Genome Publications

https://doi.org/10.61096/978-81-994851-8-1_2

Chapter 2

Artificial Intelligence in Drug Design and Discovery

Chandana Addada[1]

[1]Sir C.R. Reddy College of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Eluru, Andhra Pradesh-534007

Abstract: Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming drug design and discovery by allowing faster, more accurate, and cost-effective identification and optimization of therapeutic candidates. Machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL) models improve predictions for molecular activity, drug-target interactions, ADMET properties, and toxicity. Generative AI tools such as VAEs, GANs, and transformer models are helping speed up de novo molecule production, while advances like AlphaFold2 and AlphaFold3 improve structure-based drug design by predicting proteins and protein-ligand interactions with high accuracy. AI-driven high-content screening (HCS) enhances phenotypic analysis and hit recognition. Despite these breakthroughs, challenges remain, including data quality limitations, model interpretability, dataset bias, overfitting, and the challenge of created compounds to be synthesized. For reliable and accountable adoption, these issues have to be addressed by improved data curation, explainable AI, multimodal integration, and extensive validation. Overall, AI is transforming pharmaceutical research and development by increasing efficiency, decreasing attrition, and pushing innovation throughout the drug discovery pipeline.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; drug discovery; machine learning; deep learning; generative models; Alpha Fold; high-content screening; toxicity prediction; ADMET; virtual screening.

Citation: Kuncham Anand Phani Kumar, Sravani Koralla, Eluru Jajili. Recent Advances in AI-Based Toxicity Prediction for Drug Discovery. *Integrating Artificial Intelligence in Pharmacy: Execution and Exploration.* 2025; Pp10-20.
https://doi.org/10.61096/978-81-994851-8-1_2

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most transformative forces in modern drug design and discovery by offering solutions to long-standing problems such as prolonged development timelines, and the growing financial burden associated with bringing a new therapeutic drug to market. Traditional drug discovery pipelines usually require 10-15 years and billions of dollars, with only a handful of candidates

achieving clinical success. This inefficiency has led to interest in computational approaches that can improve early-stage decision-making while reducing the experimental workload. AI, particularly machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL), has played a key role in this ideal shift, enabling rapid evaluation of complicated chemical, biological, and pharmacological information [1-4].

In recent years, Deep Learning techniques including convolutional neural networks (CNNs), recurrent neural networks (RNNs), graph neural networks (GNNs) and transformers have established significant performance improvements in tasks such as hit identification, de novo molecular design, target prediction and structure-based drug design [2,4–6]. Chen et al. (2018) highlighted how Deep L models outperform traditional computational methods by learning hierarchical molecular features directly from raw data without manual feature engineering [4]. Similarly, Walters and Barzilay emphasized the capacity of generative models to produce novel molecular structures optimized for pharmacological and physicochemical properties, marking a major milestone in AI-driven molecular design [6].

The expansion of biological big data including genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics and phenotypic screening datasets has further accelerated the adoption of AI in drug discovery. Matsuzaka and Uesawa (2022) underscored how big data analytics combined with DL enables more accurate predictions of drug target interactions and bioactivity profiles, thereby minimizing experimental bottlenecks [5]. Recent integrative reviews have outlined how AI-driven approaches now play key roles in virtual screening, lead optimization, activity prediction and ADMET profiling, establishing AI as an indispensable component of modern pharmaceutical research [1,3,7–9].

AI has also revolutionized structure-based drug discovery through advances in protein structure prediction. AlphaFold2, introduced by DeepMind, represented a breakthrough in structural biology by achieving near-experimental accuracy for protein folding, enabling researchers to model previously uncharacterized proteins and accelerating structure-guided drug design [13]. Subsequent enhancements seen in AlphaFold3 further improved protein–ligand and protein–DNA/RNA complex predictions, providing unprecedented accuracy for modelling molecular interactions relevant to drug discovery [14]. These developments have opened new possibilities for tackling previously "undruggable" targets and designing therapeutics with higher precision.

Another critical application of AI lies in toxicity prediction and safety assessment, key factors influencing late-stage drug failures. Machine learning-based models have shown exceptional performance in predicting off-target effects, hepatotoxicity, cardiotoxicity and other adverse events, enabling early elimination of unsafe compounds [11]. Recent advances described by Lee et al. (2025) demonstrate how modern DL architectures can integrate multi-modal toxicity datasets such as chemical structures, omics data and imaging features to generate more reliable toxicity assessments than traditional QSAR models [12]. As safety profiling is one of the major causes of clinical attrition, AI-driven toxicity prediction has become a vital contributor to reducing overall development costs.

Beyond individual applications, AI also supports end-to-end drug discovery workflows. Reviews by Paul et al. (2021) and Kant & Saini (2025) emphasize how AI is

now embedded across all stages from target identification and hit generation to clinical trial optimization and post-market surveillance [1,9]. The integration of AI with automated laboratory platforms and high-throughput robotics, as noted by Fu et al. (2025), is further driving the creation of self-driving laboratories that can autonomously design, synthesize and test candidate molecules [8]. Such innovations represent the future of pharmaceutical R&D, enabling faster and more cost-effective discovery cycles.

Despite these notable achievements, several challenges remain. Issues such as data quality, model interpretability, bias in training datasets, limited availability of negative results, and lack of standardized benchmarking frameworks continue to constrain the reliability and generalizability of AI models [3,7]. Integrating human expertise with AI-driven pipelines, ensuring transparency of models, and developing robust validation protocols are thus essential for sustainable adoption. Addressing these challenges will be necessary to fully realize the transformative potential of AI in drug design.

Overall, the convergence of AI, big data and computational chemistry is reshaping the landscape of drug discovery. The rapid advancements in DL, predictive modelling, structural biology and generative chemistry suggest that AI will continue to drive innovation and efficiency across the pharmaceutical industry. With ongoing advancements in algorithm development, computing power, and data integration, AI is poised to significantly accelerate the discovery of safer, more effective therapeutics.

AI TECHNIQUES IN DRUG DISCOVERY:

AI encompasses a broad set of computational methods designed to analyze molecular, biological, structural, and phenotypic data. Each technique contributes differently depending on the stage of drug discovery.

1. Machine Learning (ML) Approaches

Machine learning models learn from curated datasets containing chemical structures, biological assays, or phenotypic annotations. They form the foundation of many predictive tasks, including: ligand-based virtual screening, QSAR modelling, toxicity classification, solubility and permeability prediction, and drug-target interaction analysis

ML models such as support vector machines (SVMs), random forests (RF), gradient boosting trees, and KNN classifiers remain widely used due to their interpretability and strong performance on structured datasets [2]. In scenarios where experimental data are abundant and consistent, ML models provide fast, stable, and reliable predictions.

2. Deep Learning (DL) Architectures

Deep learning offers improved predictive accuracy by learning non-linear, high-dimensional representations from complex datasets.

2.1 Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)

CNNs are widely used in: - protein–ligand docking - molecular image analysis-phenotypic imaging - 3D grid-based binding prediction. CNNs automatically extract features that capture shape, electrostatics, and spatial relationships among atoms capabilities that exceed manual featurization [4].

2.2 Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) and LSTMs

These models process sequential molecular representations, particularly SMILES strings. Applications include: - generating novel molecules - predicting synthetic pathways - analyzing chemical reactions. RNN-based generative models design structures optimized for potency, selectivity, and ADMET properties [6].

2.3 Graph Neural Networks (GNNs)

GNNs treat molecules as interconnected graphs, enabling atom-level message passing and improved representation learning. GNNs outperform traditional fingerprints in predicting: - bioactivity - reaction outcomes - physicochemical properties - toxicity [3]

3. Generative Models for Molecule Design

Generative AI models have emerged as powerful tools for de novo molecular design.

3.1 Variational Autoencoders (VAEs)

VAEs embed molecules into a latent space where smooth interpolation allows exploration of chemical variants [6]. They are useful for scaffold modification and hit expansion.

3.2 Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)

GANs promote diversity and creativity in molecular design by generating realistic structures that mimic chemical distributions.

3.3 Transformer-Based Generative Models

Transformers can model long-range chemical dependencies and generate chemically valid SMILES with desirable properties [7]. Many state-of-the-art generative chemistry platforms use transformer backbones.

4. Structure-Based Drug Design (SBDD)

AI is now central to structure-based methods.

4.1 Protein Structure Prediction (AlphaFold and Beyond)

AlphaFold2 fundamentally changed structural biology by predicting protein folds with high accuracy [13]. AlphaFold3 further incorporated: - protein–ligand interactions - nucleic acid complexes - improved modelling of disordered regions [14]

4.2 AI-Enhanced Docking

DL models improve docking accuracy by learning from thousands of experimentally determined complexes. These models enhance scoring functions, pose prediction, and affinity estimation [10].

5. AI in ADMET and Toxicity Prediction

AI supports early identification of toxic compounds by learning from chemical descriptors and phenotypic signals.

DL models achieve improved performance in predicting: - cardiotoxicity (hERG inhibition) - hepatotoxicity - mutagenicity - metabolic liabilities [11,12]

6. Integrative Big-Data Frameworks

Modern drug discovery relies heavily on integrating multiple data types. AI platforms combine: - chemical structures - omics profiles - image-based phenotypes - pathway data. This multimodal integration improves biological relevance and strengthens predictions [5].

7. End-to-End AI Pipelines

AI systems now support entire discovery workflows—from target identification to preclinical validation. These pipelines combine predictive models, generative chemistry, retrosynthesis tools, and automated robotics [1,9].

ARTIFICIAL INTELLENGE IN HIGH-CONTENT SCREENING (HCS)

High-content screening integrates automated microscopy with multiparametric image analysis to evaluate cellular responses. DL has dramatically improved the sensitivity, speed, and resolution of HCS workflows.

1. AI-Driven Image Analysis

HCS generates enormous volumes of cellular images, often beyond human capacity to interpret. CNNs identify fine-grained morphological changes and extract features linked to mechanism of action (MoA) [4].

2. Phenotypic Profiling and MoA Prediction

AI models cluster compounds based on phenotypic fingerprints and infer MoA by integrating structural and image-derived data. GNNs and transformer models enhance these predictions by linking chemical structure to phenotypic outcome [3,5,7].

3. Automated Hit Identification

ML and DL models improve hit calling by classifying cellular states and prioritizing compounds with biologically meaningful effects [1,2]. This reduces false positives and accelerates discovery.

4. Integration with Multi-Omic Platforms

HCS data combined with transcriptomic, proteomic, and metabolomic signatures provide richer biological insights. Transformer models help integrate these heterogeneous datasets [7].

5. Self-Driving HCS Labs

Next-generation HCS platforms autonomously adjust imaging parameters, optimize assay conditions, and iteratively improve experimental design using AI-guided feedback [8].

6. Early Toxicity Prediction from HCS Images

HCS-derived cellular morphology contains subtle signatures of toxicity that may not be obvious through biochemical assays alone. AI models—particularly CNNs and multimodal DL systems—can detect mitochondrial swelling, nuclear fragmentation, cytoskeletal rearrangement, or membrane permeability changes at early time points. These predictive indicators allow researchers to eliminate toxic candidates well before in vivo testing, significantly reducing cost and risk [11, 12].

METHODOLOGICAL LIMITATIONS AND RISKS OF AI IN PHARMACEUTICAL R&D:

Despite its transformative potential, artificial intelligence (AI) in pharmaceutical R&D faces several methodological limitations and risks that affect reliability, reproducibility, and real-world applicability. Challenges arise from issues related to data quality, model interpretability, generalization, structural prediction uncertainties, and risks of algorithmic bias. Understanding these limitations is essential to ensure safe and effective integration of AI in drug discovery.

1. Data Quality, Availability, and Bias

AI models depend heavily on the quality and diversity of the datasets used for training. Paul et al. (2021) emphasize that pharmaceutical datasets are often noisy, incomplete, imbalanced, or biased toward well-studied chemical scaffolds and targets, which reduces model generalizability to novel chemical space [1]. Dara et al. (2022) similarly highlight that ML models struggle when training data contain measurement errors, inconsistent assay protocols, or missing annotations, which can propagate errors throughout the discovery pipeline [2].

Askr and Khalaf (2023) note that insufficient negative data, limited representation of rare targets, and biased molecular distributions contribute to unreliable predictions and high variance in deep learning (DL) models [3]. These limitations restrict the ability of AI to explore new biological mechanisms or design first-in-class agents.

2. Lack of Interpretability and Explain ability

A major methodological risk is the "black-box" nature of many deep learning models.Chen et al. (2018) discuss how DL architectures especially CNNs and RNNs often lack transparency, making it difficult to understand why a molecule is predicted to be active or toxic [4]. This complicates decision-making for medicinal chemists who require mechanistic reasoning.

Walters & Barzilay (2021) emphasize that generative models often propose chemically plausible molecules without explaining underlying structural determinants of activity or safety, posing risks when moving candidates toward preclinical testing [6].

Uninterpretable models can lead to:

- incorrect hit prioritization
- overlooked safety liabilities
- misinformed structure–activity relationship (SAR) reasoning

3. Overfitting and Limited Model Generalization

DL models with millions of parameters are prone to overfitting, especially when trained on small or narrow datasets. Dara et al. (2022) explain that overfitted ML models perform well on training data but fail on independent datasets, leading to inflated accuracy metrics during development [2].
Askr & Khalaf (2023) highlight that many published AI studies fail to use rigorous validation strategies, such as external test sets or time-split validation, resulting in over-optimistic performance estimates [3].

Generalization risks are especially acute in:

- predicting activity against novel targets
- designing compounds outside the training chemical space
- toxicity modelling with limited phenotypic diversity

4. Limitations in Structural Modelling and SBDD

AI-based structure prediction tools such as AlphaFold2 and AlphaFold3 represent major advancements but also introduce methodological caveats.
Yang et al. (2023) note that AlphaFold2 predicts static protein structures and does not accurately capture conformational flexibility, ligand-induced fit, or dynamic allosteric changes essential for drug discovery [13]. Desai et al. (2024) further report that AlphaFold3, despite improvements, still faces limitations in modelling protein–ligand

complexes in realistic physiological environments, especially when dealing with small-molecule binding pockets, solvent effects, and induced conformations [14].

These uncertainties pose risks for structure-based drug design (SBDD), potentially leading to:

- inaccurate docking results
- misleading binding-site interpretations
- unreliable hit identification for flexible or disordered proteins

5. Challenges in Toxicity and ADMET Prediction Models

Toxicity prediction is a key application of AI but remains difficult due to biological complexity. Guo et al. (2023) highlight that ML/DL toxicity models are limited by the scarcity of high-quality experimental toxicity data and by inconsistent assay conditions across databases [11]. Lee et al. (2025) add that multimodal toxicity models can still struggle to integrate diverse data types (omics, imaging, chemistry) and may misinterpret phenotype-based readouts [12].

These limitations risk false-negative toxicity predictions, which are dangerous as toxic compounds may progress to costly later-stage studies.

6. Risks of Over-Reliance on Generative Models

Generative AI models can produce chemically novel structures, but the risk of generating synthetically inaccessible or unstable molecules remains high. Walters & Barzilay (2021) note that generative models often lack constraints for synthetic feasibility, metabolic stability, chirality, and stereochemistry, leading to unrealistic molecular designs [6]. Su et al. (2025) warn that transformer-based chemical generators may exploit dataset biases and produce compounds optimized for model metrics rather than meaningful biological relevance [7].

This creates risks such as:

- generating non-druggable or toxic scaffolds
- misallocating resources to unrealistic hits
- misleading medicinal chemistry strategies

7. Ethical and Regulatory Risks

Although not always the main focus of the cited articles, several references describe the risks associated with adopting opaque or insufficiently validated models in regulated environments. Kant & Saini (2025) note that uncertainty, bias, and lack of transparency in AI models are major obstacles for regulatory acceptance in pharmaceutical R&D [9]. AI predictions without validation can lead to ethically questionable decisions during clinical selection or toxicity assessment

CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES FOR AI IN DRUG DISCOVERY:

AI has become central to modern drug discovery, but its success depends on addressing major scientific, technical, and practical challenges. The following section synthesizes the key challenges and strategic solutions described across your references.

1. Challenge: Data Quality, Scarcity, and Bias

High-quality, diverse, and well-annotated datasets are essential for reliable AI models. Paul et al. (2021) emphasize that pharmaceutical datasets often contain noise, missing values, inconsistent assay protocols, and biases toward well-studied targets and chemical scaffolds [1]. Dara et al. (2022) highlight data imbalance and assay

heterogeneity as major contributors to poor model performance and generalization [2]. Askr & Khalaf (2023) add that limited negative examples and uneven representation of chemical space lead to biased predictions [3].

Strategies

- **Standardize datasets across platforms** to reduce variability and enhance reproducibility [1,3].
- **Curate high-quality training sets** by filtering outliers and harmonizing assay conditions [2].
- **Use data augmentation** (e.g., SMILES augmentation, conformer sampling) to expand chemical space coverage [6].
- **Integrate multimodal datasets**—omics, structural, phenotypic—to improve robustness and biological relevance [5,7].

2. Challenge: Model Interpretability and the "Black Box" Problem

Deep learning (DL) models often lack interpretability, limiting their acceptance in medicinal chemistry. Chen et al. (2018) and Walters & Barzilay (2021) note that DL systems frequently make predictions without explaining why a molecule is active, toxic, or synthetically feasible, reducing trust in AI-driven decisions [4,6].

Strategies

- **Adopt explainable AI (XAI)** techniques such as attention maps, feature attribution, and saliency analysis to clarify model decisions [4].
- **Pair DL models with interpretable methods** (e.g., random forests, rule-based classifiers) for hybrid workflows [2].
- **Use mechanistic annotations** and pathway data to contextualize molecular predictions [1].

3. Challenge: Overfitting and Weak Generalization

AI models risk overfitting when trained on narrow or biased datasets. Dara et al. (2022) report that many ML models achieve high accuracy on training sets but fail on external datasets [2]. Askr & Khalaf (2023) note that limited validation and lack of independent benchmarks exacerbate overoptimistic performance claims [3].

Strategies

- **Use external and time-split validation** to evaluate real-world performance [3].
- **Employ regularization techniques**, dropout, and early stopping during DL training [2].
- **Benchmark models on standardized datasets**, such as ChEMBL or Tox21, to ensure comparability [5].

4. Challenge: Structural Prediction Limitations

AlphaFold2 and AlphaFold3 have advanced structural biology but retain methodological limits. Yang et al. (2023) emphasize that AlphaFold2 predicts static structures, missing conformational flexibility and ligand-induced fit essential for drug design [13]. Desai et al. (2024) report that AlphaFold3 provides improved ligand modelling but still struggles with dynamic binding pockets, solvent effects, and protein–RNA/DNA interactions under physiological conditions [14].

Strategies

- **Combine Alpha Fold** outputs with molecular dynamics (MD) to capture protein flexibility [13].
- **Use ensemble** docking to account for multiple conformations [10].
- **Integrate experimental structural data** (NMR, crystallography) when available [14].

5. Challenge: Limited Performance in Toxicity and ADMET Prediction

AI toxicity models face challenges due to biological complexity and inconsistent data. Guo et al. (2023) note that toxicity datasets are sparse and highly variable, limiting predictive accuracy [11]. Lee et al. (2025) highlight that multimodal toxicity models are computationally demanding and may misinterpret phenotypic or imaging data if improperly trained [12].

Strategies

- **Use multimodal fusion approaches** integrating chemical, phenotypic, and omics data for better ADMET modelling [12].
- **Improve assay standardization and experimental reproducibility** to enhance training data quality [11].
- **Adopt early-stage phenotypic screening** (HCS + DL) to detect toxicity before in vivo testing [5].

6. Challenge: Synthetic Infeasibility of AI-Generated Molecules

Generative AI often produces molecules that are unstable, toxic, or synthetically unrealistic. Walters & Barzilay (2021) note that VAEs, GANs, and transformers may exploit dataset biases and generate chemically implausible compounds [6]. Su et al. (2025) report that models may optimize computational scores rather than genuine drug-like properties [7].

Strategies

- **Incorporate synthetic feasibility scores** (e.g., SCScore, retrosynthesis predictors) into generative models [6].
- **Constrain generative spaces** using medicinal chemistry rules and drug-likeness filters [7].
- **Integrate AI retrosynthesis tools** to ensure practical synthetic routes.

7. Challenge: Regulatory and Ethical Barriers

The lack of regulatory frameworks for AI-generated predictions hinders clinical translation. Kant & Saini (2025) highlight that uncertainty, bias, and opacity in AI pose challenges for regulatory approval and clinical decision-making [9].

Strategies

- **Develop regulatory guidelines** for AI validation, model robustness, and transparency.
- **Use interpretable and auditable AI systems** in applications involving patient safety [9].
- **Implement risk–benefit assessment frameworks** for AI-guided clinical choices.

CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence has rapidly evolved into a cornerstone of modern drug discovery. It has redefined traditional workflows by introducing highly efficient computational systems capable of analyzing chemical structures, predicting activity, designing novel molecules, and interpreting large multimodal datasets. Tools such as ML, DL, generative models, and advanced structural prediction algorithms have significantly accelerated the early phases of research while reducing costs and attrition.

Despite remarkable progress, challenges remain—particularly in data quality, interpretability, overfitting, and structural modeling. Effective integration of AI with experimental workflows, along with improved validation frame works and regulatory alignment, will be essential for maximizing AI's real-world impact.

As innovations in algorithm development, robotics, and multimodal analytics continue to grow, AI is positioned to become an indispensable driver of future therapeutic discovery. The ongoing alignment of computational tools with biological understanding will enable the development of safer, more effective, and more targeted medicines.

REFERENCES:

1. Paul D, Sanap G, Shenoy S, Kalyane D, Kalia K, Tekade RK. Artificial intelligence in drug discovery and development. *Drug Discovery Today*. 2021;26(1):80–93. (PMC)
2. Dara S, Dhamercherla S, Jadav SS, Babu CM, Ahsan MJ. Machine learning in drug discovery: A review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*. 2022;55:1947–1999. (SpringerLink)
3. Askr H, Khalaf OI, et al. Deep learning in drug discovery: an integrative review and future challenges. *Artificial Intelligence Review*. 2023;56:10619–10665. (SpringerLink)
4. Chen H, Engkvist O, Wang Y, Olivecrona M, Blaschke T. The rise of deep learning in drug discovery. *Drug Discovery Today*. 2018;23(6):1241–1250. (ScienceDirect)
5. Matsuzaka Y, Uesawa Y. Applications of deep learning for drug discovery systems with Big Data. *AI*. 2022;3(4):810–838. (MDPI)
6. Walters WP, Barzilay R. Applications of deep learning in molecule generation and molecular property prediction. *Accounts of Chemical Research*. 2021;54(2):263–270. (MDPI)
7. Su J, et al. Artificial intelligence in drug discovery: A comprehensive review. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2507.03407. 2025. (arXiv)
8. Fu C, Zhang Y, et al. The future of pharmaceuticals: Artificial intelligence in drug discovery and development. *Engineering Reports*. 2025;7(1):e13102 (online first). (ScienceDirect)
9. Kant S, Saini A. Artificial intelligence in drug discovery and development. *AI in Precision Oncology* (Springer). 2025; online ahead of print. (SpringerLink)
10. Özçelik R, Akgün E, Durmaz V, Durmaz R. Structure-based drug discovery with deep learning. *ChemBioChem*. 2023;24(3):e202200776. (Chemistry Europe)

11. Guo W, Liu Y, et al. Review of machine learning and deep learning models in toxicity prediction. *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal*. 2023;21:1927–1951. (PMC)
12. Lee H, Park S, et al. Recent advances in AI-based toxicity prediction for drug discovery. *Frontiers in Chemistry*. 2025;13:1632046. (Frontiers)
13. Yang Z, Zhang H, et al. AlphaFold2 and its applications in the fields of biology and medicine. *Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy*. 2023;8(1):157. (Nature)
14. Desai D, Zhang J, et al. Review of AlphaFold 3: Transformative advances in drug discovery and structural biology. *Cells*. 2024;13(4):555. (PMC)