Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. 2008 January 15; 18(2): 469–473.

Inhibition of Tubulin Polymerization by Select Alkenyldiarylmethanes

Matthew D. Cullen^a, Taradas Sarkar^b, Ernest Hamel^b, Tracy L. Hartman^c, Karen M. Watson^c, Robert W. Buckheit Jr.^c, Christophe Pannecouque^d, Erik De Clercq^d, and Mark Cushman^{a*}

Department of Medicinal Chemistry and Molecular Pharmacology, School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, and the Purdue Cancer Center, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907, USA, Toxicology and Pharmacology Branch, Developmental Therapeutics Program, Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis, National Cancer Institute at Frederick, National Institutes of Health, Frederick, Maryland 21702, USA, ImQuest Biosciences, Inc., 7340 Executive Way, Suite R, Frederick, Maryland 21704, USA, Rega Institute for Medical Research, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

Abstract

During studies on the alkenyldiarylmethane (ADAM) class of non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs), analogues were discovered that exhibit low micromolar and sub-micromolar cytotoxicities. Since the ADAMs are structurally related to the tubulin polymerization inhibitor CC-5079, a set of fourteen ADAMs were tested for inhibition of tubulin polymerization in an attempt to identify the biological target responsible for their cytotoxicity. The results indicate that, overall, the ADAMs are poor inhibitors of tubulin polymerization. However, the two most cytotoxic compounds, **15** and **16**, are in fact active as inhibitors of tubulin assembly with IC₅₀ values of 3.7 ± 0.3 and 2.8 ± 0.2 μ M, respectively, and they both inhibit the binding of colchicine to tubulin. Both compounds were investigated for anticancer activity in the National Cancer Institute's panel of 60 human cancer cell lines, and both compounds consistently displayed submicromolar cytotoxicities with mean-graph midpoint (MGM) values of 0.31 ± 0.08 and 0.47 ± 0.09 μ M, respectively.

Over the past twenty-five years, infection by the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) has reached pandemic proportions, and an estimated 41 million people are believed to be carriers of the acquired immune deficiency syndrome's (AIDS) etiological agent.¹ HIV has caused the deaths of more than 25 million people since its first major appearance in 1981¹, and developing a cure for HIV-infection is one of the major challenges currently facing medical science. Several FDA-approved drugs are available to combat HIV infections and AIDS progression. Unfortunately, the rapid mutation rate of HIV allows the virus to develop resistance to many antiviral agents as early as two months after initial anti-HIV treatment. Thus, until a cure is discovered, development of antiviral therapeutics that are active against both the wild-type and drug-resistant forms of HIV is a primary goal for AIDS researchers.^{2–4}

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: cushman@pharmacy.purdue.edu. Phone: 765-494-1465. Fax: 765-494-6790.

^aPurdue University

^bNational Cancer Institute at Frederick

^cImQuest Biosciences, Inc.

^dUniversiteit Leuven

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

The alkenyldiarylmethane (ADAM) class of non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs) was discovered over ten years ago. The lead compounds **1** and **2** retain antiviral activity against the common HIV-1 reverse transcriptase (RT) drug-resistance mutations K103N and Y188C.^{5–8} For this reason, the development of the ADAMs as potential antiviral therapeutics has been pursued. It has been established that the ADAMs exert their antiviral properties through the allosteric inhibition of HIV-1 RT. However, the observation that some ADAM analogues do not inhibit HIV-1 RT and yet still exhibit anti-HIV activity indicates that, at least, certain ADAMs interact with another viral or cellular entity, and this has led us to investigate other molecular targets.⁹

Another series of ADAMs has recently been developed by scientists at Celgene Corp. as potent inhibitors of inflammation, phosphodiesterase type 4 activity, and tubulin polymerization, where tubulin inhibition involves binding of the inhibitor to the same site as the natural antimitotic agent, colchicine (**3**, Chart 1).^{10–13} The structural similarity between Celgene's inhibitor CC-5079 (Chart 1) and our own antiviral agents led us to consider that the ADAMs may also exhibit one or more of the properties displayed by the Celgene inhibitors. It is well known that disrupting microtubule homeostasis causes cells to undergo apoptosis¹¹, and the low micromolar toxicity generally displayed by the ADAM class of NNRTIs led to the hypothesis that the ADAMs' cytotoxic properties may originate from the inhibition of tubulin polymerization by binding to the colchicine binding site. Additionally, inhibition of tubulin polymerization may also account for the RT-independent antiviral activity displayed by many ADAM analogues. The vital HIV protein Tat is known to, among other things, stabilize the microtubule framework of HIV-infected cells by binding to microtubule-associated protein (MAP) binding sites.¹⁴ It has been proposed that the interactions between Tat and microtubules help facilitate the replication of HIV and may also contribute to the mechanism of HIV-related cell death.¹⁴ In light of this information, the inhibition of tubulin polymerization by a select group of ADAMs was investigated. Herein we report the syntheses, antiviral activity, and tubulin inhibitory effects of ADAMs **4–17**.

A number of methods have been developed for the synthesis of the ADAM scaffold, and the syntheses of ADAMs **4–10**,[†] **12**,¹⁵ **13**,¹⁵ and **17**¹⁶ have been published. ADAMs **11**, **14**, **15**, and **16** were constructed via the general cross-coupling route depicted in Scheme 1. Sonogashira coupling of aryl halide **18**^{††},¹⁷ and terminal alkyne **19**,¹⁵ followed by hydrostannation, affords stannane intermediate **20**. The stannane and aryl halide **21** are coupled via the Stille reaction to obtain the desired analogue.

The tubulin polymerization inhibitory data^{18–20} for ADAMs **4–17** are presented in Table 1, together with the antiviral data^{*,6,21–23} associated with the compounds. Nevirapine is included for antiviral activity comparisons, while colchicine and combretastatin A-4 are well-known inhibitors of tubulin polymerization, with the latter compound an exceptionally potent inhibitor of the binding of radiolabeled colchicine to tubulin. The majority of the compounds studied for inhibition of tubulin polymerization were chosen on the basis of their acute cytotoxicity, which one would expect to correlate with tubulin destabilizing activity. To our surprise, only two of the fourteen analogues investigated were capable of inhibiting tubulin polymerization at concentrations lower than 40 μ M, despite the structural similarities observed between the compounds and Celgene's inhibitors of tubulin polymerization. These data refute the hypothesis that inhibition of tubulin polymerization is the general source of ADAMs'

[†]Syntheses for aryl iodide corresponding to the isoxazole and isoxazolone were reported in reference ¹⁷. The aryl bromides corresponding to the benzonitriles are commercially available.

^{*}The ability of target compounds to inhibit the enzymatic activity of recombinant HIV-1 RT (p66/51 dimer) was evaluated as previously described.⁶ Evaluation of antiviral activity against HIV-1_{RF} was determined in infected CEM-SS cells while using the XTT cytoprotection assay, as previously described.^{6,22} Evaluation of antiviral activity against the HIV-1_{IIIB} and HIV-2_{ROD} strains was performed in infected MT-4 cells using the previously described MTT assay.^{20,23}

activity. However, the tubulin IC₅₀'s observed for ADAMs **15** and **16** are not substantially greater than that of the potent antimitotic agent combretastatin A-4, indicating the extreme cytotoxicity observed with these two analogues most likely results from disruption of the microtubule network. Inhibitors of tubulin polymerization often induce cell death at concentrations much lower than their in vitro tubulin IC₅₀ values in cell-free systems, which accounts for the 1,000-fold difference in tubulin inhibitory activity and cytotoxicity observed for ADAMs **15** and **16**. The ADAMs **12** and **13**, which are structurally related to **15** and **16**, were completely inactive as inhibitors of tubulin polymerization. Evidently, the relatively small structural change involving the movement of the nitrile from the para position in **16** to the meta position in **15** only causes a small drop in activity, but the more drastic alterations embodied in **12** and **13** are not tolerated.

In order to confirm that ADAMs **15** and **16** are in fact binding to the colchicine site of tubulin, the inhibition of colchicine binding to tubulin was determined at 37 °C in reaction mixtures incubated for 10 min and containing tubulin (1 μM), **15** or **16** (5 μM), and [³H]colchicine (5 μM). ADAMs **15** and **16** inhibited [³H]colchicine binding by 24 ± 1% and 42 ± 3%, respectively. Combretastatin A-4, which was used as a positive control, inhibited [³H]colchicine binding by 98 ± 0.3 %.

The ADAMs **15** and **16** were examined for antiproliferative activity against the human cancer cell lines in the National Cancer Institute screen, in which the activity of each compound was evaluated with approximately 55 different cancer cell lines of diverse tumor origins. The GI₅₀ values obtained with selected cell lines, along with the mean graph midpoint (MGM) values, are summarized in Table 2. The MGM is based on a calculation of the average GI₅₀ for all of the cell lines tested (approximately 55) in which GI₅₀ values below and above the test range (10⁻⁸ to 10⁻⁴ molar) are taken as the minimum (10⁻⁸ molar) and maximum (10⁻⁴ molar) drug concentrations used in the screening test. Both ADAMs **15** and **16** consistently produced submicromolar GI₅₀ values in these human cancer cell lines, resulting in MGM values of 0.31 ± 0.08 and 0.47 ± 0.09 μM, respectively.

The results with analogues **4**, **6**, **8**, and **10** are consistent with the conclusion that inhibition of tubulin polymerization is not required for the ADAMs' RT-independent antiviral mechanism. These compounds each exhibited RT-independent antiviral activity, as can be seen by comparing their in vitro RT inhibitory activities with their respective cytoprotective activities; yet, none of these four analogues had a significant effect on tubulin polymerization at 40 μM.

In summary, select ADAMs were evaluated for inhibition of tubulin polymerization, and the results indicate that most members of this structural class of compounds are poor inhibitors. These results do not support the hypothesis that disruption of microtubule stability is the origin of the ADAMs' cytotoxicity, nor do the results support an important role for tubulin in the ADAMs' RT-independent antiviral mechanism. Additional studies are required to elucidate the so far unknown antiviral mechanism. Despite the poor tubulin inhibition generally exhibited by most members of the ADAM class described here, the highly cytotoxic analogues **15** and **16** were identified as potent tubulin destabilizing agents with activities not substantially greater than the activity of the natural antimitotic agent combretastatin A-4. In light of this information, **15** and **16** could potentially be used as leads in the development of ADAM-based inhibitors of tubulin polymerization for the treatment of cancer.

Supporting Information

Physical constants, elemental analysis data, and experimental procedures for the synthesis of compounds **11**, **14**, **15**, and **16** are included in the Supporting Information section of this report.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This investigation was made possible by funding from the National Institutes of Health, DHHS through grant RO1-AI-43637 and research was conducted in a facility constructed with the financial support of a Research Facilities Improvement Program grant, No. C06-14499, also from the National Institutes of Health.

References and Notes

1. AIDS Epidemic Update, December 2006; Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS); Geneva. 2006. p. 1-98.
2. Gotte M, Kameoka M, McLellan N, Cellai L, Wainberg MA. J. Biol. Chem 2001;276:6711. [PubMed: 11096104]
3. Kerr SG, Anderson KS. Biochemistry 1997;36:14056. [PubMed: 9369477]
4. Kati WM, Johnson KA, Jerva LF, Anderson KS. J. Biol. Chem 1992;267:25988. [PubMed: 1281479]
5. Cushman M, Golebiewski M, Buckheit RW Jr. Graham L, Rice WG. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett 1995;5:2713.
6. Cushman M, Golebiewski WM, Graham L, Turpin JA, Rice WG, Fliakas-Boltz V, Buckheit RW Jr. J. Med. Chem 1996;39:3217. [PubMed: 8759644]
7. Casimiro-Garcia A, Micklatcher M, Turpin JA, Stup TL, Watson K, Buckheit RW, Cushman M. J. Med. Chem 1999;42:4861. [PubMed: 10579849]
8. Xu G, Micklatcher M, Silvestri MA, Hartman TL, Burrier J, Osterling MC, Wargo H, Turpin JA, Buckheit RW Jr. Cushman M. J. Med. Chem 2001;44:4092. [PubMed: 11708913]
9. 2006Unpublished Results
10. Muller, GW.; Man, H-W. US. 2006052596. 2006. Zhang L-H, Wu L, Raymon HK, Chen RS, Corral L, Shirley MA, Narla RK, Gamez J, Muller GW, Stirling DI, Bartlett JB, Schafer PH, Payvandi F. Cancer Res 2006;66:951. [PubMed: 16424030]
11. Jordan MA, Hadfield JA, Lawrence NJ, McGown AT. Med. Res. Rev 1998;18.
12. Downing KH. Annu. Rev. Cell. Dev. Biol 2000;16:89. [PubMed: 11031231]
13. Hait WN, Rubin E, Goodin S. Cancer Chemother. Biol. Response Modif 2003;21:41. [PubMed: 15338740]
14. Giacca M. Retrovirology 2005;7. [PubMed: 15698476]
15. Cullen MD, Deng B, Hartman TL, Watson KM, Buckheit RW Jr. Pannecouque C, De Clercq E, Cushman MS. J. Med. Chem 2007;50:4854. [PubMed: 17803290]
16. Sakamoto T, Cullen MD, Hartman Tracy L, Watson KM, Buckheit Robert W, Pannecouque C, De Clercq E, Cushman M. J. Med. Chem 2007;50:3314. [PubMed: 17579385]
17. Deng B-L, Hartman TL, Buckheit RW Jr. Pannecouque C, De Clercq E, Fanwick PE, Cushman M. J. Med. Chem 2005;48:6140. [PubMed: 16162014]
18. The ability of target compounds to inhibit tubulin polymerization was evaluated as previously described.^{19,20}
19. Hamel E, Lin CM. Biochemistry 1984;23:4173. [PubMed: 6487596]
20. Hamel E. Cell Biochem. Biophys 2003;38:1. [PubMed: 12663938]
21. Silvestri MA, Nagarajan M, De Clercq E, Pannecouque C, Cushman M. J. Med. Chem 2004;47:3149. [PubMed: 15163195]
22. Rice WGB, Bader JP. Adv. Pharmacol. (San Diego) 1995;33:389.
23. Pauwels R, Baba M, Snoeck R, Schols D, Herdewijn P, Desmyter J, De Clercq E. J. Virol. Methods 1988;20:309. [PubMed: 2460479]
24. Hargrave KD, Proudfoot JR, Grozinger K, Cullen E, Kapadia SR, Patel UR, Fuchs VU, Mauldin SC, Vitous J, Behnke ML, Klunder JM, Plal K, Skiles JW, McNeil DW, Rose JM, Chow GC, Skoog MT, Wu JC, Schmidt G, Engel WW, Eberlein WG, Saboe TD, Campbell SJ, Rosenthal AS, Adams J. J. Med. Chem 1991;34:2231. [PubMed: 1712395]

Chart 1.

4 X = Cl, R = CO₂CH₃ **5**X = Br, R = Ph **6**X = Cl, R = CH₂CH₃ **7**X = Br, R = HC=CH₂ **8**X = Cl, R = SCH₃ **9** **10** n = 1, Ar¹ = Isoxalone, Ar² = *m*-Nitrile **11**n = 1, Ar¹ = Isox-OMe, Ar² = Thio **12**n = 2, Ar¹ = Isox-OMe, Ar² = Thio **13**n = 1, Ar¹ = *m*-Nitrile, Ar² = Isox-OMe **14**n = 1, Ar¹ = Isox-OMe, Ar² = *m*-Nitrile **15**n = 1, Ar² = Isox-OMe, Ar² = *p*-Nitrile **16** **17**

Chart 2.

Scheme 1.

a) 5 mol% PdCl₂(PPh₃), 10 mol% CuI, Et₃N, THF; b) 2 mol% Pd(PPh₃)₄, Bu₃SnH, THF, 0 °C; c) 10 mol% Pd(PPh₃)₄, 20–100 mol% CuI, CsF, DMF, 60 °C.

Table 1
Antiviral and tubulin polymerization inhibitory activities of ADAMs 4–17.

Compound	HIV-1 RT IC ₅₀ (μM) ^a	EC ₅₀ (μM) ^b			CC ₅₀ (μM) ^c			Tubulin IC ₅₀ (μM) ^d
		1 _{RF}	1 _{IIB}	2 _{ROD}	CEM-SS	MT-4		
4	71	2.3	3.2	N.A. ^e	40	36	>40	
5	0.3	0.013	0.60	2.5	32	160	>40	
6	>100	13	2.6	29	>200	>198	>40	
7	N.T. ^f	N.A. ^e	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	29	N.T. ^f	>40	
8	99	8.2	3.0	N.A. ^e	>100	62	>40	
9	100	53	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	20	N.T. ^f	>40	
10	67	2.9	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	33	7.0	>40	
11	40	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	1.1	0.97	>40	
12	33	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	1.2	1.6	>40	
13	5.2	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	0.78	1.1	>40	
14	73	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	2.1	4.2	>40	
15	93	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	0.004	0.20	3.7 ± 0.3	
16	>100	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	N.A. ^e	0.004	0.34	2.8 ± 0.2	
17	0.60	N.A. ^e	1.2	N.A. ^e	2.9	12	>40	
Nevirapine	0.084 ²⁴	0.0015	0.053	N.A. ^e	N.T. ^f	15	N.T. ^f	
Combretastatin A-4	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	1.2 ± 0.1	
Colchicine	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	N.T. ^f	3.8 ± 0.1	

^aInhibitory activity versus HIV-1 RT with poly(rC).oligo(dG) as the template primer.

^bEC₅₀ is the concentration required to inhibit 50% of the cytopathic effect of HIV-1_{RF} in CEM-SS cells, HIV-1_{IIB} in MT-4 cells, or HIV-2_{ROD} in MT-4 cells.

^cCC₅₀ is the cytotoxic concentration required to cause cell death for 50% of the mock-infected CEM-SS or MT-4 cells.

^dThe concentration required to inhibit 50% of tubulin polymerization *in vitro*. The reaction mixtures contained 10 μM tubulin, and the extent of assembly after 20 min at 30 °C in 0.8 M monosodium glutamate + 0.4 mM GTP was measured.

^eNot Active.

^fNot Tested.

Table 2
Cytotoxicities of Alkenyldiarylmethanes **15** and **16**.

Cell Line or MGM ^b	Compound GI ₅₀ (μM) ^a	
	15	16
Lung (HOP-62)	0.76	0.55 ± 0.08
Colon (HCT-116)	0.49	0.46 ± 0.08
CNS (SF-539)	0.24 ± 0.06	0.30 ± 0.04
Melanoma (LOX IMVI)	0.59 ± 0.17	0.72 ± 0.19
Ovarian (OVCAR-3)	0.10 ± 0.06	0.20 ± 0.03
Renal (SN12C)	0.50 ± 0.07	0.78 ± 0.32
Prostate (DU-145)	0.32 ± 0.08	0.57 ± 0.14
Breast (MDA-MB-435)	0.089 ± 0.051	0.19 ± 0.02
MGM	0.31 ± 0.08	0.47 ± 0.09

^aConcentration for 50% growth inhibition

^bMean graph midpoint for growth inhibition of all human cancer cell lines found to be sensitive.