

Pharmacophore

(An International Research Journal)

Available online at <http://www.pharmacophorejournal.com/>

Original Research Paper

QSAR MODELLING OF NEW TRIAZOLOTHIADIAZOLE DERIVATIVES AS ANTIMICROBIALS

Chaturvedi Prerna^{1*}, Dubey P.K.¹, Shrivastava Birendra² and Sharma Pankaj²

¹Swami Vivekanand College of Pharmacy, Khandwa Road, Near Toll Naka, Indore-452020, India

²Department of Pharmaceutical Science, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India

ABSTRACT

In the present research twenty nine analogues displaying variable inhibition of *E.coli* were subjected to quantitative structure activity relationship analysis. Various thermodynamic, electronic and steric parameters were calculated using Chem 3D package of molecular modeling software Chemoffice 8.0. QSAR models were generated employing sequential multiple regression method using in-house statistical program VALSTAT. Statistically significant models with *R*-values 0.90 were obtained. Models were validated using leave one out and bootstrapping methods. Results obtained shows that stretch energy, dipole-dipole energy, HOMO energy and Non-1, 4 VDW Energy are contributing to biological activity. Findings of present study reveal that substituent those decrease the flexibility of molecule results in increase in antimicrobial potency, aryl substituent would enhance the antimicrobial activity of compounds and presence of electron withdrawing group in structure is favorable for antibacterial activity of triazolothiadiazoles.

Keywords: Triazolothiadiazoles, Antimicrobials, QSAR, Quantitative Structure Property Relationships.

INTRODUCTION

Triazolo thiadiazole system may be viewed as a cyclic analogue of two very important compounds.¹ Thiosemicarbazide and biguanide/thioguanide which often display diverse biological activity.² More over the triazolo thiadiazole substituted in the 3 and 6 positions by aryl, alkyl or heterocyclic moiety possess pharmacological activities³⁻⁶ such as anti- bacterial, anti-fungal activity, anti- viral activity, anti-inflammatory, analgesic, herbicidal and anti- HIV-1 effects. 1, 2, 4-triazole and 1, 3, 4-triazoles represent one of the most biologically active classes of compounds, possessing a wide spectrum of activities. A literature, survey indicated that 1, 2, 4-triazole and 1, 3, 4-triazole thiadiazoles derivatives play vital role as synthetic drugs. These observations led to the conception that triazolothiadiazole derivatives

would possess potential antimicrobial properties. This Quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR) study enables the investigators to establish a reliable quantitative structure-activity and structure-property relationships to derive a QSAR model to predict the activity of novel molecules prior to their synthesis.⁷ A data set of 29 molecules exhibiting potent antibacterial activity against *E. coli* has been taken from published article of T. Karabasanagouda⁸ *et al.* and S N Swamy⁹ *et al.* The overall process of QSAR model development can be divided into three stages namely, the data preparation, data analysis, and model validation, representing a standard practice of any QSAR modeling.¹⁰⁻¹⁵ In this research, an attempt has been made to describe the Quantitative structure-activity Relationship (QSAR) analysis of

triazolothiadiazole derivatives to study and deduce a correlation between structure and antimicrobial activity of these derivatives.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A data set of 29 molecules exhibiting potent antibacterial activity against *E. coli* has been taken from published article of T.

Karabasanagouda *et al.* and S N Swamy *et al.* All the values of biological data were shown in MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$), which were converted into $-\log\text{MIC}$ ($\mu\text{g/ml}$) for convenience of computational work. Structures of reported compounds and Pmic values are shown in Table-1. QSAR study was done on these 29 compounds.




Figure 1: General structure of triazolothiadiazole

Table I: Structure of triazolothiadiazole derivatives along with their MIC and PMIC values:

| Comp. No. | Ar | Ar' | MIC | Pmic |
|-----------|--|---|------|------|
| 1. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SCH ₃ | C ₆ H ₅ | 6.25 | 7.75 |
| 2. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SCH ₃ | 2-ClC ₆ H ₄ | 25 | 7.17 |
| 3. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SCH ₃ | 4-CH ₃ C ₆ H ₄ | 6.25 | 7.77 |
| 4. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SCH ₃ | 4-OCH ₃ C ₆ H ₄ | 6.25 | 7.79 |
| 5. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SCH ₃ | 4-NH ₂ C ₆ H ₄ | 6.25 | 7.77 |
| 6. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SCH ₃ | 2,3-(Cl) ₂ C ₆ H ₄ | 6.25 | 7.83 |
| 7. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SCH ₃ | C ₆ H ₅ CH ₂ | 6.25 | 7.77 |
| 8. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SC ₂ H ₅ | C ₆ H ₅ | 6.25 | 7.77 |
| 9. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SC ₂ H ₅ | 2-ClC ₆ H ₄ | 25 | 7.21 |
| 10. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SC ₂ H ₅ | 4-CH ₃ C ₆ H ₄ | 6.25 | 7.79 |
| 11. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SC ₂ H ₅ | 4-OCH ₃ C ₆ H ₄ | 25 | 7.20 |
| 12. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SC ₂ H ₅ | 4-NH ₂ C ₆ H ₄ | 25 | 7.19 |
| 13. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SC ₂ H ₅ | 2,3-(Cl) ₂ C ₆ H ₄ | 25 | 7.24 |
| 14. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SC ₂ H ₅ | 2-OHC ₆ H ₄ | 25 | 7.19 |
| 15. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SO ₂ CH ₃ | C ₆ H ₅ | 12.5 | 7.49 |
| 16. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SO ₂ CH ₃ | 2-ClC ₆ H ₄ | 12.5 | 7.53 |
| 17. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SO ₂ CH ₃ | 3-ClC ₆ H ₄ | 12.5 | 7.53 |
| 18. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SO ₂ CH ₃ | C ₆ H ₅ CH ₂ | 12.5 | 7.51 |
| 19. | CH ₂ OC ₆ H ₄ SO ₂ CH ₃ | 2,3-(Cl) ₂ C ₆ H ₄ | 6.25 | 7.86 |
| 20. | CH ₃ | C ₆ H ₄ Cl | 41 | 6.79 |
| 21. | C ₂ H ₅ | C ₆ H ₄ Cl | 13 | 7.31 |
| 22. | C ₆ H ₅ | C ₆ H ₄ Cl | 15 | 7.32 |
| 23. | 4-CH ₃ C ₆ H ₅ | C ₆ H ₄ Cl | 17 | 7.28 |
| 24. | 4-Cl-C ₆ H ₅ | C ₆ H ₄ Cl | 40 | 6.94 |
| 25. | CH ₃ | C ₃ H ₇ | 39 | 6.79 |
| 26. | C ₂ H ₅ | C ₃ H ₇ | 12 | 7.32 |
| 27. | C ₆ H ₅ | C ₃ H ₇ | 14 | 7.33 |
| 28. | 4-CH ₃ C ₆ H ₅ | C ₃ H ₇ | 15 | 7.32 |
| 29. | 4-Cl-C ₆ H ₅ | C ₃ H ₇ | 38 | 6.95 |

Methodology and Software Used for QSAR Analysis

The molecular modeling study was performed using CS Chemoffice 2004 and regression analysis was carried out on VALSTAT. The compounds in the series were sketched using Chem Draw module of Chem Office. The sketched structures were subjected to energy minimization using Allinger's MM2 force field followed by semi empirical AM1 (Austin Model) Hamiltonian method available in MOPAC module by fixing root mean square gradient as 0.1 and 0.0001 kcal/Mol Å[°] respectively. The values of descriptor (like thermodynamic, steric and electronic,) for all the molecules were calculated using "compute properties" module of Chem ultra. The calculated values were then tabulated along with biological activity. The QSAR models were generated using biological

activity as dependent variable and descriptors as independent variables. In the present study, sequential multiple linear regression analysis was performed to generate various equations which were further validated by most popular leave one out (LOO) cross-validation method to ensure their robustness. The generated QSAR models were validated for predictive ability inside the model (Leave one out method) using VALSTAT. The statistical program which is tailored specifically for QSAR statistics estimates the predictive potential of model by calculating the validation parameters squared cross-correlation coefficient (q^2), standard deviation of sum of square of difference between predicted and observed values (SPRESS) and standard deviation of error of prediction (SDEP).

Table II: Calculated substituent constants used in 3D-QSAR analysis of triazolothiadiazoles

| Comp. No | Stretch Energy(Q) | Dipole-dipole energy (R) | HOMO Energy(AE) | Non-1,4 VDW Energy(AF) |
|----------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 1. | 16.14 | -4.17 | -8.01 | -1.18 |
| 2. | 8.39 | -2.26 | -8.10 | 2.33 |
| 3. | 15.99 | -4.18 | -8.05 | -0.68 |
| 4. | 16.56 | -4.19 | -8.05 | 0.25 |
| 5. | 19.18 | -4.12 | -7.91 | -0.43 |
| 6. | 16.45 | -4.18 | -8.08 | 11.05 |
| 7. | 15.89 | -4.14 | -7.97 | -2.80 |
| 8. | 15.47 | -4.27 | -7.96 | -0.17 |
| 9. | 12.74 | -3.06 | -8.35 | 1.24 |
| 10. | 15.66 | -4.26 | -7.95 | -3.51 |
| 11. | 15.11 | -3.57 | -8.35 | -2.73 |
| 12. | 13.86 | -2.85 | -8.41 | -2.80 |
| 13. | 12.48 | -2.95 | -8.49 | -3.85 |
| 14. | 2 | -6.73 | -8.40 | -4.45 |
| 15. | 21.64 | -1.94 | -9.35 | -3.23 |
| 16. | 22.61 | -1.92 | -9.31 | 10.91 |
| 17. | 22.59 | -1.94 | -9.43 | -1.67 |
| 18. | 22.62 | -1.91 | -9.36 | -3.85 |
| 19. | 22.97 | -1.92 | -9.36 | 11.25 |
| 20. | 6.02 | -1.87 | -9.11 | 1.74 |
| 21. | 9.88 | -2.60 | -8.87 | 11.03 |
| 22. | 9.92 | -2.56 | -8.61 | 7.71 |
| 23. | 9.93 | -2.57 | -8.53 | 10.72 |
| 24. | 9.89 | -2.57 | -8.73 | 10.21 |
| 25. | 10.20 | -2.70 | -8.98 | -2.99 |
| 26. | 10.22 | -2.69 | -8.96 | -3.30 |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 27. | 10.26 | -2.69 | -8.73 | -2.19 |
| 28. | 10.58 | -2.81 | -8.65 | -1.56 |
| 29. | 10.43 | -2.67 | -8.77 | -5.60 |

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Biological activity data and various physicochemical parameters were taken as dependent and independent variables respectively and correlations were established using sequential multiple regression analysis. The descriptors selected for modeling antibacterial activity of triazolothiadiazoles are summarized in Table 2. Among the many correlations generated, two best models were selected on the basis of statistical significance. The best models obtained are given below along with their statistical measures.

Model 1

Parent Equation

$$BA = [6.24186 (\pm 0.261315)] + Q [-0.0654959 (\pm 0.01742)] + R [0.202829 (\pm 0.0644588)] + AE [-3.30672e-005 (\pm 2.35304e-005)]$$

Contribution of parameters to model is Q : R : AE :: 2.49915 : 1.72252 : 1

n=29, r=0.898438, r²=0.80719, variance=0.0199388, std=0.141205, F=33.4917, FIT=275.425

Training-Test Set Equation

$$BA = [6.3109 (\pm 0.262132)] + Q [-0.0627601 (\pm 0.0172347)] + R [0.202202 (\pm 0.0677932)] + AE [-3.57432e-005 (\pm 2.33371e-005)]$$

n=23, r=0.906716, r²=0.822135, variance=0.0177467, std=0.133217, F=29.2741, FIT=280.135

Model 2

Parent Equation

$$BA = [6.24618 (\pm 0.26407)] + Q [-0.0641464 (\pm 0.0172144)] + R [0.197591 (\pm 0.0637312)] + AF [-0.000219438 (\pm 0.000163466)]$$

Contribution of parameters to model is Q : R : AF :: 2.67013 : 1.83056 : 1

n=29, r=0.895931, r²=0.802693, variance=0.0204039, std=0.142842, F=32.546, FIT=267.648

Training-Test Set Equation

$$BA = [6.3126 (\pm 0.263128)] + Q [-0.0617991 (\pm 0.0169394)] + R [0.198354 (\pm 0.0667528)] + AF [-0.000244006 (\pm 0.000161255)]$$

Contribution of parameters to model is Q : R : AF :: 2.26356 : 1.81684 : 1

n=23, r=0.905881, r²=0.820621, variance=0.0178978, std=0.133783, F=28.9736, FIT=277.259

Table III: Observed, Calculated and Predicted pMIC values of Training Set Compounds using 3D-QSAR Equation for model 1

| Compounds | Observed pMIC | Calculated pMIC | Predicted pMIC |
|-----------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1. | 7.53 | 7.58 | 7.60 |
| 2. | 6.79 | 6.96 | 7.02 |
| 3. | 7.75 | 7.77 | 7.77 |
| 4. | 7.77 | 7.90 | 7.94 |
| 5. | 7.77 | 7.69 | 7.68 |
| 6. | 7.32 | 7.35 | 7.36 |
| 7. | 7.2 | 7.41 | 7.45 |
| 8. | 7.28 | 7.17 | 7.16 |
| 9. | 7.33 | 7.24 | 7.23 |
| 10. | 7.49 | 7.56 | 7.58 |

| | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|
| 11. | 7.83 | 7.73 | 7.72 |
| 12. | 7.17 | 6.94 | 6.89 |
| 13. | 7.19 | 7.30 | 7.56 |
| 14. | 7.77 | 7.71 | 7.70 |
| 15. | 7.32 | 7.24 | 7.24 |
| 16. | 7.21 | 7.24 | 7.24 |
| 17. | 7.77 | 7.68 | 7.67 |
| 18. | 7.32 | 7.21 | 7.20 |
| 19. | 6.95 | 7.22 | 7.24 |
| 20. | 7.79 | 7.64 | 7.62 |
| 21. | 7.31 | 7.33 | 7.33 |
| 22. | 7.24 | 7.17 | 7.15 |
| 23. | 7.19 | 7.26 | 7.27 |




Figure 1: Discrete Plot of observed vs. calculated pMIC values by leave-one-out cross-validation for model 1





Figure 2: Discrete Plot of observed vs. predicted pMIC values by leave-one-out cross-validation for model 1

Table IV : Observed and Predicted pMIC values of Test Set Compounds using 3D-QSAR Equation for model 1

| Compounds | Observed pMIC | Predicted pMIC |
|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| 1. | 7.51 | 7.53 |
| 2. | 6.94 | 7.18 |
| 3. | 7.79 | 7.69 |
| 4. | 7.86 | 7.57 |
| 5. | 7.53 | 7.58 |

**Figure 3:** Discrete Plot of observed vs. predicted pMIC values by leave-one-out cross-validation for model 1**Table V:** Observed, Calculated and Predicted pMIC values of Training Set Compounds using 3D-QSAR Equation for model 2

| Compounds | Observed pMIC | Calculated pMIC | Predicted pMIC |
|-----------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1. | 7.53 | 7.57 | 7.59 |
| 2. | 6.79 | 6.95 | 7.01 |
| 3. | 7.75 | 7.77 | 7.77 |
| 4. | 7.77 | 7.90 | 7.93 |
| 5. | 7.77 | 7.69 | 7.68 |
| 6. | 7.32 | 7.35 | 7.36 |
| 7. | 7.2 | 7.42 | 7.45 |
| 8. | 7.28 | 7.18 | 7.17 |
| 9. | 7.33 | 7.25 | 7.24 |
| 10. | 7.49 | 7.57 | 7.59 |
| 11. | 7.83 | 7.70 | 7.69 |
| 12. | 7.17 | 6.94 | 6.88 |
| 13. | 7.19 | 7.30 | 7.57 |
| 14. | 7.77 | 7.71 | 7.70 |
| 15. | 7.32 | 7.26 | 7.25 |
| 16. | 7.21 | 7.24 | 7.24 |
| 17. | 7.77 | 7.69 | 7.68 |
| 18. | 7.32 | 7.21 | 7.20 |

| | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|
| 19. | 6.95 | 7.22 | 7.24 |
| 20. | 7.79 | 7.65 | 7.63 |
| 21. | 7.31 | 7.32 | 7.32 |
| 22. | 7.24 | 7.15 | 7.13 |
| 23. | 7.19 | 7.27 | 7.28 |




Figure 4: Discrete Plot of observed vs. calculated pMIC values by leave-one-out cross-validation for model 2.




Figure 5: Discrete Plot of observed vs. predicted pMIC values by leave-one-out cross-validation for model 1

Table VI: Observed and Predicted pMIC values of Test Set Compounds using 3D-QSAR Equation for model 2

| Compounds | Observed pMIC | Predicted pMIC |
|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| 1. | 7.51 | 7.55 |
| 2. | 6.94 | 7.17 |
| 3. | 7.79 | 7.69 |
| 4. | 7.86 | 7.54 |
| 5. | 7.53 | 7.57 |




Figure 6: Discrete Plot of observed vs. predicted pMIC values by leave-one-out cross-validation for model 2

Validation of Models

Once the equation is obtained, it is important to determine its reliability and significance. The validation of the equation is done by cross-validation /leave-one out method. The results are shown below.

Table VII: Validation of models

| Model No. | I | II |
|---------------------|---------|---------|
| n | 23 | 23 |
| r | 0.906 | 0.905 |
| r ² | 0.822 | 0.820 |
| Variance | 0.017 | 0.017 |
| Std | 0.133 | 0.133 |
| F | 29.274 | 28.973 |
| FIT | 280.135 | 277.259 |
| Q ² | 0.691 | 0.687 |
| SDep | 0.159 | 0.160 |
| Spress | 0.175 | 0.176 |
| r ² pred | 0.702 | 0.684 |
| chance | <0.001 | <0.001 |

In the above QSAR models n is the number of data points, r is correlation coefficient, r² is squared correlation coefficient, std is standard deviation or standard error of estimate, Accuracy in the analysis is shown by low values of standard error of estimate. F represents Fischer ratio between the variances of calculated and observed activities. The correlation coefficient value (r=0.906 for model 1 and r=0.905, for model 2) represents the better fit of the regression and good predictive ability and robustness of the model. Both of the models have significance level better than the 99.95% as it exceeded the tabulated F=29.27 and F= 28.97 for model 1 & 2

respectively. Very low S_{PRESS} and S_{DEP} of the models indicate predictivity of the models. Low standard error of estimation (std=0.133 for model 1 and std=0.133, for model 2) suggests a high degree of confidence in model. Chance is the ratio of the equivalent regression equations to the total number of randomized sets; (chance value of 0.001 corresponds to 0.1% chance of fortuitous correlation).

In model I & II stretch energy contributed negatively to the biological activity whereas dipole- dipole energy contributed positively to the biological activity. HOMO energy and Non-1, 4 VDW Energy contributed negatively to the

biological activity in model I & II respectively. Stretch energy is the thermodynamic parameter that deals with conformational flexibility of molecule. Negative contribution of stretch energy suggests that substituent that decrease the flexibility of nucleus will enhance the activity. The dipole-dipole energy descriptor in the models represents the sum of electrostatic terms resulting from the interaction of two dipoles. The descriptor bears a positive coefficient, which suggests significance of dipole-dipole interactions for the antibacterial activity which means increase in magnitude of dipole-dipole interaction will increase the activity of compounds. HOMO is an electronic descriptor and represents the highest energy level in the molecule that contains electron pairs. HOMO represents ability to donate electrons. It is important in governing molecular reactivity and properties and measures the nucleophilicity of the molecule. Negative contribution suggested that molecule will interact on electron rich areas on receptor and the substitution of electron withdrawing groups in the molecule will impart the positive influence on activity. Non-1, 4 VDW Energy is the energy for the through space interaction between pairs of atoms that are separated by more than three atoms. Negative contribution of Non-1, 4 VDW Energy (attractive force between active substituent and enzyme binding sites) in biological activity indicates that minimizing parameters with suitable substituent enhance the activity. Thus aryl substituent may increase activity while alkyl or bulky groups may decrease activity.

CONCLUSION

QSAR analysis was performed on a series of triazolothiadiazoles using molecular modeling program Chemoffice2001. QSAR models were proposed for antimicrobial activity of the thiadiazinoacridines using chemSAR descriptors employing sequential multiple regression analysis method. The predictive power of each model was estimated with boot strapping r^2 method and leave-one-out cross validation method. It was observed from the selected models that biological activity of triazolothiadiazoles is governed by

thermodynamic and electronic properties of the molecules.

Findings of present study reveal that substituent those decrease the flexibility of molecule results in increase in antimicrobial potency, aryl substituent would enhance the antimicrobial activity of compounds and presence of electron withdrawing group in structure is favorable for antibacterial activity of triazolothiadiazoles. The finding of the study will be helpful in the design of potent analogues of triazolothiadiazoles. Finally, it is hoped that the work presented here will play an important role in understanding the relationship of physicochemical parameters with structure and biological activity. By studying the QSAR model one can select the suitable parameter for designing active compound for antimicrobial activity with maximum potency.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Authors wish to thank the Chancellor JNU, Jaipur and Director SVCP, Indore for providing the necessary facilities for undertaking this research work.

REFERENCES

1. Amir, M; Kumar, H and Javed, SA (2007), "Condensed bridgehead nitrogen heterocyclic system: Synthesis and pharmacological activities of 1,2,4-triazolo-[3,4-b]-1,3,4-thiadiazole derivatives of ibuprofen and biphenyl-4-yloxy acetic acid", *Eur. J. Med. Chem.*, 42, 431-436.
2. Vinod, M; Keshavayya, J; Vaidya, VKP and Giles, D (2007), "Synthesis and Pharmacological activities of 3,6-disubstituted-1,2,4-thiazolo-1,2,4-thiadiazoles and their dihydro analogues", *Eur. J. Med. Chem.*, 42, 823-840.
3. Ramana Reddy, MV; Vinay Billa, K; Venkat Pallele, R; Muralidhar Mallireddigari, R; Rengasamy, B and Jerome, L (2008), "Design, synthesis and biological evaluation of 1-(4-sulfamylphenyl)-3-trifluoromethyl-5-indolyl thiadiazoles as cyclooxygenase-2

- and Lipxygenase inhibitors”, *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.*, 16, 3907-3916.
- Karegoudar, P; Prasad, DJ; Ashok, M; Mahalinga, M; Poojary, B and Holla, BS (2008), “Synthesis, antimicrobial and anti-inflammatory activities of some 1,2,4-triazolo[3,4- b][1,3,4]thiadiazoles and 1,2,4-triazolo[3,4-b][1,3,4]thiadiazines bearing trichlorophenyl moiety”, *Eur. J. Med. Chem.*, 43, 808.
 - Fusco, S; Centore, R; Riccio, P and Quatela, A (2008), “NLO-active polymers containing triazolo-thiadiazole segments”, *Polymer*, 49, 186-191.
 - Amir, M; Kumar, H and Javed, SA (2007), “Synthesis and pharmacological evaluation of condensed heterocyclic 6-substituted-1,2,4- triazolo[3,4-b][1,3,4]thiadiazole derivatives of Naproxen”, *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.*, 17, 4504-4508.
 - Khalil, NS (2007), “N-alpha-l-arabinopyranosyl[1,2,4]triazolo[3,4-b][1,3,4] thiadiazoles, First synthesis and biological evaluation”, *Eur. J. Med. Chem.*, 42, 1193-1199.
 - Airody, A; Karabasanagouda, T and Suchetha Shetty, N (2007), “Synthesis and antimicrobial activity of some novel 1,2,4-triazolo[3,4-b]-thiadiazoles and 1,2,4-triazolo[3,4-b]-thiadiazines carrying thioalkyl and suphonyl phenoxy moieties”, *Eur. J. Med. Chem.*, 42, 521-52.
 - Mogilaiah, K; Sakarm, K; Swamy, TK and Kumar, KS (2007), “Synthesis and antibacterial activity of 4-aryl-1-(2-furyl/2-thienyl)-1,2,4-triazolo-Naphthyridines”, *Indian J. Heterocycl. Chem.*, 16, 405-406.
 - Vasanthanathan, P; Lakshmi, L; Babu, MA; Arunkumar, G and Sathish, GK (2006), “QSAR Study of 3-Phenyl-5-acyloxymethyl-2H- furan-2-ones as Antifungal agents: The Dominant Role of Eletronic parameters”, *Chem. Pharm. Bull.*, 54(4), 583-587.
 - Kunal, J and Pradeep, K (2008), “Distinguishing Compounds with Anticancer Activity by ANN using Inductive QSAR descriptors”, *Bioinformatics*, 2(10), 445-451.
 - Mannivannan, E; Prasana, S and Chaturvedi, SC (2004), “Rationalization of Physio-chemical Properties of 5, 6-Diarylthiazolo- [3,2-b]-1,2,4-triazoles towards Cyclooxygenase-2-(COX-2) inhibition: A QSAR Approach”, *Indian. J. Biochem. Biophys.*, 41, 179-183.
 - Balaban, AT (1997), “*Chemical Topology of Three Dimensional Geometry*”, Plenum Publishing Corporation, New York, 420-442.
 - Rajendraprashad, Y; Ravikumar, P; Jesses miles, D and Ajaybabu, P (2008), “QSAR Studies on Chalcone Derivatives as Antibacterial agents against *Bacillus Pumilis*”, *ARKIVOC*, 11, 266-276.
 - Sharma, MC; Kohli, DV; Sahu, NK and Sharma, S (2009), “2D- QSAR Studies of some 1, 3, 4-Thiadiazol-2yl-azetid-2-one as Antimicrobial Agents”, *Dig. J. Nano. Biostru.*, 4, 339-347.

Correspondence Author:

Chaturvedi Prerna

Swami Vivekanand College of Pharmacy, Khandwa Road, Near Toll Naka, Indore-452020, India



Cite This Article: Chaturvedi, Prerna; Dubey, PK; Shrivastava, Birendra and Sharma, Pankaj (2015), “QSAR modelling of new triazolothiadiazole derivatives as antimicrobials”, *Pharmacophore*, Vol. 6 (1), 43-52.

