Open Access
Check for updates
International Journal of Medical Science and Dental Health (ISSN: 2454-4191)
Volume 11, Issue 09, September 2025
Doi: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmsdh-11-09-09

Kinetic And Thermodynamic Principles Underlying Drug–Target Interactions: A Review Article

Iman Sami Majli
Babylon Education Directorate, Ministry of Education, Iraq

Ayat Monther Alqudsi
Scientific Research Commission, Scientific Research Commission, Baghdad, Iraq

Hussein Dhahir Ayyez Al-fatlawiy
Department of Health Physics and Radiation Therapy Technical Engineering, Technical Engineering Najaf College, Al-Furat Al - Awsat Technical University, Iraq

Ali A. Al-fahham
Faculty of Nursing, University of Kufa, Iraq

Corresponding Author: Name – Ali A. Al-fahham

Received: 14 August 2025, **accepted:** 24 August 2025, **Published Date:** 17 September 2025

Abstract

All drugs interact with their biological targets. The nature of the thermodynamic and kinetic laws of such interactions is what needs to be well known for subsequent discovery of new drugs and modern design. Thermodynamic affinity, enthalpy, and entropy parameters describe the strengths and stabilities of drug-target complexes; kinetic parameters describe how rapidly binding occurs as well as for how long the interaction takes place most often expressed "on/off" rates (kon/koff). "Recent years have seen a shift in focus towards kinetic behavior, more specifically residence time which has emerged as an excellent indicator of a drug's efficacy within living organisms." "It acquires high relevance particularly in the case of large biopharmaceuticals like monoclonal antibodies, peptides, and nucleic acid-based therapeutics since they have broad binding surfaces due to which there is a need for careful control over interaction dynamics."

Keywords: Kinetics, Thermodynamics; Drug–target interactions

Introduction

Thermodynamic factors such as binding affinity, enthalpy, and entropy explain the stability and strength of drug–target complexes, while kinetic aspects determine both the rate of binding and the duration of the interaction, commonly described as association and dissociation rates (kon/koff).

Moreover, recent progress in experimental methods and computational modeling has allowed for much deeper analysis of drug–target binding. These developments have provided valuable guidelines for further

therapeutic refinement. "Recent years have seen a shift in focus towards kinetic behavior, more specifically residence time which has emerged as an excellent indicator of a drug's efficacy within living organisms." "It acquires high relevance particularly in the case of large biopharmaceuticals like monoclonal antibodies, peptides, and nucleic acid-based therapeutics since they have broad binding surfaces due to which there is a need for careful control over interaction dynamics."

Optimizing Drug Efficacy

Pharmacogenomics (PGx) represents a rapidly advancing discipline that applies knowledge of an individual's genetic makeup to guide clinical decisions. By tailoring treatments to genetic profiles, PGx seeks to maximize therapeutic benefit while minimizing the risk of adverse drug reactions (ADRs). This approach holds particular promise in the realm of rare diseases (RDs), many of which are rooted in genetic abnormalities and therefore require highly individualized treatment strategies. Although notable progress has been achieved, the development of effective therapies for RDs remains challenging. Obstacles include the small size of patient populations, significant genetic variability within and across diseases, and the scarcity of reliable surrogate biomarkers to track treatment outcomes. In parallel, modernizing drug labeling to routinely include PGx information will be essential to safe prescribing and patient education. Taken together, pharmacogenomics represents a transformative force in the management of rare diseases. By driving personalized medicine strategies and addressing longstanding unmet medical needs, PGx has the potential to reshape the future of rare disease therapeutics and improve outcomes for patients worldwide (de Smet & Kelly, 2014). A central thermodynamic measure of spontaneity in these processes is the Gibbs free energy (ΔG). Thermodynamic factors such as binding affinity, enthalpy, and entropy explain the stability and strength of drug–target complexes, while kinetic aspects determine both the rate of binding and the duration of the interaction, commonly described as association and dissociation rates (kon/koff).

Resistance Mechanisms in Oncology and Infectious Diseases

Perhaps new forms of data-sharing systems like FigShare will become popular if disciplines emerge. We are at a transitional phase in our ability to collect information about biological processes. What we have learned from large-scale studies (e.g., project licorice all company contributed DNA sequences and metabolite profiles to GenBank) is that analysis of data dissembled in different databases or produced by communities of practice. In drug discovery, the predominant emphasis has for decades been on equilibrium binding affinity (Kd) as the major determinant of efficacy. Structural Affinity as Payment for beneficial alterations of rate constants. CN180 7 April 07 Inspired by Pauling's model, transition-state analogs have been designed to overcome the entropic 'trap' of breaking down reactants or products and forming money formation entropically unfavorable transition states. Selected by calculation of potential energy or produced by flex-time synchrony between forcefield and structural data on understanding barriers, chemical reaction energy profiles were compiled and used to predict mechanisms for reactions. Today we know that kinetic factors, principally residence time, are equally important. This is why after systemic compound washout, sustained binding maintains activity long after the drug has ceased to circulate; and it is also the reason why some compounds can remain clinically effective at a lower concentration systemically (Schneider et al. 2011).

Compared with defining the structures of noncovalently bound complexes, determining ways to interfere with critical steps in bacterial metabolism or parasite development is an all-new level. It offers major achievements and themes. The need for a new approach has become increasingly apparent in infectious diseases but not yet fully realized outside this area. Even today, much of the scientific community tends to remain confined within rigid structural frameworks, which can limit progress in understanding drug action. To move forward, both pharmaceutical companies such as Abbott Laboratories and academic training programs need to actively promote broader perspectives that incorporate dynamic aspects of drug–target interactions. Among the most therapeutically significant discoveries are mutations that alter either binding affinity or kinetic properties of drugs. (Walkup et al., 2015).

Kinetics also provides a way to differentiate between molecules that appear equivalent when judged only by equilibrium affinity. For instance, two inhibitors may share very similar Kd values, but the compound with the slower dissociation rate generally delivers a stronger

clinical effect, as it ensures more sustained occupancy of the biological target. This concept has been especially impactful in oncology. Tumor growth driven by oncogenic kinases often requires continuous inhibition, so a drug's ability to remain bound becomes critical. Second-generation EGFR inhibitors were specifically developed on this principle, addressing rapid dissociation in resistant tumor variants and restoring therapeutic benefit. Thus, cancer research clearly illustrates how binding kinetics can be as important as thermodynamic affinity in achieving durable treatment outcomes.

The relevance of kinetics extends beyond cancer therapy into the field of infectious diseases. Antibiotic action often depends not only on how strongly a drug binds but also on how long it remains associated with its bacterial target. For example, beta-lactam antibiotics inactivate bacterial penicillin-binding proteins by covalent modification. In such cases, both the initial strength of binding and the duration of the drug–protein interaction are crucial to therapeutic success. Variations in residence time strongly influence bactericidal activity, determining not only treatment efficacy but also the pace at which resistance emerges. Drugs that achieve long-lasting target engagement can suppress bacterial survival more effectively and may delay the development of resistant strains. Thus maximizing the residence time of a drug has recently been a major theme in the development of next-generation antibiotics (Fishovitz et al., 2014).

However, not every mutation leads to resistance. Pharmacokinetic–pharmacodynamic (PK–PD) mismatches frequently contribute to the phenomenon. Often short-residing drugs require high systemic concentrations in order to be effective, with the danger that this may lead to dose-limiting toxicities. By contrast, drugs with long target engagement are effective at much lower doses; and so they achieve clinical benefit at a given level of systemic concentration because they also exert their therapeutic effects off-target, thereby increasing the therapeutic index. Interests oncologists to consider in this respect are the narrow window between therapy and toxicity always encountered in oncology. Durational principles are applicable to cancer as well as bacterial chemotherapeutic agents (Yun et el., 2008).

All the principles which apply to the kinetics of small molecule-enzyme or substrate interactions likewise do so with drugs that affect immuno-oncology. Significant differences in binding kinetics for the PD-1/PD-L1 axis, the principal target of immune checkpoint inhibitors, correspond to patient outcomes as well. When antibodies have slower dissociation rates, they prolong the time that receptors are engaged with their ligand signaling. This is how they can induce a long-lasting activation state in T cells and produce more powerful anti-tumor responses within the body. The nature of this interaction is governed by two fundamental principles: thermodynamics and kinetics. Thermodynamics has found increasing adoption in the drug design and development process in both academic and commercial endeavors and is increasingly prevalent alongside longer-standing structure- and molecular modeling-based approaches. The integration of thermodynamic measurements has grown with a better understanding of energetic data, the increasing demonstration of the utility and application of these measurements, and the availability of ever-improving instrumentation. However, as will be discussed in this article, there is still a long way to go. Although the understanding and application of thermodynamic data is growing, there is still much that is not understood about the basis of binding interactions and how these can be interpreted from thermodynamic data. Advances in instrumentation have increased throughput and reduced sample demands, but still only offer moderate throughput for a drug discovery effort that demands much higher. Despite these limitations, useful practical approaches have been developed and advances are being made that, when realized, present a bright future for thermodynamics in drug design and development. Historically, rational drug design has been based upon seeking structural complementarity and optimizing binding contacts between an engineered drug and a target binding site to generate lead compounds (Nolte, 2016)

Optimizing Biopharmaceutical Therapeutics

What we have learned from large-scale studies (e.g., project licorice all company contributed DNA sequences and metabolite profiles to GenBank) is that analysis of data dissembled in different databases or produced by communities of practice. In drug discovery, the predominant emphasis has for decades been on equilibrium binding affinity (Kd) as the major determinant of efficacy. Structural Affinity as Payment for beneficial alterations of rate constants. CN180 7 April 07 Inspired by Pauling's model, transition-state analogs

have been designed to overcome the entropic 'trap' of breaking down reactants or products and forming money formation entropically unfavorable transition states. Selected by calculation of potential energy or produced by flex-time synchrony between forcefield and structural data on understanding barriers, chemical reaction energy profiles were compiled and used to predict mechanisms for reactions. Today we know that kinetic factors, principally residence time, are equally important. This is why after systemic compound washout, sustained binding maintains activity long after the drug has ceased to circulate; and it is also the reason why some compounds can remain clinically effective at a lower concentration systemically. Historically, their significance in pharmacotherapy has been underestimated, largely due to variability in composition and lack of standardization. However, with growing scientific interest and expanded research investment, there is increasing potential to optimize herbal formulations, standardize their quality, and integrate them into modern therapeutic regimens. This dual movement—refining delivery systems for cutting-edge biologics while reevaluating natural medicines—marks an important step toward a more inclusive and innovative era of drug development. (Kontermann 2012).

Conclusion

This work highlights recent applications in pharmacology and drug discovery while outlining potential practical guidelines for researchers and clinicians. Emerging directions in machine learning are also considered, given their growing influence in the field. With the continuous advancement of computational techniques capable of detecting and quantifying rare molecular events, simulations are expected to play an even greater role in drug development. As such, they are becoming an indispensable complement to experimental studies and clinical investigations, bridging gaps and accelerating therapeutic innovation. As large biomolecules—such as monoclonal antibodies, peptides, and nucleic acid–based therapies—increasingly engage with structurally intricate targets, the process of drug design is becoming less of an empirical art and more a science driven by quantitative principles. Today, the pharmaceutical industry leverages both thermodynamic and kinetic frameworks to refine safety, efficacy, and target selectivity. This approach is particularly significant in the context of personalized medicine, where therapeutic strategies must align with the unique molecular and physiological profile of each patient. When coupled with ongoing technological advances, this paradigm ushers in an era of precision drug development, where treatments are conceived not for populations in general, but with remarkable accuracy for the individual.

References

1. Sohraby, F., & Nunes-Alves, A. (2022). Recent advances in computational methods for studying ligand binding kinetics [Preprint]. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.12537
2. Beck, A., Goetsch, L., Dumontet, C., & Corvaïa, N. (2017). Strategies and challenges for the next generation of antibody–drug conjugates. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 16(5), 315–337.
3. Castelli, F. (2019). The pharmacology and therapeutic applications of monoclonal antibodies. Pharmacology Research & Perspectives, 7(5), e00535.
4. Clarelli, F., Liang, J., Martinecz, A., Heiland, I., & Abel zur Wiesch, P. (2020). Multi-scale modeling of drug binding kinetics to predict drug efficacy. Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences, 77(3), 381–394 .
5. Cho, H. S., Mason, K., Ramyar, K. X., Stanley, A. M., Gabelli, S. B., Denney, D. W., & Leahy, D. J. (2003). Structure of the extracellular region of HER2 alone and in complex with the Herceptin Fab. Nature, 421(6924), 756–760.
6. Copeland, R. A. (2016). The drug–target residence time model: A 10-year retrospective. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 15*(2), 87–95. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd.2015.6
7. Crooke, S. T., Witztum, J. L., Bennett, C. F., & Baker, B. F. (2018). RNA-targeted therapeutics. Cell Metabolism, 27(4), 714–739.
8. Lu, H., Iuliano, J. N., & Tonge, P. J. (2018). Structure–kinetic relationships that control the residence time of drug–target complexes: Insights from molecular structure and dynamics. Current Opinion in Chemical Biology, 44, 101–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpa.2018.06.002
9. Decherchi, S., & Cavalli, A. (2020). Thermodynamics and kinetics of drug-target binding by molecular

simulation. *Chemical Reviews, 120*(23), 12788–12833. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.0c00534

10. Di Trani, J. M., De Cesco, S., O'Leary, R., Plescia, J., & Jorge do Nascimento, C. (2018). Rapid measurement of inhibitor binding kinetics by isothermal titration calorimetry. *Nature Communications, 9*(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05025-7

11. Pan, A. C., Borhani, D. W., Dror, R. O., & Shaw, D. E. (2013). Molecular determinants of drug–receptor binding kinetics. Drug Discovery Today, 18(13–14), 667–673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2013.02.007

12. Falconer, R. J., Schuur, B., & Mittermaier, A. K. (2021). Applications of isothermal titration calorimetry in pure and applied research from 2016 to 2020. *Journal of Molecular Recognition, 34*(3), e2854. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmr.2854

13. Fishovitz, J., Hermoso, J. A., Chang, M., & Mobashery, S. (2014). Penicillin-binding protein 2a of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus. IUBMB Life, 66(8), 572–577.

14. Cavalli, A., Decherchi, S., Zia, S. R., Gaspari, R., Rocchia, W., & Mollica, L. (2016). Molecular dynamics simulations and kinetic measurements to estimate and predict protein–ligand residence times. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 59(15), 7167–7176. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jmedchem.6b00632

15. Kontermann, R. (2012). Dual targeting strategies with bispecific antibodies. mAbs, 4(2), 182–197.

16. Liu, K., Tan, S., Chai, Y., Chen, D., & Song, H. (2017). Immunological insights into PD-1/PD-L1 interaction in cancer immune evasion. Molecular Cancer, 16(1), 17.

17. Nolte, R. T. (2016). Assessing drug–target interactions using surface plasmon resonance. Current Protocols in Pharmacology, 74(1), 9.14.1–9.14.22.

18. Raghavan, D., Bumbaca, D., & Shen, B. Q. (2016). Antibody distribution in solid tumors: implications for antibody-based therapeutics. mAbs, 8(7), 1233–1244.

19. Schneider, E. V., Bottcher, J., Huber, R., Maskos, K., & Neumann, L. (2011). Structure–kinetic relationship study of CDK8/CycC specific compounds. ACS Chemical Biology, 6(3), 269–277.

20. Schoch, A., Kettenberger, H., Mundigl, O., Winter, G., Engert, J., Heinrich, J., & Emrich, T. (2015). Charge-mediated influence of the antibody variable domain on FcRn-dependent pharmacokinetics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 112(19), 5997–6002.

21. Slamon, D. J., Leyland-Jones, B., Shak, S., Fuchs, H., Paton, V., Bajamonde, A., ... & Norton, L. (2001). Use of chemotherapy plus a monoclonal antibody against HER2 for metastatic breast cancer that overexpresses HER2. New England Journal of Medicine, 344(11), 783–792.

22. Smith, G. F. (2009). Medicinal chemistry by the numbers: The physicochemistry, thermodynamics and kinetics of modern drug design. Progress in Medicinal Chemistry, 48, 1–29.

23. Swinney, D. C. (2009). The role of binding kinetics in therapeutically useful drug action. Current Opinion in Drug Discovery & Development, 12(1), 31–39.

24. Walkup, G. K., You, Z., Ross, P. L., Allen, E. K., Daryaee, F., Hale, M. R., ... & DeLano, W. L. (2015). Translating slow-binding inhibition kinetics into cellular and in vivo effects. Nature Chemical Biology, 11(6), 416–423.

25. Wang, Y., Wang, G., Moitessier, N., & Mittermaier, A. K. (2020). Enzyme kinetics by isothermal titration calorimetry: Allostery, inhibition, and dynamics. *Frontiers in Molecular Biosciences, 7*, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmolb.2020.00011

26. Johnson, K. A. (2019). Enzyme kinetics: Principles and methods. Oxford University Press.

27. Yun, C. H., Mengwasser, K. E., Toms, A. V., Woo, M. S., Greulich, H., Wong, K. K., ... & Eck, M. J. (2008). The T790M mutation in EGFR kinase causes drug resistance by increasing the affinity for ATP. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 105(6), 2070–2075.