account the fact that the training set should contain as many compounds as possible to fully cover the entire information space and the remaining 30 compounds were sequentially stored in training, test and prediction set, respectively. In order to carry out the subsequent genetic algorithm (GA) procedure the compounds were thus divided into three groups: (i) a training set comprising 32 inhibitors, (ii) a test set of 10 inhibitors and (iii) a prediction set of 10 inhibitors. The initially removed prediction set provided a means to test the quality of the final model and did not influence either the determination of CP ANN model parameters like number of training epochs, number of neurons, maximal and minimal learning rates, etc., or the next step of the procedure in which the selection of variables with GA is performed (step (e) below).\(^{35}\)

The CP-ANN procedure was performed on the training set of 32 molecules and the antibiotic activity values in the test set of \( N = 10 \) compounds were predicted by the network as described below. During the training the weights of the winning neuron and close neighbours are corrected in small steps and thus in the last cycle they are completely adapted to the input object. By training the network we obtained a model whose prediction ability is determined by checking it with the test objects.

**ANN Testing Step**

The testing procedure is as follows: each test object \( X \) first finds (Figure 3) in the upper (Kohonen) layer the most similar neuron. The corresponding weight at the position \( j_x, j_y \) in the lower (output) layer gives the predicted target value.

The difference between target \( T \) and the predicted property \( P \) is squared and summed over all objects of the test set to give the PRESS (predicted residual errors sum of squares) measure of error. The regression equation linking theoretical and predicted properties is also determined. The correlation coefficient \( r \) derived from this equation represents the quality measure of the proposed model.

**Representation Reduction by Use of GA Approach**

In the last step of the present algorithm the complete representation of all compounds in the data set was reduced to its most relevant part by the use of a genetic algorithm.

A genetic algorithm consists of three basic processes mimicking Darwinian evolution: crossover, mutation and selection. In the crossover step, new chromosomes are generated by mixing those of the parents. In the mutation step, individual bits of the chromosome are exchanged at random and, in the selection step the best chromosomes are identified for the next round.

This last step should yield the lowest possible number of bits in the compound vector representation which gives a satisfactory prediction for biological activity for
each individual compound in the data set. The number of input parameters (180) representing the spectrum like code determines the length of the chromosome in bits. In our specific example the 180 components which represent each molecule in its spectrum-like representation were reduced to a few which provide the maximal influence on the experimentally determined antibiotic activity of the compound.

The following selection procedure was implemented: each bit in the allele could take a value of 0 or 1. A value of 1 was used to assign the spectral intensity value at a point in the model while the value of 0 described the lack of taking into account this value in a substituent of the compound.

A pool of 100 chromosomes was tested using a random choice of the points on the surface. For each chromosome a CP-ANN model was obtained and simultaneously

Figure 3. Schematic representation of a counter-propagation artificial neural network (CP ANN) used for predicting biological property (target T) from molecular structure (X) represented with 180 values of «spectrum like» intensity as described in the text above. During the training the weights (W) of the winning neuron (the winning neuron is determined with the position (jx, jy) in the Kohonen layer according to the similarity between the object (X, i = 1...180) and the neuron's weights (Wjxjyi, i = 1...180)) are adapted step by step, in learning cycles, to the compounds of the object.
the reduction of vector length was performed. These vectors with reduced length in
the training set of compounds were used for training the CP-ANN. The quality of
each such chromosome representation was again determined by PRESS in the test
set. The best chromosomes were crossed over (mutated) and in the new pool of 100
chromosomes the new pattern representation was tested for quality. This procedure
was repeated 200 times and thus in each generation a more representative pattern
was obtained. Finally, the resulting optimized model CP-ANN incorporates the abil-
ity to predict the antibiotic activity of the compound.

Figure 4. Schematic representation of GA procedure. The 180-dimensional chromosomes
are ordered according to the fitness function obtained from a CP-ANN model (PRESS of bi-
ological activity expressed as log MIC value of 10 test compounds). The cross-over event
is shown on the first two chromosomes. Black and white squares indicate values 1 or 0
for individual chromosomes’ compounds (genes). In order to present the difference be-
tween two parent chromosomes which produce two offspring chromosomes the white
genes of one of them were labeled gray. See Ref. 12 and text for additional explanation.
In order to systematically vary the variables which determine the genetic algorithm (size of ANN, the representation length, number of iterations (epochs), speed of learning, number of generations in the algorithms, choice of bits out of 180 possible and mutation probability) SIMPLEX optimization was used. This method proved very useful for simultaneous optimization of a small number of variables.7

Five ANN and GA parameters were adjusted in the course of Simplex optimization: number of neurons in the ANN (range from \(4 \times 4\) to \(8 \times 8\)), learning rate constant (from 0.1 to 0.9), number of epochs for training (from 160–640), number of starting bits in each chromosome turned on (from 3–30) and elitist rate (number of survivals from 3–30). Other parameters were constant: numbers and selection of objects in the training, test, and control sets for ANN modeling, number of 180-bit chromosomes in the pool (100), number of generations in each GA run (200), probabilities for mutation (0.005), cross-over was made exactly once at each 180 genes (bits) long chromosome.

For each Simplex point, defined by the above five parameters, a complete GA optimization consisting of 200 generation of the 100 chromosome pool each having 180 bits was made. The fitness function from which the survival chance of each chromosome was calculated was the RMS of the particular CP ANN model determined by the differences between the predictions and actual activities on the control set of 10 compounds. Each CP ANN model was based on different number of intensities in the spectrum-like representation. The selection of the intensities is determined by the bits turned »on« in the chromosome which in turn depends on the cross-over, mutation and selection procedure during the next chromosome pool generation of the GA.

In order to determine one optimization criterion of a single Simplex point 20,000 CP ANN models were generated and tested. For each GA run all CP ANNs have the same number of neurons, but different numbers of weight. Hence, the number of weights to be adjusted varied from \(3 \times 3 \times 3 = 27\) to \(3 \times 3 \times 30 = 270\) in the case of the smallest \(3 \times 3\) ANN to \(8 \times 8 \times 3 = 192\) to \(8 \times 8 \times 30 = 1920\) in the case of the largest \(8 \times 8\) ANN, respectively. To achieve the convergence for each ANN at least 160 epochs of training containing of 32 spectra were employed.

The GA and ANN computer routines were integrated into a single home made PC resident Fortran program. Due to its extreme simplicity the Simplex determination of the parameters for each next point were made by hand. Altogether 252 Simplex points or simplex movements from six different starting positions were tested. The contraction of simplex close to the local optima was made by a factor of 0.5.45

This means that in the entire optimization procedure about 5,000,000 CP ANN models were inspected.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*Model Optimization Using the ANN Approach*

In Figure 5 the spectrum-like representation for is shown for molecule 1 of the data set. The unreduced length of this representation gives the complete chemical structure of the molecule as a 2D plot in which intensities of each component give the presence or absence of a substituent in given position on the tricylic skeleton.
The selection of most relevant variables for the structure-activity relationship using a combination of ANN and GA algorithms as outlined above in the Methods section has two goals: (i) to reduce the dimension of the representation vectors (in our case, from 180 to 10–20) and (ii) to correlate the selected variables with a possible biochemical mechanism underlying antibiotic bioactivity of the tricylic carbapenem analogues in the series.

The accuracy of the results shows that this approach can result in a valuable description of the relationship between structure and bioactivity.

Figure 6 shows how selection of the training set on the basis of CV-LOO (leave one out) was performed on the experimental data set of 52 molecules and with 180 long representation of their structure. In order to select the compounds for the training set in an optimal way, a compound causing a large prediction error in LOO CV should be included in the training-set since it contains structural and property information that is more important in comparison with other compounds from the data set.

The final model is thus sensitive to the elimination of such unique compounds from the training set. The same division of the compounds into training and test sets was used to calculate the optimization criterion in the GA step which was then applied in order to select variables from the 180-dimensional structure representation vectors.
Thus, this intermediate CP ANN model generated from the non-reduced 180 dimensional structure representation provides the proof of concept that antibiotic activity for compounds in the test set can be predicted with the reasonable accuracy. It has to be stressed that these results are not describing the final CP ANN model. The ANN parameters are further changed during the GA procedure and these parameters then describe the final CP ANN model for the reduced representation.

Reducing the Representation Using GA

By application of the genetic algorithm procedure a selection of the variables (vector components) with the largest influence on the prediction ability is obtained, i.e. those having the largest influence on antibiotic activity of the compounds.

The optimization criterion in the GA algorithm was the correlation of the experimental MIC values for 10 test compounds with those predicted by a CP ANN model which was trained with 32 compounds. As shown in the Table II, 12 to 19 variables (denominated as »bits«, see also description of a genetic algorithm procedure in the Methods section) out of 180 were selected. The corresponding correlation coefficients are also shown in the Table II.
The best correlation was obtained if the molecular structure was represented by the 15 variables. This reduced model gave the following statistical values for the training and test set, respectively:

\[
R_{\text{train}} = 0.99, \quad \text{RMS}_{\text{train}} = 0.22, \quad R_{\text{test}} = 0.88, \quad \text{RMS}_{\text{test}} = 0.68 \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{RMS}_{\text{train}} / R_{\text{train}}) \times (\text{RMS}_{\text{test}} / R_{\text{test}}) = 0.17.
\]

Using the resulting reduced representation the final correlation results are given in Figure 7. The correlation of experimental biological activity

---

**TABLE II**

Summary of reduced representations given by GA procedure for the 20 experiments performed in the present work. The reduced representations are chosen with 12 to 19 bits from the full spectral length of 180 bits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>$R_{\text{train}}$</th>
<th>RMS$_{\text{train}}$</th>
<th>$R_{\text{test}}$</th>
<th>RMS$_{\text{test}}$</th>
<th>Bits</th>
<th>$\frac{\text{RMS}<em>{\text{train}}}{R</em>{\text{train}}} \times \frac{\text{RMS}<em>{\text{test}}}{R</em>{\text{test}}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>3.628</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>5.183</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>4.298</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>1.559</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with computed bioactivity is shown for the training set \((N = 32, \text{symbol } \Delta_1)\) and for the test set \((N = 11, \text{symbol } \leftarrow)\). The final predictions for the non-biased set of 10 compounds (prediction set) which were excluded from any optimization since the start of the procedure are given in Figure 7 with symbols O.

![Figure 7. Correlation between computed and experimental bioactivity for the data set of 52 tricyclic carbapenem: predicted values are given by using the model based on the reduced representation obtained by the GA (see also Table II).](image)

The reduced representation is expressed as a chromosome with the best fit value given by the PRESS value. In our case the chromosome with the best fit value of 0.17 has 15 genes turned to 1, which means that 15 of the selected variables contain a large amount of information for predicting the biological activity of the compounds under investigation. These 15 variables were analysed and found to originate from atoms present in substituents at position \(R_4\) and \(R_5\). Not all substituents determined by GA from the reduced representation were represented with equal frequency. Those that appeared the most frequently in the reduced representations (the data are given for the best 7 representations) are shown in Figure 8.

Thus, by conversion of the most populated angular frequencies in the spectrum-like structure representation yielded by this computational proce-
Figure 8. The most relevant directions with respect to the skeleton of the tricyclic carbapenem (coordinate system is shown in the insert). Seven best representations are shown. The important directions are in the 1st (0–90 degrees) and 4th (270–360 degrees) quadrant. See text for discussion.

Figure 9. Molecule 41 with best bioactivity MIC > 32.0 μmol in the series as represented with the spectral-like and reduced representation obtained by the GA procedure.
dure into three dimensional molecular structure we obtain a valuable insight into structure-activity relationship of tricyclic carbapenems. Molecule 41 with best bioactivity MIC > 32.0 μmol in the series as represented with the spectral-like and reduced representation obtained by the GA procedure is shown in Figure 9. The substituent OCH₂CH₂OCH₃ in position R₅ covers spectral directions in the 1st and 4th quadrant and the position of this substituent in three-dimensional space is shown in Figure 8 above.

Furthermore, such procedure appears to provide a valuable model for design of novel tricyclic carbapenems based on correlating the experimental antibiotic bioactivities with their structure.35,45

CONCLUSIONS

We have used a variety of the artificial intelligence armory to obtain the model for correlation of experimental antibiotic bioactivity in a series of 52 tricyclic carbapenems with their threedimensional structure. A combination of ANN and GA based on spectrum-like representation of molecules in the data set yields good statistical values for this description. Such a model can be used for design of novel inhibitors of the target enzyme in question, D,D peptidase, whose active site is inhibited in order to stop the formation of the outer cell membrane in the bacterial cells.
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ANN – artificial neural network
CP – counter-propagation
GA – genetic algorithm
PRESS – predicted residual errors sum of squares
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SAŽETAK

Kvantitativni odnos struktura in aktivnosti troprstnih karbapenema: Primjena metoda umjetne inteligencije za predviđanje bioaktivnosti

Mira Lebez, Tom Šolmajer i Jure Zupan

Rezistencija bakterija na antibiotike privukla je pažnjo znanstvenika, ki rade na razvoju novih terapeutskih spojev. Največa skupina antibiotika na tržištu so penicilini in cefalosporini, ki imajo isto β-laktamsko strukturalno jedinstvo. Njihovi nedavno odkriveni troprstni analozi so izvanredno aktivni prema širokem spektru bakterijalnih vrst. Niz od 52 troprstnih karbapenema prikazanih s pomočjo 180-dimenzionalne »spectru nalik« reprezentacije so iz študije odnos strukturne in aktivnosti s pomočjo neuronske mreže. Prikaz molekulske strukturi s pomočjo razreditev simetričnih intenzitet poslužil je kot vodilni podatki za neuronsko mrežo. Provedena SIMPLEX optimizacija je pripisana najboljši rezultati modelu, a zatem je upotrijebljen genetički algoritam za simulirano smanjivanje broja varijabilnosti. Tako je bila potrjena stvarnost predviđanja so stvarnost eksperimentalnega, dobitnih CP-ANN model model povečanje bioaktivnosti s koeficientom korelacije od 0,88, v nasprotju s medvijemenostjo od preko 4 reda večina. Lista supstituenata, ki so ali odgovarjali njihovim automatnim postopkom uporabljene so s podatci dobivenimi kristalografijom β-laktamskih inhibitorov v kompleksu s enzimom D,D-peptidazom.