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**A B S T R A C T**

In this work, ten molecular compounds were optimised using density functional theory (DFT) method via Spartan 14. The obtained descriptors were used to develop quantitative structural activities relationship (QSAR) model using Gretl and Matlab software and the similarity between predicted IC50 and observed IC50 was investigated. Also, docking study revealed the non-bonding interactions between the studied compounds and the receptor. The molecular interactions between the observed ligands and brain cancer protein (PDB ID: 1q7f) were investigated. Adsorption, distribution, metabolism, excretion and toxicity (ADMET) properties were also investigated.
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Specifications Table

| Subject                  | Computational Chemistry                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Specific subject area    | Drug Discovery and Development          |
| Type of data             | Table                                   |
| How data were acquired   | Spartan'14, Pymol 1.7.4.4, Autodock tool 1.5.6, AutoVina 1.1.2, Discovery Studio 2017. |
| Data format              | Raw data                                |
| Parameters for data      | B3LYP, 6–31G*, Pymol 1.7.4.4, Discovery studio 2017R, Autodock tool 1.5.6 and Autodock vina 1.1.2. |
| Description of data collection | The research work started with optimizing the selected compounds using DFT. The obtained descriptors from the optimized compounds were extracted and used to develop QSAR model using MLR and Genetic Algorithm. Also, the developed QSAR model was used to predict the biological activities of new set of triazole based drug-like compounds and further subjected to docking. The results obtained were collected and interpreted. |
| Data source location     | Computational Chemistry Research Laboratory, Department of Pure and Applied Chemistry, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, P.M.B. 4000, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria. |
| Data accessibility       | The observed and calculated data can be accessed with the data article |

Value of the Data

- The data obtained from investigated triazole derivatives in this research will assist scientists to know the molecular descriptors that describe its anti-glioblastoma activity.
- Data in this research will disclose the role of individual molecular descriptors obtained from optimised compounds in the developed QSAR model.
- The obtained binding affinity will reveal the ability of each compound to inhibit brain tumor protein (PDB ID: 1q7f).
- ADMET properties of the observed and proposed molecular compounds were also investigated in order to define the nature of triazole derivatives in receptor.

1. Data Description

The 2D structures of the molecules used in this research were shown in Table 1. The observed compounds used in this work were obtained from the research carried out by Ewa et al., (2018) [1]. The compounds with inhibition concentration (IC$_{50}$) of $\leq$10µM were selected and subjected to quantum chemical calculation using density functional theory via B3LYP (6–31G$^*$basis set).

Thirteen descriptors (Table 2) which describe anti-glioblastoma activities of the investigated triazole derivative were obtained and they were used for further research. The descriptors obtained were highest occupied molecular orbital energy ($E_{\text{HOMO}}$), lowest unoccupied molecular orbital ($E_{\text{LUMO}}$), band gap (BG), molecular weight (MW), area, volume, polar surface area (PSA), ovality, dipole moment (DM), log P, polarisability (POL), hydrogen bond donor (HBD) and hydrogen bond acceptor (HBA).

Table 3 revealed the developed QSAR model (which help to probe into biological activities of triazoles derivatives) from the calculated molecular descriptor obtained from
Table 1
The Schematic diagram of the observed Triazole derivatives [1].

| SN | Molecular Structures | IUPAC Name |
|----|----------------------|------------|
| 1  | ![Molecular Structure 1](image1) | 3-Acetyl-28-propynoylbetulin |
| 2  | ![Molecular Structure 2](image2) | 28-Propynoylbetulone |
| 3  | ![Molecular Structure 3](image3) | 3-Acetyl-28-[1-(4-fluorobenzyl)−1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl]carbonylbetulin |
| 4  | ![Molecular Structure 4](image4) | 3-Acetyl-28-(1-ethylacetyl-1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl)carbonylbetulin |
| 5  | ![Molecular Structure 5](image5) | 3-Acetyl-28-[1-(3-hydroxypropyl)−1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl]carbonylbetulin |

(continued on next page)
| SN | Molecular Structures | IUPAC Name |
|----|----------------------|------------|
| 6  | ![Molecular Structure](image1) | 2-Amino-3-[4-(3-acetyl-28-betulinylcarbonyl)-1H-1,2,3-triazol-1-yl]propanoic acid |
| 7  | ![Molecular Structure](image2) | 28-[1-(4-Fluorobenzyl)-1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl]carbonylbetulone |
| 8  | ![Molecular Structure](image3) | 28-[1-(4-Cyanobenzyl)-1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl]carbonylbetulone |
| 9  | ![Molecular Structure](image4) | 28-[1-(3′-Deoxythymidine-5′-yl)-1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl]carbonylbetulone |
| 10 | ![Molecular Structure](image5) | 28-[1-(1-Deoxy-β-D-glucopyranosyl)-1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl]carbonylbetulone |
Table 2
Calculated molecular descriptors with anti-glioblastoma activities.

| E_HOMO | E_LUMO | BG | DM | MW | AREA | VOL | PSA | OVA | LOG P | POL | HBD | HBA |
|--------|--------|----|----|----|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|
| 1      | −6.30  | −2.75 | 3.55 | 3.72 | 536.79 | 571.38 | 598.14 | 40.09 | 1.66  | 8.09 | 89.06 | 0 | 2 |
| 2      | −6.29  | −1.49 | 4.80 | 3.76 | 492.74 | 521.02 | 551.1  | 33.37 | 1.60  | 8.35 | 84.95 | 0 | 2 |
| 3      | −6.36  | −0.99 | 5.37 | 6.72 | 673.95 | 706.89 | 726.39 | 51.01 | 1.81  | 10.23 | 99.03 | 0 | 5 |
| 4      | −6.33  | −1.00 | 5.33 | 7.57 | 651.93 | 692.8  | 704.58 | 71.86 | 1.81  | 8.21 | 97.27 | 0 | 6 |
| 5      | −6.39  | −0.96 | 5.43 | 7.58 | 623.92 | 668.32 | 681.66 | 71.04 | 1.78  | 8.10 | 95.39 | 1 | 6 |
| 6      | −6.36  | −1.02 | 5.34 | 6.29 | 652.92 | 682.91 | 695.04 | 109.53 | 1.80 | 6.86 | 96.49 | 1 | 7 |
| 7      | −6.25  | −1.04 | 5.21 | 5.98 | 643.88 | 659.42 | 682.81 | 59.30 | 1.76  | 10.02 | 95.53 | 0 | 5 |
| 8      | −6.28  | −1.92 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 650.90 | 674.84 | 697.86 | 74.64 | 1.77  | 9.90 | 96.95 | 0 | 6 |
| 9      | −6.28  | −1.12 | 5.16 | 6.23 | 759.98 | 760.65 | 777.32 | 125.34 | 1.98 | 7.12 | 103.21 | 2 | 11 |
| 10     | −6.26  | −1.15 | 5.11 | 4.81 | 697.91 | 692.16 | 711.58 | 138.97 | 1.80  | 6.03 | 97.89 | 4 | 10 |

Table 3
Calculated QSAR model for the observed triazole derivatives.

| Equation | F | P-value | R² | Adjusted R² | MSE |
|----------|---|---------|----|-------------|-----|
| IC₅₀ = −88,509.7 - 513.940(E_HOMO) + 500.156(E_LUMO) - 174.603(VOL) + 11.3407(Log F) + 2137.77(POL) + 0.587370(PSA) + 1.01540(AREA) | 31.03 | P < 0.0001 | 0.990 | 0.958 | 0.085 |

Table 4
Assessment for validation of Developed QSAR model.

| QSAR model validation parameters | Standard value | Developed QSAR model value | Remark |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------|
| Correlation coefficient (R²)     | ≥0.5           | 0.990                      | Pass   |
| Adjusted Correlation coefficient | ≥0.6           | 0.958                      | Pass   |
| Confidence interval at 95% confidence level i.e. P-value | <0.05           | 0.031                      | Pass   |

Table 5
Observed IC₅₀ and predicted IC₅₀.

| Observed IC₅₀ | Predicted IC₅₀ | Residual | Genetic Algorithm (GA) | Residual |
|---------------|----------------|----------|------------------------|----------|
| 1 | 0.67 | 0.45 | 0.217310 | 0.616731 | 0.053269 |
| 2 | 0.19 | 0.49 | −0.307571 | 0.136731 | 0.053269 |
| 3 | 0.85 | 0.50 | 0.342669 | 0.816023 | 0.033977 |
| 4 | 0.78 | 0.74 | 0.0302183 | 0.746023 | 0.033977 |
| 5 | 7.75 | 7.91 | −0.161626 | 7.716023 | 0.033977 |
| 6 | 1.22 | 1.19 | 0.02266067 | 1.186023 | 0.033977 |
| 7 | 0.45 | 0.28 | 0.167543 | 0.416023 | 0.033977 |
| 8 | 6.45 | 6.72 | −0.270293 | 6.416796 | 0.033204 |
| 9 | 0.17 | 0.67 | −0.500773 | 0.137068 | 0.032932 |
| 10 | 7.45 | 6.99 | 0.459915 | 7.417068 | 0.032932 |

Optimised compounds using Gretl software and Matlab [2,3]. The selected descriptors used in developing QSAR model were E_HOMO, E_LUMO, Vol, Log P, Pol, PSA and Area and the statistical factors considered for QSAR validation were correlation coefficient (R²), adjusted correlation coefficient (Adj.R²), P-Value, F-Value and MSE. The calculated value for correlation coefficient (R²), Adjusted correlation coefficient (Adj. R²), P-Value and F-Value were 0.990, 0.958, P < 0.0001, 31.03 and 0.085 as shown in Table 4.

Table 5 showed the calculated inhibition concentration (IC₅₀) for the investigated molecular compounds. The correlation between the predicted inhibition efficiency (IC₅₀) and observed efficiency (IC₅₀) were displayed in Fig. 1. In this work, six (6) molecular compounds were proposed using the developed QSAR model and the inhibition concentration of individual proposed compound was predicted and displayed in Table 6.
Table 6
Schematics structures of the proposed compounds with the inhibition concentration.

| R₁        | R₂  | IC₅₀  |
|-----------|-----|-------|
| OCH₃      | CH₃ | −13.54|
| OC₂H₅     | CH₃ | −9.60 |
| NH₂       | CH₃ | −16.79|
| CH₃       | CH₃ | −7.72 |
| CH₃F      | CH₃ | −27.30|
| CHF₂      | CH₃ | −32.98|

Also, Table 7 showed four molecular compounds (2, 7, 9 and 10) with −9.5 kcal/mol, −11.2 kcal/mol, −10.0 kcal/mol, and −9.4 kcal/mol respectively. The selected compounds were subjected to ADMET study using admetSAR server and the factor considered were based on adsorption, distribution, metabolism, excretion and toxicity of the investigated ligands. The obtained ADMET values were compared to the standard compound used (Carmustine).

The calculated molecular interaction observed between the optimised triazole derivatives and brain tumor protein (PDB ID: 1q7f) [4] were reported in Table 8. The binding affinity calculated for each complex was −8.4 kcal/mol, −9.5 kcal/mol, −8.6 kcal/mol, −8.8 kcal/mol, −8.5 kcal/mol, −8.1 kcal/mol, −9.0 kcal/mol, −10.0 kcal/mol and −9.4 kcal/mol for compound 1–10 and the interaction between the observed complexes were shown in Fig. 2.

2. Design, Materials and Methods

The studied triazole derivatives (Table 1) were drawn using ChemDraw Ultra 8.0 and were optimised using Spartan 14 [5]. The optimization was accomplished using B3LYP with 6–31 G*
| Mode                          | Compound 2 | Probability | Compound 7 | Probability | Compound 8 | Probability | Compound 9 | Probability | Compound 10 | Probability | Carmustine | Probability |
|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Blood-Brain Barrier          | BBB+       | 0.9079      | BBB+       | 0.5902      | BBB+       | 0.5456      | BBB-       | 0.8875      | BBB+        | 0.9564      | BBB+       | 0.9533      |
| Human Intestinal Absorption  | HIA+       | 0.9900      | HIA+       | 0.9962      | HIA+       | 0.9947      | HIA+       | 0.9430      | HIA+        | 0.6024      | HIA+       | 1.0000      |
| Caco-2 Permeability          | Caco2+     | 0.6469      | Caco2-     | 0.5649      | Caco2-     | 0.5831      | Caco2-     | 0.6729      | Caco2-      | 0.6979      | Caco2-     | 0.5621      |
| P-glycoprotein Substrate     | Substrate  | 0.6290      | Substrate  | 0.8512      | Substrate  | 0.8125      | Substrate  | 0.8454      | Substrate   | 0.8269      | Non-Substrate | 0.7552   |
| P-glycoprotein Inhibitor     | Inhibitor  | 0.9030      | Inhibitor  | 0.9365      | Inhibitor  | 0.9495      | Inhibitor  | 0.6937      | Inhibitor   | 0.7651      | Non-inhibitor | 0.7970   |
| Renal Organic Cation         | Non-inhibitor | 0.7387     | Non-inhibitor | 0.5700  | Non-inhibitor | 0.5301      | Non-inhibitor | 0.8682      | Non-inhibitor | 0.9224      | Non-inhibitor | 0.8177   |
| Transporter                   |            |             |            |             |            |             |            |             |             |             |             |             |
| Subcellular localization     | Mitochondria | 0.8457     | Mitochondria | 0.6253  | Mitochondria | 0.6304      | Mitochondria | 0.5907      | Mitochondria | 0.4545      | Mitochondria | 0.7342   |
| CYP450 2C9 Substrate         | Non-substrate | 0.8652     | Non-substrate | 0.8442 | Non-substrate | 0.8867      | Non-substrate | 0.7638      | Non-substrate | 0.7948      | Non-substrate | 0.7656   |
| CYP450 2D6 Substrate         | Non-substrate | 0.9104     | Non-substrate | 0.8250 | Non-substrate | 0.8210      | Non-substrate | 0.8343      | Non-substrate | 0.8260      | Non-substrate | 0.8491   |
| CYP450 3A4 Substrate         | Substrate  | 0.7739      | Substrate  | 0.6987      | Substrate  | 0.7062      | Substrate  | 0.7097      | Substrate   | 0.6901      | Non-substrate | 0.6720   |
| CYP450 1A2 Inhibitor         | Non-inhibitor | 0.8848     | Non-inhibitor | 0.7102 | Non-inhibitor | 0.7503      | Non-inhibitor | 0.8277      | Non-inhibitor | 0.7723      | Non-inhibitor | 0.9045   |
| CYP450 2C9 Inhibitor         | Non-inhibitor | 0.6679     | Non-inhibitor | 0.5937 | Non-inhibitor | 0.6198      | Non-inhibitor | 0.6658      | Non-inhibitor | 0.7210      | Non-inhibitor | 0.9070   |
| CYP450 2D6 Inhibitor         | Non-inhibitor | 0.9248     | Non-inhibitor | 0.8454 | Non-inhibitor | 0.8666      | Non-inhibitor | 0.8863      | Non-inhibitor | 0.9026      | Non-inhibitor | 0.9521   |
| CYP450 2C19 Inhibitor        | Inhibitor  | 0.5296      | Inhibitor  | 0.5581      | Inhibitor  | 0.5391      | Inhibitor  | 0.7017      | Non-inhibitor | 0.7290      | Non-inhibitor | 0.9020   |
| CYP450 3A4 Inhibitor         | Non-inhibitor | 0.6446     | Inhibitor  | 0.7561      | Inhibitor  | 0.7227      | Inhibitor  | 0.9283      | Inhibitor   | 0.6378      | Non-inhibitor | 0.9031   |
| CYP Inhibitory Promiscuity   | Low CYP     | 0.5976      | CYP        | 0.8442      | CYP        | 0.7893      | CYP        | 0.6235      | CYP         | 0.5903      | Low CYP     | 0.9131   |
| Inhibitory Promiscuity       | Promiscuity | 0.5976      | Inhibitory | 0.8442      | Inhibitory | 0.7893      | Inhibitory | 0.6235      | Inhibitory   | 0.5903      | Low CYP     | 0.9131   |
| Human Ether-a-go-go-Related Inhibitor Promiscuity | Weak inhibitor | 0.9102                | Weak inhibitor | 0.6081                | Weak inhibitor | 0.5223                | Weak inhibitor | 0.7555                | Weak inhibitor | 0.9532                | Weak inhibitor | 0.7478                |
| Gene Inhibition              | Non-inhibitor | 0.7874     | Non-inhibitor | 0.5632     | Non-inhibitor | 0.7159     | Non-inhibitor | 0.7119     | Non-inhibitor | 0.5634     | Non-inhibitor | 0.9190     |
| AMES Toxicity                | Non AMES toxic | 0.8923     | Non AMES toxic | 0.5299     | Non AMES toxic | 0.5228     | Non AMES toxic | 0.5140     | Non AMES toxic | 0.5885     | AMES toxic | 0.9577     |
| Carcinogens                  | Non-carcinogens | 0.8769     | Non-carcinogens | 0.8221     | Non-carcinogens | 0.8393     | Non-carcinogens | 0.7862     | Non-carcinogens | 0.9015     | Carcinogens | 0.6840     |
| Fish Toxicity                | High FHMT  | 0.9996      | High FHMT  | 1.0000      | High FHMT  | 0.9999      | High FHMT  | 0.9998      | High FHMT   | 0.9999      | High FHMT | 0.6546     |
| Tetrahymena Pyriformis       | High TPT  | 0.9996      | High TPT  | 0.9968      | High TPT  | 0.9931      | High TPT  | 0.9874      | High TPT   | 0.9924      | High TPT | 0.9857     |
| Toxicity                     |            |             |            |             |            |             |            |             |            |             |            |             |
| Honey Bee Toxicity           | High HBT  | 0.8781      | Low HBT   | 0.6610      | Low HBT   | 0.5742      | Low HBT   | 0.6662      | Low HBT    | 0.6038      | Low HBT    | 0.7045     |
| Biodegradation               | Not ready | 0.9800      | Not ready | 1.0000      | Not ready | 1.0000      | Not ready | 0.9870      | Not ready  | 0.9803      | Not ready  | 0.5596     |
| biodegradable                | biodegradable | biodegradable | biodegradable | biodegradable | biodegradable | biodegradable | biodegradable | biodegradable | biodegradable | biodegradable | biodegradable | biodegradable |
Table 8
Scoring and residues involved in the interaction between the studied complex.

| Scoring (kcal/mol) | Residues involved in the interactions | Types of Non-bonding interaction involved |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 1                 | −8.4 VAL-835, VAL-788, VAL-921, LEU-1sss009, ILE-965 | Conventional Hydrogen Bond, Alkyl |
| 2                 | −9.5 Gly-964, VAL-921, ALA-787, ARG-837, ILE-965 | Carbon Hydrogen Bond, Alkyl |
| 3                 | −8.6 ILE-965, VAL-1007, ALA-787, ALA-834, VAL-922, ARG-837 | Carbon Hydrogen Bond, Alkyl |
| 4                 | −8.8 ASP-924, ARG-837, ALA-834, VAL-877 | Conventional Hydrogen Bond, Hydrogen Bond, Pi-Alkyl, Alkyl |
| 5                 | −8.5 ASP-924, ILE-965, VAL-950, THR-878, LEU-1009, ALA-1008, ARG-837 | Conventional Hydrogen Bond, Hydrogen Bond, Pi-Alkyl, Alkyl |
| 6                 | −8.1 THR-986, GLN-987, GLY-969, ASN-968, ILE-965, VAL-922, ARG-837, VAL-835 | Conventional Hydrogen Bond, Hydrogen Bond, Alkyl |
| 7                 | −11.2 ARG-837, ALA-1008, ASP-1006, VAL-877, VAL-833, LEU-1009, ILE-965 | Conventional Hydrogen Bond, Halogen(Fluorine), Pi-Anion, Pi-Alkyl, Alkyl |
| 8                 | −9.0 ILE-965, GLY-969, VAL-922, ARG-837, ALA-1008, ALA-787 | Carbon Hydrogen Bond, Alkyl |
| 9                 | −10.0 ILE-965, ALA-787, ALA-834, VAL-922, ARG-837, ALA-790 | Conventional Hydrogen Bond, Carbon Hydrogen Bond, Pi-Alkyl, Pi-Sigma, Alkyl |
| 10                | −9.4 ILE-965, ALA-787, ALA-1008, VAL-922, ASN-838, ARG-837 | Conventional Hydrogen Bond, Carbon Hydrogen Bond, Pi-Alkyl, Alkyl |
| Carmustine        | −5.0 VAL-835, ARG-837, VAL-879 | Conventional Hydrogen Bond |

Proposed Compounds

| P1     | −8.6 PHE-916, ILE-961, TYR-959 | Alkyl, Pi-Alkyl |
| P2     | −8.7 PHE-916, ILE-961, TYR-959 | Alkyl, Pi-Alkyl |
| P3     | −8.5 VAL-788, VAL-835, ARG-837, ILE-965 | Conventional Hydrogen Bond, Unfavourable Donor-Donor, Alkyl |
| P4     | −8.7 PHE-916, ILE-961, TYR-959 | Alkyl, Pi-Alkyl |
| P5     | −8.6 PHE-1005, PHE-916, ILE-961, TYR-959 | Alkyl, Pi-Alkyl |
| P6     | −8.9 ARG-837, VAL-788, ALA-787, VAL-835, ALA-834, ILE-965, VAL-921 | Conventional Hydrogen Bond, Halogen, Alkyl |

as basis set which produce descriptors that were used for further investigation. The selected calculated descriptors obtained from the optimised compounds were used to build robust QSAR model in order to relate the biological activity of the studied compounds to the calculated molecular parameters [6]. This was achieved using mathematical methods (multiple linear regression method) via Gretl 1.9.8. The observed inhibition concentration (IC\textsubscript{50}) served as dependent variable while the calculated descriptors served as independent variables; thus, the QSAR model was developed. Several factors such as correlation coefficient (R\textsuperscript{2}), P-Value, F-value were considered to know the level of efficiency of the developed QSAR model. More so, validation of the developed QSAR model was implemented by observing some mathematical factors (cross validation correlation coefficient (C.V R\textsuperscript{2}), adjusted correlation coefficient) which could be calculated using Eq. (1) and 2 [7].

\[
C.V R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum(Y_{obs} - Y_{cal})^2}{\sum(Y_{obs} - \bar{Y}_{obs})^2}
\]  
\[
R^2_a = \frac{(N - 1) \times R^2 - P}{N - 1 - P}
\]

Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism, Excretion and the Toxicity properties of the studied triazole derivatives were done via online software (admetSAR) (http://lmmd.ecust.edu.cn/admetsar1) [8]. The factors considered were Blood Brain Barrier, Caco-2 cell permeability, Human Intestinal Absorption, Ames test. Also, four software (Pymol
Fig. 2. 2D structures of brain tumor protein (PDB ID: 1q7f) and compound 2, 7, 8, 9 and 10 respectively.

(for treating downloaded protein), Autodock Tool (for locating binding site in the downloaded protein and for converting ligand and receptor to.pdbqt format from.pdb format), Auto dock vina (for docking calculation) and discovery studio (for viewing the non-bonding interaction between the docked complexes) were used to accomplish docking study between triazole derivative and brain tumor protein (PDB ID: 1q7f). The observed grid box was as follows: center (X = 12.534, Y = 23.847, Z = 40.848) and size (X = 68, Y = 64, Z = 72) as well as the spacing was set to be 1.00 Å.
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