



**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES**
[ISSN: 0975-4725; CODEN(USA): IJPS00]
Journal Homepage: <https://www.ijpsjournal.com>



Review Article

Harnessing Artificial Intelligence in Drug Discovery: A Comprehensive Review of Applications, Challenges, and Future Prospects

Chetana Sancheti*, Ganesh Basarkar

Department Of Pharmaceutics, SNJB's Sureshdada Jain College of Pharmacy, Chandwad Nashik, Maharashtra India.

ARTICLE INFO

Published: 03 June 2025

Keywords:

Neural Networks,
Pharmaceutical R&D,
QSAR modeling, Drug
Discovery, Deep Learning,
Virtual Screening, Artificial
Intelligence, Precision
Medicine

DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.15584341

ABSTRACT

Drug development is being revolutionized by artificial intelligence (AI), which provides quicker, more precise, and more economical alternatives to conventional techniques. Quick data analysis, predictive modelling, and virtual screening using machine learning (ML), deep learning (DL), and neural networks are all made possible by AI, which is completely changing how researchers identify potential drugs and assess toxicity. This review highlights the core concepts and practical applications of AI in pharmaceutical research, such as platforms that improve molecular design and pharmacological profiling. Issues including interpretability, data limitations, and ethical concerns persist despite AI's enormous promise. With sustained progress and interdisciplinary cooperation, AI is expected to play an essential part in personalized medicine and developing drugs in years to come.

INTRODUCTION

AI has recently gained a lot of attention in drug development as a promising tool for pharmaceutical companies^[1]. The lengthy and difficult process of finding and developing new drugs, known as drug discovery, has historically relied on time-consuming methods like experiments research and rapid screening. However, by enabling more accurate and efficient

processing of vast amounts of data, AI-based techniques like machine learning (ML) and natural language processing provide the potential to improve and speed up this process^[2]. According to the experts' recent descriptions, deep learning (DL) has been effectively used to accurately predict a drug's effectiveness^[3]. AI-based techniques have also been used for forecasting the potential danger of medication alternatives^[4]. Research has demonstrated that AI can enhance

*Corresponding Author: Chetana Sancheti

Address: Department Of Pharmaceutics, SNJB's Sureshdada Jain College of Pharmacy, Chandwad Nashik, Maharashtra India.

Email : chetanasanchetip@gmail.com

Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.



the efficiency and efficacy of medication creation operations. But employing AI to develop new bioactive compounds has limitations and challenges. It will need additional research and ethical concerns to fully understand the advantages and limitations of AI in this area^[5]. AI is expected to play a significant role in the creation of innovative drugs and treatments in the decades to come, despite these challenges.

Artificial Intelligence: Essential Knowledge

The pharmaceutical sector has experienced a significant increase in data digitization lately. However, digitization also presents the challenge of understanding, assessing, and utilizing such data for complex clinical problems^[6]. Because AI can manage huge quantities of data more effortlessly, this encourages adoption^[7]. Artificial intelligence (AI) is a technological system that uses a range of complex tools and networks to simulate human intelligence. However, it does not endanger people's physical presence^[8, 9]. In order to make decisions and accomplish preset objectives, artificial intelligence (AI) uses hardware and software that can evaluate, understand, and learn from data entered. This article describes how its applications in the pharmaceutical sector are gradually growing. Rapid advancements in AI-guided technology are expected to drastically change how humans think about work, according to the McKinsey Global Institute^[10,11].

AI: networks and tools

Along with thinking, representation of knowledge, and solution search, artificial intelligence (AI) includes a core paradigm of machine learning (ML). An area of machine learning (ML) is deep learning (DL), which makes use of artificial neural networks (ANNs). They form an intricate system of interconnected computer components that

simulate the passage of electrical impulses in the human cerebral cortex through "perceptions," which are similar to neurons that exist in humans^[12]. Artificial neural networks (ANNs) are collections of networks that receive different inputs, solve problems using algorithms, and then both single-link or multi-link inputs are translated to output^[13]. Artificial neural networks (ANNs) come in a wide variety of forms, such as recurrent neural networks (RNNs), convolutional neural networks (CNNs), and multilayer perceptron (MLP) networks. There are two methods for training these networks: guided and unsupervised^[14]. Often trained with one-way supervised training processes, the MLP network can be used as a generalized classifier. Among its applications are controls, process identification, pattern recognition, and optimization tools^[15]. Closed-loop reinforcement neural networks (RNNs), such as Hopfield networks and Boltzmann constants, are capable of learning and remembering information^[16,17]. The structure of CNNs sets them apart as a type of dynamic system with local connections. complicated signal processing, biological system modelling, image and video processing, identifying patterns, and the processing of complicated brain functions are some of their possible applications^[18]. ADALINE connections, Kohonen associations, RBF connections, LVQ connections, and counter-propagation networks are some of the more complex varieties^[19]. These networks serve as the foundation for the main architecture of AI systems, and numerous tools have been created using them. A typical instance of such a tool is the IBM Watson supercomputer, which was created with AI technology (IBM, New York, USA). It was developed to make it easier to examine an individual's medical records and how they link to a sizable database, which ultimately leads to suggestions for cancer treatment regimens. This approach can also be used for rapid sickness



detection. It demonstrated this by detecting breast cancer in 60 seconds ^[20].

The shortcomings of the current drug discovery methodologies

These days, medicinal chemistry approaches mostly rely on trial-and-error methodology and extensive testing processes ^[21]. These methods help analyze many potential drug molecules to find ones with the desired properties. However, they can be costly, take a lot of time, and sometimes give unreliable results ^[22]. Challenges like limited access to suitable test compounds and the difficulty of accurately predicting their physical behaviour can also create barriers in the drug discovery process^[23]. These problems could be resolved by a variety of AI computations, including reinforcement learning, both supervised and unsupervised learning, and adaptive or rule-driven techniques. These methods can be used in a variety of drug research domains and typically rely on the examination of huge datasets ^[24]. When forecasting the toxicity and efficacy of novel medicinal drugs, these approaches in particular are more accurate and successful than traditional methods^[25]. Furthermore, new objectives for medication development, such particular proteins or genetic pathways associated to diseases, may be uncovered by AI-based methods ^[26]. AI has the ability to advance research on drugs exceeding the bounds of traditional techniques, resulting in the creation of innovative and more effective drugs ^[27-28]. Even if they occasionally work, conventional drug development methods frequently rely on trial-and-error testing and have trouble accurately estimating how highly active molecules would behave in the body ^[29]. Artificial intelligence, on the other hand, can improve drug development's speed and accuracy, raising the likelihood of finding superior therapies.

AI METHODS AND TOOLS FOR DRUG DETECTION

Utilizing AI for drug discovery

The synthesis of numerous medicinal compounds is encouraged by the large chemical space of roughly 1060 molecules^[30]. The production of drugs is constrained by a lack of sophisticated technology, making it a costly and time-consuming endeavour. AI can help alleviate this issue ^[31]. In addition to identifying hit and lead compounds, artificial intelligence (AI) can speed up drug target validation and optimize drug structure design ^[32]. Despite its advantages, AI still has to handle large amounts of data, especially data that is diverse, growing, and ambiguous. It can be challenging for standard algorithms for machine learning to effectively manage the enormous datasets that pharmaceutical companies frequently have access to, which comprise millions of chemical components. Quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR)-based simulations may rapidly estimate fundamental properties for a variety of molecules, such as log P or log D. These models are still unable to accurately forecast intricate biological activities, such as the overall efficacy of a medication or possible adverse effects. Limited training data, incorrect experimental inputs, and inadequate experimental validation are further difficulties facing QSAR models. Applying cutting-edge AI techniques, such deep learning, to analyze massive datasets and assess the efficacy and safety of medication molecules can help address these issues. To investigate the advantages of deep learning in drug discovery, Merck started a QSAR-based machine learning competition in 2012. In 15 ADMET datasets (which cover absorption, distribution, metabolism, excretion, and toxicity), the results demonstrated that DL models outperformed conventional machine learning



techniques in terms of outcome prediction^[33]. One may think of the enormous virtual chemical space as a kind of map that illustrates the many molecules' structures and traits. Virtual screening (VS) plays a vital role in identifying potential candidate molecules for further experimental evaluation. Its primary objective is to analyze the spatial distribution of molecules within a given chemical environment to discover biologically active compounds. Researchers can explore numerous chemical databases such as ChemBank, PubChem, DrugBank, and ChemDB for this purpose. Beyond traditional structure-based and ligand-based approaches, various computational strategies within virtual chemical libraries enhance lead profiling, enable rapid exclusion of non-promising compounds, and facilitate more efficient and cost-effective drug candidate selection^[34]. Drug design methods such as charge-based molecular descriptors and chemical structure pattern analysis are used to select lead compounds by evaluating their chemical, biological, and toxicity-related features^[35]. A medicine's intended chemical structure can be predicted using a variety of features, including molecular similarity, the manufacturing process, prediction models, and *in silico* techniques^[36]. Pereira and associates. showed that the DeepVS method performed exceptionally well when tested against 95 000 decoys for the coupling of 40 targets and 2950 agonists^[37]. A different approach used a multiple goals automated substitute system to assess a cyclin-dependent kinase-2 inhibitor's physicochemical properties, medicinal activity, and form similarities in order to optimize its potency profile^[38]. Examples of AI-based QSAR techniques that have evolved from QSAR modelling techniques that can be used to identify new drugs and can be used to speed up QSAR research include decision-tree models, random forests, vector machines, and linear discriminant analysis (LDA)^[39, 40]. Based on biological activity,

anonymous compounds are rated. found that the results of six algorithms based on AI varied not statistically significantly from those of traditional approaches^[41].

ML's Function in Forecasting Drug Toxicity and Efficacy

Artificial intelligence is being used extensively in medicinal chemistry to predict the hazard and beneficial effects of potential therapeutic compounds. Conventional drug development methods often entail a lot of time and effort to evaluate a compound's possible physiological effects. This procedure can be expensive and lengthy, and the results are often unclear and quite unpredictable. These restrictions can be addressed by AI methods such as machine learning. After sorting through vast volumes of data, ML systems are able to identify emerging trends and patterns that individual scientists might overlook. This might enable the proposal of innovative bioactive substances with negligible adverse effects much more quickly than is currently achievable. For instance, the system that uses deep learning was recently programmed with a dataset of well-known medicinal compounds and the biological processes linked to them^[42]. The system then showed a high level of accuracy in forecasting new compounds' activities. Furthermore, great strides have been made in avoiding the toxicity of possible therapeutic substances. These developments require extensive machine learning training on sizable datasets of known dangerous and harmless substances. Finding drug interactions which can occur when a patient is taken many prescriptions for the same or different conditions is another crucial use of AI in drug development. These interactions may result in unanticipated side effects. Artificial intelligence (AI) methods that comb through enormous databases of recorded drug interactions to identify



patterns and developments are able to solve this issue. This has recently been addressed by an ML technique that is utilized to accurately predict reaction times of novel pharmacological pairings^[43]. In the field of personalized healthcare, AI's capacity to recognize probable drug interactions is very important since it enables the development of tailored therapy plans that lower the likelihood of adverse effects. Matching therapy to each patient's distinct characteristics, such as their genetic composition and drug reaction, is the aim of personalized medicine. The aforementioned instances of literature show how using AI in pharmaceutical research could enhance the prediction of the toxicity and efficacy of possible medicinal substances. This can help develop more secure and successful medications and speed up the process of identifying drugs^[44].

AI-Driven Strategies for Novel Drug Design

Since the chemical repertoire of molecule-like drugs is said to be cardinally large, ranging from 1060 to 10100, de novo designs, or the process of creating unique molecule designs with desired pharmaceutical companies' features from scratch^[45], are among the most difficult computer-automated tasks in drug discovery^[46]. Due to the vast diversity of atomic elements and molecular structures that can be explored, the de novo molecular design process often encounters a significant challenge known as the combinatorial explosion^[47]. The de novo drug design process might be led by structural data, receptor information, or some combination of the two methodologies. When considering ligand-based approaches, they are often classified into two major categories: (i) Rule-driven methods assemble predetermined building components, such as chemicals or molecular fragments, using particular synthetic rules. (ii) Rule-free technologies synthesize compounds without

predetermined assembly guidelines. Modern rule-based de novo design has its roots in the Topliss technique^[48], which aims to maximize potency by synthesizing analogs of an active lead molecule incrementally. Current approaches rely on predetermined sets of molecular transformations for optimization, such as general rules for altering the molecular framework and functional group^[49] or matching molecular pairings^[50]. The synthesis-oriented approaches clearly encompass the synthesis principles for element building and ligand the next. These approaches, for instance, can be used to develop artificially public libraries^[51], like CHIPMUNK and BI CLAIM. Since the late 1990s, several integrated computational platforms have been developed to support the generation of novel drug-like molecules. Notable examples include TOPAS (TOPology Assigning System), DOGS (Design of Genuine Structures), and DINGOS (Design of Innovative NCEs Generated by Optimization Strategies). These tools aim to enhance de novo drug design by improving the synthetic accessibility of new compounds while ensuring structural similarity to known bioactive molecules. Each platform employs distinct algorithmic strategies—such as fragment-based assembly, reaction-driven synthesis, and multi-objective optimization—to balance innovation with practicality in medicinal chemistry^[52, 53]. The goal of "rule-free" techniques is to produce desired compounds directly, eliminating the requirement for rules representation using generative deep learning models^[54]. The increasingly popular technique of producing unique structures for molecules by sampling from mathematical simulations has its roots in the 'reverse QSAR' problem, originally suggested by Skvortsova and Zefirov in the first decade of the 1990s^[55]. This method uses current QSAR (Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationship) models to create compounds by selecting attribute values that



correspond to a targeted characteristic or biological activity. There are many issues with the latter methods, such as the difficulty of converting molecular descriptors into valid structures in reverse and the fact that there are multiple solutions for a certain feature. Generative neural networks help solve some drug design problems by finding patterns in existing molecules and using that knowledge to the development of innovative molecules^[56]. Simplified Molecular Input Line Entry Systems (SMILES) are the most widely utilized algorithms for processing human language models^[57]. These models are trained on particular "semantics" (like bioactivity or other desired molecular properties) to comprehend what is called the SMILES "syntax," or the way to generate a scientifically accurate string. The majority of them use recurrent multilayer networks^[58], either in collaboration with reinforcement learning^[58] or transfer^[59]. Other well-known creative instructional techniques based on machine learning, like generative adversarial networks, variational autoencoders^[60], and others based on graph convolutions^[61], have also been described in great detail. Conditional generative techniques, which have been developed more recently, use extra information, including multidimensional framework, molecular attribute values, synthesizability, and resemblance^[62], and gene expression patterns, to direct the design process. One significant obstacle in modern drug discovery is developing well-balanced objective functions capable of handling complex multi-criteria optimization. This includes strategies such as multi-objective trade-off techniques like those based on Pareto efficiency or preference-weighted scoring systems, which are frequently applied in compound selection^[63]. The number of ligand-based designs has considerably grown as a consequence of the quick development of new recurrent neural network technology. A recent investigation found that over 40 novel models

have been created in the past several years^[64]. Researchers are being compelled to fairly and uniformly assess and benchmark generative techniques due to the proliferation of possible drug design tools. Recent efforts that implement both more conventional models (such evolutionary algorithms) and popular neural generative models, and provide several metrics for comparison, are exemplified by the MOSES and GuacaMol platforms. (i) Diversity of scaffolds and fragments; (ii) Researchers frequently compare de novo design techniques to known substances by examining their chemical and physiological features to assess how well they perform, (iii) The novelty and validity of the developed molecules are also examined. However, compared to predictive methods, it is more difficult to assess the effectiveness of these tools once they are put into action. Rules-driven and rule-free design methods are the two primary categories. Rule-based approaches are typically simpler to produce in the lab and can produce molecules with the proper characteristics because they make use of well-known chemical reactions and construction blocks. The rules as well as constructing blocks selected, however, determine the range of molecules they generate. Since rule-free approaches don't require hard-coded design/similarity principles and instead learn directly from the data, it is theoretically possible to explore the chemical space more thoroughly. The disadvantage of this freedom of investigation is that it might reveal molecules the fact is greater difficult, if not not feasible, to synthesize. To develop new bioactive and synthesizable molecules, combination methods that combine rule-free and rule-driven techniques could be a good compromise. Recently, a hybrid strategy has shown assure in producing bioactive chemicals in a rule-free a way while respecting synthesizability within the emergence of micro system^[65,66]. Ligand-based methods have dominated the



majority of research on deep learning-driven de novo design. The drawback of this investigative freedom is that it may uncover molecules that are more challenging, if not impracticable, to synthesize. A combined approach using both framework-driven and flexible-design methods can be useful for creating new compounds that show biological activity and can also be synthesized practically. Recently, some hybrid techniques that use computer-defined reaction schemes have shown good potential in designing compounds without rigid construction rules, while still ensuring synthetic feasibility, especially in microscale environments^[67,68]. One downside of fully non-restricted approaches is that they may generate structures that are too complex or impossible to produce in the lab. To address this, hybrid methods offer a more realistic path. The majority of de novo drug identification studies based on neural networks have so far mostly employed ligand-focused approaches. Because it is based on a set of pre-established virtual reactions, a hybrid strategy that maintains synthesizability inside a microfluidics system while building bioactive molecules in a rule-free manner has recently shown promise^[69,70]. The majority of investigation on de novo design based on artificial intelligence has so far concentrated on ligand-based techniques.

AI Techniques in QSAR

Ligands can be described using either structural or non-structural characteristics. Consequently, a crucial first step in any QSAR study is selecting important descriptors. Finding patterns (predictive biometrics or feature combinations) associated with activities is another crucial stage. In order to find more possible medications with similar basic components, compounds exhibiting encouraging properties could also be compared to other candidates. Therefore, it is clear that AI methods

for feature selection, identification of patterns, classification, and grouping can be used to address the aforementioned difficulties^[71]. These kinds of issues have actually been handled by a number of clustering algorithms, including multi-domain clustering, hierarch agglomerative organization, democratic clustering, and hierarchical polarizing clustering^[72]. For instance, it has been demonstrated that grouping receptor proteins according to their structural similarity enhances docking investigations and medication creation^[73]. A review of clustering approaches and evolutionary algorithms' applications for molecular interaction prediction may be found in^[74]. A recent review^[75] also examined the function of feature selection in QSAR. Consensus k-nearest neighbor (in) QSAR is an additional technique that has been developed to predict estrogenic activity^[76]. According to the theory underlying this method, one can estimate an activity by averaging its k-nearest neighbor activities. Afterwards, the consensus forecast is produced by utilizing a number of models, each of which employs a unique collection of attributes^[77]. Numerous other studies have also used AI techniques to address related problems. Numerous issues have been resolved with NNs, especially in the field of medication design. Winkler has provided a thorough examination of NN applications in a range of QSAR issues^[78]. The use of NNs in pharmacokinetic, toxicological, and biophysical component prediction is covered in the review. Another study examined NN techniques and statistical methodologies^[79]. Drug development and molecular diversity studies have made use of self-organized maps (SOM)^[80]. Specifically, the SOM-based comparative molecular spectrum analysis (CoMSA) method has been extensively explained^[81]. In recent years, SVMs have become increasingly popular. For example, Zhao et al. found that SVMs outperformed axial basis function NNs and multiple regression models



when they were employed to predict toxicity^[82]. One QSAR study evaluated for inhibitors of calcium channels using a novel method known as the least squares support vector machine (LSSVM)^[83]. SVMs were used to estimate oral absorption in humans using chemical structure descriptors, in addition to a number of other relevant investigation^[84] and assess the effectiveness of specific enzyme inhibitors^[85], both of which produced accuracy on par with other QSAR methods. For uses like the docking of molecules and related research, scientists are also creating natural QSAR approaches that employ genetic algorithms. For instance, research on neuronal nicotinic acetylcholine ion channel receptors (nAChRs) has been developed using the QSAR (MoQSAR) technique^[86,87]. Additional instances include the application of genetic algorithms in classification-based SAR^[88] and for the forecasting of receptor-ligand affinity binding^[89]. Another adaptive technique influenced by biological processes is particle-swarm optimization (PSO). Both biomarker selection and other QSAR investigations have used this methodology^[90]. In medicine design, Bayesian networks have also been applied to address various problems^[91].

Artificial intelligence in drug testing, both primary and secondary

AI has become a very competitive and successful technology in recent years because to its efficiency with time as well as financial resources^[92]. In general, artificial intelligence can decrease and accelerate time-consuming and taxing tasks like cell sorting, cell classification, small molecule property calculations, computer-assisted organic compound synthesis, compound design, assay development, and target molecule three-dimensional structure prediction^[93,94]. In the first stage of drug screening, artificial intelligence (AI)

uses image analysis to classify and organize cells. Various machine learning models that employ different techniques to accurately identify photographs begin to perform poorly as large amounts of data are processed. To classify a target cell, a machine learning model must first be trained to recognize its distinct features. This is usually achieved by comparing the cell's image against the surrounding background to distinguish it clearly^[95]. After extracting the image using various pattern recognition techniques—such as wavelet transform-based textures and Tamura's visual texture descriptors a dimensionality reduction method is applied to simplify the image data for further analysis. Les-square SVM has demonstrated the maximum precision in classification of 95.34%, according one study^[96,97]. For identifying the required cell type from the supplied sample, the cell sorting device needs to run swiftly. The most advanced technique for evaluating a cell's visible, electrically, and mechanical qualities has been demonstrated to be image-activated cell sorting (IACS)^[98]. The supplementary drug assessment procedure looks at the chemical's toxicity, bioactivity, and chemical characteristics. Two physical characteristics that influence a compound's bioavailability when creating new molecules are the point of melting and partition coefficient. Molecular fingerprinting, electric matrices, and the simplified molecule input line-entry system (SMILES) are some of the techniques that can be used to create a molecular representation while creating a medication^[99, 100]. Both of the separate stages of DNN the production stage and the modeling phase—use these data. When stages are trained concurrently, bias can still be introduced into the outcome, even if each stage is learned separately using supervised learning. A particular output property can be rewarded or punished using this bias. This whole procedure is amenable to reinforcement learning^[101]. MMPs, or matched molecular pairs, have been widely used



for QSAR studies. The compound's bioactivity is further influenced by a single change in a treatment candidate associated with MMP^[102]. MMP is used to obtain adjustments, together with RF, DNN, gradient boosting machines (GBM), and other machine learning approaches. Compared to RF and GBM, DNN has been shown to be more predictive^[103]. Publicly available databases such as ChEMBL, PubChem, and ZINC have grown to include annotated information about the structure, known targets, and purchasing power of millions of chemicals. Combining MMP and ML, which encompass fundamental clearance, oral exposure, ADMET, and mode of action, allows for the forecasting of bioactivity^[104]. The most expensive and tedious task in pharmaceutical development is optimizing a compound's toxicity. The process of developing new medications is significantly accelerated by this essential component.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Ethical Issues with Artificial Intelligence in the Pharmaceutical Sector

As discussed in the last chapter, the moral costs of using AI in this sector must be considered^[105]. AI's potential to affect choices regarding which drugs to create, which clinical trials to do, and the best ways to publicize and deliver medications is a serious worry. The health and well-being of people may be impacted by these choices. Another key concern is that AI systems may carry hidden biases, which could lead to unfair treatment of certain populations and unequal access to healthcare. Such issues could jeopardize the values of justice and equality. Furthermore, concerns about possible job losses due to automation have been raised by the expanding usage of AI in the healthcare industry. The right support and opportunities for reskilling must be provided to affected personnel in order to overcome these challenges. Data security and privacy are other

issues brought up by the pharmaceutical industry's usage of AI. Sensitive personal data may be accessed or misused since AI systems depend on massive volumes of data to operate. People may suffer as a result, as well as the participating companies' reputations. The gathering and use of sensitive medical data must respect patient privacy and adhere to relevant legal requirements. After all, the pharmaceutical industry's ethical use of AI demands careful consideration and the purposeful implementation of solutions to address these problems. It's critical to train systems on representative and diverse data, conduct frequent bias checks, and have strict regulations in place to safeguard data security and privacy if you want to utilize AI responsibly. The pharmaceutical sector can guarantee the moral and equitable application of AI technologies by implementing these measures^[106].

Integrating AI Expertise into Pharmaceutical Research: A Collaborative Approach

AI and pharmaceutical experts collaborate to create novel and potent treatments for a range of diseases. Pharmaceutical scientists and AI researchers can speed up the medication development process by pooling their knowledge. They are able to create strong machine learning models that forecast the possible efficacy of various treatments. Because AI systems can evaluate trial data to find patterns, assess drug performance, and more precisely detect potential side effects, this partnership also improves clinical research. Large-scale community data can be analysed with the aid of AI techniques to find trends that forecast how particular medications would affect particular patient populations. AI researchers and pharmaceutical experts can collaborate to lower healthcare expenses and increase treatment accessibility. Additionally, this partnership can expedite drug development and



assist businesses in choosing more effective treatments. This allows treatment plans to be more specifically tailored to each patient's needs. An interesting example is the partnership between the AI firm Numerate and the pharmaceutical corporation Merck to create AI-based methods for medicinal chemistry^[107]. A significant number of new businesses are currently emerging in this field of study, and their immediate effects are expected to be significant^[108]. When combined, they could improve the effectiveness of presently available medications and help identify new targets for pharmaceutical development, which would benefit patients and raise their level of living.

Advanced drug dispensing applications using AI-powered nanorobots

Nanorobots are enhanced through the use of advanced computing technologies, including artificial intelligence, and are supported by components like integrated circuits, sensors, power supplies, and secure data storage systems^[109]. Avoiding collisions, recognizing targets, detecting and attaching, and ultimately removing waste from the body are some of their responsibilities. Nano/microrobots' efficacy has increased and their systemic negative effects have decreased due to their capacity to go to the right location depending on physiological variables, such as pH^[110]. For the controlled delivery of medications and genes, implanted nanorobots must be developed with several considerations, such as sustained release, regulated release, and dose adjustment. AI tools like fuzzy logic, neural networks, and integrators must also be used to automate the release of medications. Microchip-equipped implants can be used for both body position detection and programmed release. Sophisticated technology for computation, such as artificial intelligence, are used to improve nanorobots, which are bolstered by parts like

sensors, incorporated circuits, power sources, and safe data storage systems. High-throughput screening and a great deal of work are needed to find particular and promising compounds for combination therapy; for example, treating cancer necessitates a combination of six or seven medications. Network-based modeling, logistic regression, and artificial neural networks (ANNs) can all be used to improve the overall medication schedule and check for drug combinations^[111]. To determine the most effective therapy combinations for patients with bortezomib-resistant multiple myeloma, Rashid and associates created a unique refinement technique. After testing 114 FDA-approved medications, they discovered that the optimum two-drug combination was Decitabine (Dec.) and Mitomycin C (MitoC). The addition of methlorethamine made the three drug combinations the most successful^[112]. If studies on the antagonistic or synergistic effects of medications administered together are validated, combination drug administration might be more successful. Using "Master Regulator genes," the Master Regulator Inference Algorithm showed a 56% synergy in drug response. Along with this, other techniques like Random Forest (RF) and Network-based Laplacian models can also help in finding effective drug combinations^[113]. For example, Li et al. used the Random Forest method to create a model that predicts synergistic anticancer drug pairs. By studying different gene expression patterns and pathways, they identified 28 possible drug combinations, although only three were confirmed in their findings^[114]. In another study, Mason et al. used a dataset of 1,540 antimalarial drugs and an AI method called Combination Synergy Estimation to predict promising drug combinations for malaria treatment^[115].

Challenges



The pharmaceutical industry still faces several challenges in incorporating AI and machine learning algorithms, both generally and in relation to the drug discovery process. Even with the most recent developments in these technologies, this remains true. One problem is ineffective data integration. This issue is brought on by a variety of datasets, which may comprise contender data, unprocessed or data that was processed, or metadata. For effective analysis, these datasets need to be gathered and combined, but there isn't a fixed procedure in place at the moment. This must be done prior to the start of the drug development process because improperly processed data will result in erroneous output from machine learning algorithms. Early on in the process, it's critical to enhance data sharing with databases in order to facilitate AI-driven medication development. A shortage of talent is a further problem: several pharmaceutical sector employees have the necessary training to use AI technologies. Few people are proficient in both fields, while several have solid educations in data science and others in chemistry or biology. It is challenging to properly implement AI in drug development due to this lack of collective knowledge. It is essential to comprehend the fundamental chemistry in order to create suitable algorithms, and vice versa^[116]. The pharmaceutical firm is afraid of AI and machine learning because it doesn't comprehend algorithmic processes, or the "black box," and doesn't trust the results. This is a third issue, but it's connected. The data generated by AI and machine learning may be rejected by skeptics, wasting money and impeding the industry's progress toward greater efficiency. The pharmaceutical business doesn't invest in AI development because of this worry. Because it doesn't understand algorithmic operations, or the "black box," and doesn't trust the outcomes, the pharmaceutical company is terrified of AI and machine learning. Although it's a third problem,

they are related. Some people may doubt the results produced by AI and machine learning, which could lead to wasted resources and slow down progress in making the pharmaceutical industry more efficient. Research and development may occur more slowly and inefficiently than it should, which could limit artificial intelligence's ability to advance the pharmaceutical sector. These are the several obstacles that must be removed in order to include AI into the procedures associated with drug development^[117].

Future-Oriented Perspective

AI offers major advantages to the pharmaceutical industry, especially by reducing costs and boosting productivity. According to certain research, machine learning can create highly precise algorithms with just half of the typical input. This improved efficiency may be due to reduced repetition and bias, along with the ability to focus on more valuable information when facing decision-making limits, even though the exact reason is still not fully understood. This appears to reduce screening costs by as much as 90%^[118], excluding the estimated mechanical overhead required to perform dynamic learning processes. Machine learning methods are useful for business because they can handle large, complex, and diverse data sets without needing constant human involvement. The best approach to coordinating multiple huge data sources may be to combine human knowledge and experience with machine learning, especially deep learning. While inadequate information may expedite the prescription procedure, the remarkable information-mining capabilities of AI innovation have necessitated computer-supported drug regimens that take into account several clinical concerns. With improvements in collecting clinical data and machine learning techniques, it is



expected that AI will help with many aspects of research and development for drugs and constitute a standard tool for creating medications. The combined use of automation and new technologies will help analyze large and complex data more effectively. The main goals of employing AI in the discovery of drugs are to increase the chances of success, reduce expenditures, and expedite the process^[119].

CONCLUSION

By improving the speed, precision, and efficiency of the development pipeline, artificial intelligence is transforming drug research. Long-standing problems in pharmaceutical research are being helped to be resolved by its design and prediction abilities. Notwithstanding persistent obstacles like data quality and ethical concerns, AI's growing potential makes it a significant driver of future innovation in customized and precision medicine.

REFERENCES

1. Paul, D.; Sanap, G.; Shenoy, S.; Kalyane, D.; Kalia, K.; Tekade, R.K. Artificial intelligence in drug discovery and development. *Drug Discov. Today* 2021, 26, 80–93. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
2. Xu, Y.; Liu, X.; Cao, X.; Huang, C.; Liu, E.; Qian, S.; Liu, X.; Wu, Y.; Dong, F.; Qiu, C.W.; et al. Artificial intelligence: A powerful paradigm for scientific research. *Innovation* 2021, 2, 100179. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
3. Zhuang, D.; Ibrahim, A.K. Deep learning for drug discovery: A study of identifying high efficacy drug compounds using a cascade transfer learning approach. *Appl. Sci.* 2021, 11, 7772. [CrossRef]
4. Pu, L.; Naderi, M.; Liu, T.; Wu, H.C.; Mukhopadhyay, S.; Brylinski, M. EToxPred: A machine learning-based approach to estimate the toxicity of drug candidates. *BMC Pharmacol. Toxicol.* 2019, 20, 2. [CrossRef]
5. Rees, C. The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. In *IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology*, 1st ed.; Chapman and Hall/CRC; CRC Press/Taylor & Francis Group: Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2020; Volume 555, pp. 55–69, ISBN 9781351251389.
6. Ramesh, A.; et al. Artificial intelligence in medicine. *Ann. R. Coll. Surg. Engl.* 2004, 86, 334–338.
7. Miles, J.; Walker, A. The potential application of artificial intelligence in transport. *IEE Proc. Intell. Transp. Syst.* 2006, 153, 183–198.
8. Wirtz, B.W.; et al. Artificial intelligence and the public sector—applications and challenges. *Int. J. Public Adm.* 2019, 42, 596–615.
9. Smith, R.G.; Farquhar, A. The road ahead for knowledge management: an AI perspective. *AI Mag.* 2000, 21, 17.
10. Lamberti, M.J.; et al. A study on the application and use of artificial intelligence to support drug development. *Clin. Ther.* 2019, 41, 1414–1426.
11. Beneke, F.; Mackenrodt, M.O. Artificial intelligence and collusion. *IIC Int. Rev. Intellect. Prop. Compet. Law* 2019, 50, 109–134.
12. Steels, L.; Brooks, R. *The Artificial Life Route to Artificial Intelligence: Building Embodied, Situated Agents*; Routledge: 2018.
13. Bielecki, A. Foundations of artificial neural networks. In *Models of Neurons and Perceptrons: Selected Problems and Challenges*; Springer: 2019; pp. 15–28.
14. Kalyane, D.; et al. Artificial intelligence in the pharmaceutical sector: current scene and future prospect. In *The Future of Pharmaceutical Product Development and Research*; Elsevier: 2020; pp. 73–107.

15. Da Silva, I.N.; et al. *Artificial Neural Networks*; Springer: 2017.
16. Medsker, L.; Jain, L.C. *Recurrent Neural Networks: Design and Applications*; CRC Press: 1999.
17. Hänggi, M.; Moschytz, G.S. *Cellular Neural Networks: Analysis, Design and Optimization*; Springer: 2000.
18. Rouse, M. IBM Watson Supercomputer; <https://searchenterpriseai.techtarget.com/definition/IBM-Watson-supercomputer> [Accessed October 13, 2020].
19. Vyas, M.; et al. Artificial intelligence: the beginning of a new era in pharmacy profession. *Asian J. Pharm.* 2018, 12, 72–76.
20. Wess, G.; Urmann, M.; Sickenberger, B. Medicinal Chemistry: Challenges and Opportunities. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2001, 40, 3341–3350. [CrossRef]
21. Chen, R.; Liu, X.; Jin, S.; Lin, J.; Liu, J. Machine learning for drug-target interaction prediction. *Molecules* 2018, 23, 2208. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
22. Gómez-Bombarelli, R.; et al. Automatic Chemical Design Using a Data-Driven Continuous Representation of Molecules. *ACS Cent. Sci.* 2018, 4, 268–276. [CrossRef]
23. Hansen, K.; et al. Machine learning predictions of molecular properties: Accurate many-body potentials and nonlocality in chemical space. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* 2015, 6, 2326–2331. [CrossRef]
24. Gawehn, E.; Hiss, J.A.; Schneider, G. Deep Learning in Drug Discovery. *Mol. Inform.* 2016, 35, 3–14. [CrossRef]
25. Lysenko, A.; et al. An integrative machine learning approach for prediction of toxicity-related drug safety. *Life Sci. Alliance* 2018, 1, e201800098. [CrossRef]
26. You, J.; McLeod, R.D.; Hu, P. Predicting drug-target interaction network using deep learning model. *Comput. Biol. Chem.* 2019, 80, 90–101. [CrossRef]
27. Liu, X.; IJzerman, A.P.; van Westen, G.J.P. Computational Approaches for De Novo Drug Design: Past, Present, and Future. In *Methods Mol. Biol.*; Humana Press: Totowa, NJ, USA, 2021; Volume 2190, pp. 139–165.
28. Bannigan, P.; et al. Machine learning directed drug formulation development. *Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev.* 2021, 175, 113806. [CrossRef]
29. Mak, K.K.; Pichika, M.R. Artificial intelligence in drug development: present status and future prospects. *Drug Discov. Today* 2019, 24, 773–780.
30. Sellwood, M.A.; et al. Artificial intelligence in drug discovery. *Future Sci.* 2018, ZZ, 2025–2028.
31. Zhu, H. Big data and artificial intelligence modeling for drug discovery. *Annu. Rev. Pharmacol. Toxicol.* 2020, 60, 573–589.
32. Ciallella, H.L.; Zhu, H. Advancing computational toxicology in the big data era by artificial intelligence: data-driven and mechanism-driven modeling for chemical toxicity. *Chem. Res. Toxicol.* 2019, 32, 536–547.
33. Chan, H.S.; et al. Advancing drug discovery via artificial intelligence. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* 2019, 40(8), 592–604.
34. Brown, N. *In Silico Medicinal Chemistry: Computational Methods to Support Drug Design*; Royal Society of Chemistry: 2015.
35. Pereira, J.C.; et al. Boosting docking-based virtual screening with deep learning. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* 2016, 56, 2495–2506.
36. Firth, N.C.; et al. MOARF, an integrated workflow for multiobjective optimization: implementation, synthesis, and biological evaluation. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* 2015, 55, 1169–1180.
37. Zhang, L.; et al. From machine learning to deep learning: progress in machine



- intelligence for rational drug discovery. *Drug Discov. Today* 2017, 22, 1680–1685.
38. Jain, N.; et al. In silico de novo design of novel NNRTIs: a bio-molecular modelling approach. *RSC Adv.* 2015, 5, 14814–14827.
39. Wang, Y.; et al. A comparative study of family-specific protein–ligand complex affinity prediction based on random forest approach. *J. Comput. Aided Mol. Des.* 2015, 29, 349–360.
40. King, R.D.; et al. Comparison of artificial intelligence methods for modeling pharmaceutical QSARs. *Appl. Artif. Intell.* 1995, 9, 213–233.
41. Santín, E.P.; et al. Toxicity prediction based on artificial intelligence: A multidisciplinary overview. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Comput. Mol. Sci.* 2021, 11, e1516. [CrossRef]
42. Jang, H.Y.; et al. Machine learning-based quantitative prediction of drug exposure in drug-drug interactions using drug label information. *npj Digit. Med.* 2022, 5, 100. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
43. Schneider, G.; Fechner, U. Computer-based de novo design of drug-like molecules. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* 2005, 4(8), 649–663.
44. Jang HY, Song J, Kim JH, Lee H, Kim IW, Moon B, et al. Machine learning-based quantitative prediction of drug exposure in drug-drug interactions using drug label information. *NPJ Digit Med.* 2022;5:100. doi:10.1038/s41746-022-00650-5.
45. Schneider G, Fechner U. Computer-based de novo design of drug-like molecules. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2005;4(8):649-63. doi:10.1038/nrd1799.
46. Dobson CM. Chemical space and biology. *Nature.* 2004;432(7019):824-8. doi:10.1038/nature03192.
47. Lipinski C, Hopkins A. Navigating chemical space for biology and medicine. *Nature.* 2004;432(7019):855-61. doi:10.1038/nature03193.
48. Ruddigkeit L, Van Deursen R, Blum LC, et al. Enumeration of 166 billion organic small molecules in the chemical universe database GDB-17. *J Chem Inf Model.* 2012;52(11):2864-75. doi:10.1021/ci300415d.
49. Topliss JG. Utilization of operational schemes for analog synthesis in drug design. *J Med Chem.* 1972;15(10):1006-11. doi:10.1021/jm00280a002.
50. O’Boyle NM, Boström J, Sayle RA, et al. Using matched molecular series as a predictive tool to optimize biological activity. *J Med Chem.* 2014;57(6):2704-13. doi:10.1021/jm500022q.
51. Griffen E, Leach AG, Robb GR, et al. Matched molecular pairs as a medicinal chemistry tool. *J Med Chem.* 2011;54(22):7739-50. doi:10.1021/jm200452d.
52. Stewart KD, Shiroda M, James CA. Drug Guru: a computer software program for drug design using medicinal chemistry rules. *Bioorg Med Chem.* 2006;14(20):7011-22. doi:10.1016/j.bmc.2006.06.020.
53. Patel H, Bodkin MJ, Chen B, et al. Knowledge-based approach to de novo design using reaction vectors. *J Chem Inf Model.* 2009;49(5):1163-84. doi:10.1021/ci900063m.
54. Hoffmann T, Gastreich M. The next level in chemical space navigation: going far beyond enumerable compound libraries. *Drug Discov Today.* 2019;24(5):1148-56. doi:10.1016/j.drudis.2019.02.013.
55. Lessel U, Wellenzohn B, Lilienthal M, et al. Searching fragment spaces with feature trees. *J Chem Inf Model.* 2009;49(2):270-9. doi:10.1021/ci8003279.
56. Humbeck L, Weigang S, Schäfer T, et al. CHI PMUNK: a virtual synthesizable small-molecule library for medicinal chemistry, exploitable for protein-protein interaction

- modulators. *ChemMedChem*. 2018;13(6):532-9. doi:10.1002/cmdc.201700689.
57. Schneider G, Lee ML, Stahl M, et al. De novo design of molecular architectures by evolutionary assembly of drug-derived building blocks. *J Comput Aided Mol Des*. 2000;14(5):487-94. doi:10.1023/a:1008184405658.
58. Hartenfeller M, Zettl H, Walter M, et al. DOGS: reaction-driven de novo design of bioactive compounds. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2012;8(2):e1002380. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002380.
59. Button A, Merk D, Hiss JA, et al. Automated de novo molecular design by hybrid machine intelligence and rule-driven chemical synthesis. *Nat Mach Intell*. 2019;1(7):307-15. doi:10.1038/s42256-019-0067-7.
60. Salakhutdinov R. Learning deep generative models. *Annu Rev Stat Appl*. 2015;2(1):361-85. doi:10.1146/annurev-statistics-010814-020120.
61. Gordeeva EV, Molchanova MS, Zefirov NS. General methodology and computer program for the exhaustive restoring of chemical structures by molecular connectivity indexes. Solution of the inverse problem in QSAR/QSPR. *Tetrahedron Comput Methodol*. 1990;3(6):389-415. doi:10.1016/0898-5529(90)90001-9.
62. Skvortsova MI, Stankevich IV, Zefirov NS. Generation of molecular structures of polycondensed benzenoid hydrocarbons using the Randic index. *J Struct Chem*. 1992;33(3):416-22. doi:10.1007/BF00745870.
63. Skvortsova MI, Baskin II, Slovkhotova OL, et al. Inverse problem in QSAR/QSPR studies for the case of topological indexes characterizing molecular shape (Kier indices). *J Chem Inf Model*. 1993;33:630-4. doi:10.1021/ci00014a018.
64. Miyao T, Kaneko H, Funatsu K. Ring-system-based exhaustive structure generation for inverse-QSPR/QSAR. *Mol Inform*. 2014;33(11-12):764-78. doi:10.1002/minf.201400052.
65. Wong WW, Burkowski FJ. A constructive approach for discovering new drug leads: using a kernel methodology for the inverse-QSAR problem. *J Cheminform*. 2009;1(4). doi:10.1186/1758-2946-1-4.
66. Cho SJ, Zheng W, Tropsha A. Rational combinatorial library design. 2. Rational design of targeted combinatorial peptide libraries using chemical similarity probe and the inverse QSAR approaches. *J Chem Inf Comput Sci*. 1998;38(2):259-68. doi:10.1021/ci970102r.
67. Miyao T, Kaneko H, Funatsu K. Inverse QSPR/QSAR analysis for chemical structure generation (from y to x). *J Chem Inf Model*. 2016;56(2):286-99. doi:10.1021/acs.jcim.5b00628.
68. Vanhaelen Q, Lin YC, Zhavoronkov A. The advent of generative chemistry. *ACS Med Chem Lett*. 2020;11(8):1496-505. doi:10.1021/acsmchemlett.0c00088.
69. Weininger D. SMILES, a chemical language and information system. 1. Introduction to methodology and encoding rules. *J Chem Inf Model*. 1988;28(1):31-6. doi:10.1021/ci00057a005.
70. Segler MHS, Kogej T, Tyrchan C, et al. Generating focused molecule libraries for drug discovery with recurrent neural networks. *ACS Cent Sci*. 2018;4(1):120-31. doi:10.1021/acscentsci.7b00512.
71. Merk D, Friedrich L, Grisoni F, et al. De novo design of bioactive small molecules by artificial intelligence. *Mol Inform*. 2018;37(1-2):1700153. doi:10.1002/minf.201700153.
72. Kitchen DB, Stahura FL, Bajorath J. Computational techniques for diversity

- analysis and compound classification. *Mini Rev Med Chem.* 2004;4(10):1029-39. doi:10.2174/1389557043403126.
73. Walters WP, Goldman BB. Feature selection in quantitative structure-activity relationships. *Curr Opin Drug Discov Devel.* 2005;8(3):329-33. PMID: 15892250.
74. Koch MA, Waldmann H. Protein structure similarity clustering and natural product structure as guiding principles in drug discovery. *Drug Discov Today.* 2005;10(7):471-83. doi:10.1016/S1359-6446(05)03414-7.
75. Asikainen AH, Ruuskanen J, Tuppurainen KA. Performance of (consensus) kNN QSAR for predicting estrogenic activity in a large diverse set of organic compounds. *SAR QSAR Environ Res.* 2004;15(1):19-32. doi:10.1080/1062936032000169646.
76. Winkler DA. Neural networks as robust tools in drug lead discovery and development. *Mol Biotechnol.* 2004;27(2):139-68. doi:10.1385/MB:27:2:139.
77. Douali L, Villemin D, Cherqaoui D. Comparative QSAR based on neural networks for the anti-HIV activity of HEPT derivatives. *Curr Pharm Des.* 2003;9(22):1817-26. doi:10.2174/1381612033454570.
78. Polanski J, Gieleciak R. Comparative molecular surface analysis: a novel tool for drug design and molecular diversity studies. *Mol Divers.* 2003;7(1):45-59. doi:10.1023/b:modi.0000006561.33641.5d.
79. Zhao CY, Zhang HX, Zhang XY, et al. Application of support vector machine (SVM) for prediction toxic activity of different data sets. *Toxicology.* 2006;217(2-3):105-19. doi:10.1016/j.tox.2005.08.025.
80. Yao X, Liu H, Zhang R, et al. QSAR and classification study of 1,4-dihydropyridine calcium channel antagonists based on least squares support vector machines. *Mol Pharm.* 2005;2(5):348-56. doi:10.1021/mp0500151.
81. Liu HX, Hu RJ, Zhang RS, et al. The prediction of human oral absorption for diffusion rate-limited drugs based on heuristic method and support vector machine. *J Comput Aided Mol Des.* 2005;19(1):33-46. doi:10.1007/s10822-005-1488-4.
82. Zernov VV, Balakin KV, Ivaschenko AA, et al. Drug discovery using support vector machines. The case studies of drug-likeness, agrochemical-likeness, and enzyme inhibition predictions. *J Chem Inf Comput Sci.* 2003;43(6):2048-56. doi:10.1021/ci0340916.
83. Deng W, Breneman C, Embrechts MJ. Predicting protein-ligand binding affinities using novel geometrical descriptors and machine-learning methods. *J Chem Inf Comput Sci.* 2004;44(2):699-703. doi:10.1021/ci034246+.
84. Sutherland JJ, O'Brien LA, Weaver DF. Spline-fitting with a genetic algorithm: a method for developing classification structure-activity relationships. *J Chem Inf Comput Sci.* 2003;43(6):1906-15. doi:10.1021/ci034041y.
85. Lu Q, Wu H, Yu R, Shen G. The lifetime of CFC substitutes studied by a network trained with chaotic mapping modified genetic algorithm and DFT calculations. *SAR QSAR Environ Res.* 2004;15(4):279-92. doi:10.1080/10629360410001724999.
86. Kennedy J, Eberhart RC. Particle swarm optimization. *Proc IEEE Int Conf Neural Netw.* 1995;4:1942-8. doi:10.1109/ICNN.1995.488968.
87. Lin L, Lin WQ, Jiang JH, et al. QSAR analysis of substituted bis[(acridine-4-carboxamide)propyl]methylamines using optimized block-wise variable combination by particle swarm optimization for partial least squares modeling. *Eur J Pharm Sci.* 2005;25(2-3):245-54. doi:10.1016/j.ejps.2005.02.012.



88. Shen Q, Jiang JH, Jiao CX, et al. Optimized partition of minimum spanning tree for piecewise modeling by particle swarm algorithm. QSAR studies of antagonism of angiotensin II antagonists. *J Chem Inf Comput Sci.* 2004;44(6):2027-31.
89. Shen Q, Jiang JH, Jiao CX, et al. Hybridized particle swarm algorithm for adaptive structure training of multilayer feed-forward neural network: QSAR studies of bioactivity of organic compounds. *J Comput Chem.* 2004;25(14):1726-35. doi:10.1002/jcc.20099.
90. Resson HW, Varghese RS, Abdel-Hamid M, et al. Analysis of mass spectral serum profiles for biomarker selection. *Bioinformatics.* 2005;21(21):4039-45. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bti670.
91. Caballero J, Fernandez M. Linear and nonlinear modeling of antifungal activity of some heterocyclic ring derivatives using multiple linear regression and Bayesian-regularized neural networks. *J Mol Model.* 2006;12(2):168-81. doi:10.1007/s00894-005-0014-x.
92. Wang YH, Li Y, Yang SL, Yang L. An in silico approach for screening flavonoids as P-glycoprotein inhibitors based on a Bayesian-regularized neural network. *J Comput Aided Mol Des.* 2005;19(3):137-47. doi:10.1007/s10822-005-4789-8.
93. Davenport TH, Ronanki R. Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harv Bus Rev.* 2018;96(1):108-16.
94. Zhavoronkov A, Vanhaelen Q, Oprea TI. Will artificial intelligence for drug discovery impact clinical pharmacology? *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2020;107(4):780-785.
95. Watson O, Cortes-Ciriano I, Taylor A, Watson JA. A decision theoretic approach to model evaluation in computational drug discovery. arXiv. 2018.
96. Tripathy RK, Mahanta S, Paul S. Artificial intelligence-based classification of breast cancer using cellular images. *RSC Adv.* 2014;4:9349-9355.
97. Samui P, Kothari DP. Utilization of a least square support vector machine (LSSVM) for slope stability analysis. *Sci Iran.* 2011;18:53-58.
98. Chan HCS, Shan H, Dahoun T, et al. Advancing drug discovery via artificial intelligence. *Trends Pharmacol Sci.* 2019;40(8):592-604.
99. Ho CWL, Soon D, Caals K, Kapur J. Governance of automated image analysis and artificial intelligence analytics in healthcare. *Clin Radiol.* 2019;74(5):329-337.
100. Andrysek T. Impact of physical properties of formulations on bioavailability of active substance: Current and novel drugs with cyclosporine. *Mol Immunol.* 2003;39(17-18):1061-1065.
101. Elton DC, Boukouvalas Z, Butrico MS, et al. Applying machine learning techniques to predict the properties of energetic materials. *Sci Rep.* 2018;8:9059.
102. Tyrchan C, Evertsson E. Matched molecular pair analysis in short: algorithms, applications and limitations. *Comput Struct Biotechnol J.* 2017;15:86-90.
103. Turk S, Merget B, Rippmann F, Fulle S. Coupling matched molecular pairs with machine learning for virtual compound optimization. *J Chem Inf Model.* 2017;57(12):3079-3085.
104. Carpenter KA, Huang X. Machine learning-based virtual screening and its applications to Alzheimer's drug discovery: a review. *Curr Pharm Des.* 2018;24(28):3347-3358.
105. Schyman P, Liu R, Desai V, Wallqvist A. vNN web server for ADMET predictions. *Front Pharmacol.* 2017;8:889.



106. Naik N, Hameed BMZ, Shetty DK, et al. Legal and ethical consideration in artificial intelligence in healthcare: Who takes responsibility? *Front Surg.* 2022;9:266.
107. Karimian G, Petelos E, Evers SMAA. The ethical issues of the application of artificial intelligence in healthcare: A systematic scoping review. *AI Ethics.* 2022;2:539-551.
108. Numerate forms drug discovery collaboration with Merck to utilize in silico drug design [Internet]. *FierceBiotech*; 2022 [cited 2022 Dec 6]. Available from:
109. Hassanzadeh P, Atyabi F, Dinarvand R. The significance of artificial intelligence in drug delivery system design. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev.* 2019;151-152:169-190.
110. Luo M, Feng Y, Wang T, Guan J. Micro-/nanorobots at work in active drug delivery. *Adv Funct Mater.* 2018;28(25):1706100.
111. Fu J, Yan H. Controlled drug release by a nanorobot. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2012;30(5):407-408.
112. Calzolari D, Bruschi S, Coquin L, et al. Search algorithms as a framework for the optimization of drug combinations. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2008;4(12):e1000249.
113. Wilson B, Geetha KM. Artificial intelligence and related technologies enabled nanomedicine for advanced cancer treatment. *Nanomedicine (Lond).* 2020;15(5):433-435
114. Tsigelny IF. Artificial intelligence in drug combination therapy. *Brief Bioinform.* 2019;20(4):1434-1448.
115. Li X, Xu Y, Cui J, et al. Prediction of synergistic anticancer drug combinations based on drug target network and drug induced gene expression profiles. *Artif Intell Med.* 2017;83:35-43.
116. Mason DJ, Eastman RT, Lewis RP, et al. Using machine learning to predict synergistic antimalarial compound combinations with novel structures. *Front Pharmacol.* 2018;9:1096.
117. Henstock PV. Artificial intelligence for pharma: time for internal investment. *Trends Pharmacol Sci.* 2019;40(8):543-546.
118. Wang LL, Ding JJ, Pan L, et al. Artificial intelligence facilitates drug design in the big data era. *Chemom Intell Lab Syst.* 2019;194:103850.
119. Kshirsagar A. Bio-remediation: use of nature in a technical way to fight pollution for a long run [Internet]. *ResearchGate*; 2018.

HOW TO CITE: Chetana Sancheti*, Ganesh Basarkar, Harnessing Artificial Intelligence in Drug Discovery: A Comprehensive Review of Applications, Challenges, and Future Prospects, *Int. J. of Pharm. Sci.*, 2025, Vol 3, Issue 6, 426-443. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15584341>

