Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2006 March 1; 128(8): 2532–2533. doi:10.1021/ja058126p.

A Designed Receptor for pH-Switchable Ion Binding in Water

Stephen G. Tajc[†] and Benjamin L. Miller^{†,‡,*}

[†] Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14642

[‡] Department of Dermatology, and the Center for Future Health, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14642

The design and synthesis of molecules with conditional or “switchable” properties is of considerable practical and fundamental interest. Fundamentally, such systems serve as models of Nature’s strategies for regulating cellular processes.¹ Potential applications of “molecular switches” include drug delivery systems, optical devices, and sensors. While the majority of studies on switchable receptors have focused on photochemical switching, changes in other environmental properties, including temperature and pH, are also known. These include cyclodextrin-conjugated poly(ε-lysine) inclusion complexes,² ion recognition-mediated rotaxane switching,³ pH-switchable polymeric capsules derived from calixarenes,⁴ and pH-switchable ligands for transition metal complexation.⁵

In the context of our work on cycloalkane-based receptors for carbohydrates and other metabolites,⁶ we began exploring the structures and binding properties of derivatives of cyclohexane 1,3,5-cis-trimethanol (**1**). In particular, we were intrigued by molecular mechanics conformational searches⁷ of trityrosine derivative **2**, which suggested that this receptor could access a low-energy “closed” conformation in its neutral state, mediated by hydrogen bonding between tyrosine –OH and amino groups (Figure 1). In contrast, **2** would be expected to exist as a complex mixture of “open” conformers as either a cation or anion. Literature values⁸ for the tyrosine amino and phenolic –OH pKa’s are 9.21 and 10.46, respectively. Therefore, we anticipated that **2** might serve as a pH-switchable receptor, adopting the “closed” conformation only in the range of 9.2 < pH < 10.5. While phenol-amine H-bonded complexes are well known,⁹ they have been characterized almost exclusively in the solid state. Therefore, we set out to test whether the predicted conformation-switching behavior of **2** could indeed be observed in solution, and if it translated to pH-dependent differences in ion binding ability. Synthesis of

2 was accomplished in a straightforward three-step reduction/esterification/deprotection sequence from cyclohexane 1,3,5-tricarboxylic acid, with final purification by preparative reverse-phase HPLC. Since triphenylalanine derivative **3** would not be capable of achieving the same H-bonded “closed” structure proposed for **2**, it was also synthesized as a control. With **2** and **3** in hand, we next set out to examine their solution conformational behavior.

We anticipated that 2D NOE (NOESY) spectroscopy would be particularly valuable for examining pH-dependent changes in the solution conformation of **2**. Indeed, NOESY spectra of **2** in D₂O at pH* = 3.17 and in a sodium bicarbonate/carbonate buffer (100 mM in D₂O; pH* = 9.40) showed significant differences in the number, intensity, and sign of proton NOEs. In particular, NOESY cross peaks between aromatic and cyclohexyl protons are visible in the pH* 9.4 spectrum, and not in the pH* 3.17 spectrum. The change in sign of NOESY crosspeaks is also noteworthy. The intensity and sign of the NOE is a function of $\omega\tau_c$, where ω is the magnetic field strength and τ_c is the correlation time. Since “small” organic molecules tend to have values of τ_c that place them near the zero-crossing point for the theoretical NOE curve, their enhancements can be positive, zero, or negative.¹⁰ In this case, the sign change from negative NOE (higher τ_c) at pH* 3.17 to positive (lower τ_c) is consistent with a conformational change from extended to compact.

Differences in the solution conformational behavior of compounds are also reflected in their longitudinal, or spin-lattice relaxation (T₁) times.¹¹ T₁ measurement of **2** at pH* = 3.17 and pH* = 9.40 showed considerable differences in the relaxation rates of several protons. These pH-dependent differences are most pronounced for the pendant tyrosines, consistent with the majority of the change in conformational bias occurring in this portion of **2**. In contrast, neither **3** nor tyrosine methyl ester showed pH-dependent changes in T₁ values, supporting the idea that changes in the relaxation behavior of **2** are due to a conformational shift, and not simply due to variations in dissolved ion concentrations or to the change in ionization state.

We next examined the ability of **2** to function as a receptor for ions.¹² In addition to constituting a fundamentally interesting problem in itself, we anticipated that ion binding would serve as an efficient structural reporter for the conformation (open or closed) of **2**. Molecular modeling of the closed conformer suggested that smaller ions would likely fit into the cavity formed by the cyclohexane core and tyrosine side chains, while larger ions such as nitrate would likely not fit as well.

An initial screen was conducted in 96-well plates, monitoring changes in UV-Vis absorbance as a function of added inorganic salt. Several species (Ce⁴⁺, Ag⁺, and Sn²⁺) caused immediate precipitation of **2** at pH 9.5. However, both Zn²⁺ and Cd²⁺ induced changes in UV-Vis absorbance without causing obvious precipitation, warranting further exploration. We also examined anion binding to **2** by UV-Vis titration. Chloride and bromide anions, present from the dissociation of the corresponding tetrabutylammonium salts, bind to **2** at pH 9.50 with association constants (K_a) of 680 ± 146 (bromide), and 550 ± 112 (chloride). Binding was not observed to tetrabutylammonium nitrate or fluoride. In addition, there was no binding observed to **2** at pH 7.0, to **3** at pH 9.50, or to tyrosine methyl ester at pH 9.50.

Isothermal titration calorimetry (ITC) experiments confirmed that both chloride and bromide bind to **2** at pH 9.5 (Table 1), with association constants consistent with those determined by UV-Vis titration. While ITC showed some interaction between **2** and fluoride, the small amount of heat evolved precluded extraction of thermodynamic data. No interaction between **2** and nitrate or sulfate was detectable at pH 9.5. As in the UV-Vis experiments, no binding of fluoride, chloride, or bromide was observed to **2** at pH < 9.5. As the putative binding cavity of **2** is electron rich, the observation that Cl[−] and Br[−] bind was somewhat surprising. ITC thermograms for bromide and chloride at pH 9.50 were endothermic: characterized by an

unfavorable enthalpic term (ΔH), and balanced by positive entropy (ΔS). This suggests that anion binding may be driven not by specific interactions within the receptor cavity, but rather by the disruption of solvent within the highly hydrophobic structure. This is consistent with other authors' analysis of entropy-driven binding to hydrophobic receptors.¹³

In contrast, ITC measurements of cation binding to **2** at pH 9.5 showed exothermic binding, driven by favorable enthalpy. As with anion binding, no cation binding was observed for **2** at pH < 9.5. Confirming that none of our NMR or ion-binding results were affected by potential receptor aggregation, the ITC of **2** into buffer alone (both at pH 5.27 and pH 9.5) showed essentially no heat evolved. Job plot analyses of **2** with Zn^{2+} confirmed the 1:1 binding model indicated by ITC data. Finally, an NMR titration of zinc triflate into **2** at pH 9.5 showed Zn^{2+} -dependent changes in chemical shift and line broadening of cyclohexyl protons, consistent with ion binding occurring inside the cavity formed by the "closed" conformation of **2**.

In conclusion, we have employed NMR spectroscopy to demonstrate that the cyclohexane-based receptor **2** undergoes a pH-dependent conformational change, consistent with molecular mechanics-based predictions. UV-vis and calorimetric titrations confirm that **2** can act as a receptor for ions at high pH, but not at low pH. In combination, these data suggest that the tyrosine OH-amine H-bond is a useful structural element for the design of pH-switchable receptors. Compounds like **2** may also serve as useful models for naturally occurring phenol-amine H-bonds. Hydrogen bonds to tyrosine hydroxyl protons are common structural motifs in proteins, and often manifest as changes in pKa. RNase A is a prototypical example, with several buried/H-bonded tyrosine residues exhibiting pKa's > 11.5.¹⁴ Since new methods for characterizing such interactions will be particularly useful, an immediate goal will be to extend our recently reported method for pKa determination by ITC to tyrosines.¹⁵

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the NIH-NIGMS for support of this work (5-R01-GM-062825). SGT was supported via an NIH training grant in Dermatology (T32AR007472).

References

1. Schnarr NA, Kennan AJ. *Org Lett* 2005;7:395. [PubMed: 15673248]
2. Choi HS, Huh KM, Ooya T, Yui N. *J Am Chem Soc* 2003;125:6350. [PubMed: 12785758]
3. Vignon SA, Jarrosson T, Iijima T, Tseng HR, Sanders JKM, Stoddart JF. *J Am Chem Soc* 2004;126:9884. [PubMed: 15303838]
4. Xu H, Stamp SP, Rudkevich DM. *Org Lett* 2003;5:4583. [PubMed: 14627389]
5. Gunnlaugsson T, Leonard JP, Senechal K, Harte AJ. *J Am Chem Soc* 2003;125:12062. [PubMed: 14518970]
6. (a) Hubbard RD, Horner SR, Miller BL. *J Am Chem Soc* 2001;123:5810. [PubMed: 11403619] (b) Hubbard RD, Miller BL. *Tetrahedron* 2003;59:8143.
7. Mohamadi F, Richards NGJ, Guida WC, Liskamp R, Lipton M, Caufield C, Chang G, Hendrickson T, Still WC. *J Comp Chem* 1990;11:440. (Maestro v. 4.1.012/Macromodel v. 7.2, Schrodinger, Inc.)
8. (a) Nozaki Y, Tanford C. *J Am Chem Soc* 1967;89:736. [PubMed: 6037018] Dawson, RMC.; Elliott, DC.; Elliott, WH.; Jones, KM. *Data for Biochemical Research*. 3. Oxford Science Publications; 1986. p. 1-31.

9. (a) Barry JE, Finkelstein M, Ross S. *J Org Chem* 1984;49:1669. (b) Majerz I, Malarski Z, Sobczyk L. *Chem Phys Lett* 1997;274:361. (c) Fun HK, Usman A, Chantrapromma S, Osman J, Ong LH, Tilley DR, Ishibashi Y. *Sol State Commun* 2003;127:677.
10. Neuhaus, D.; Williamson, M. *The Nuclear Overhauser Effect in Structural and Conformational Analysis*. VCH Publishers; New York: 1989. p. 30-39.
11. For selected examples, see: (a) Holzberg A, Holdt HJ, Kleinpeter E. *Org Biomol Chem* 2004;2:1691. [PubMed: 15188035] (b) Bleich HE, Cutnell JD, Day AR, Freer RJ, Glasel JA, McKelvy JF. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1976;73:2589. [PubMed: 1066668]
12. For lead references on ion-binding macrocyclic organic receptors, see: (a) Custelcean R, Delmau LH, Moyer BA, Sessler JL, Cho W-S, Gross D, Bates GW, Brooks SJ, Light ME, Gale PA. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2005;44:2537. (b) Nabeshima T, Saiki T, Iwabuchi J, Akine S. *J Am Chem Soc* 2005;127:5507. [PubMed: 15826188] (c) Izatt RM, Pawlak K, Bradshaw JS, Bruening RL. *Chem Rev* 1995;95:2529. (d) Best MD, Tobey SL, Anslyn EV. *Coord Chem Rev* 2003;240:3. Arduini A, Casnati A, Pochini A, Ungaro R. *Curr Opin Chem Biol* 1997;1:467-474. [PubMed: 9667888]
13. Leavitt S, Freire E. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 2001;11:560-566. [PubMed: 11785756]
14. (a) Tanford C, Hauenstein JD, Rands DG. *J Am Chem Soc* 1956;77:6409. (b) Laurents DV, Huyghues-Despointes BMP, Bruix M, Thurlkill RL, Schell D, Newsom S, Grimsley GR, Shaw KL, Treviño S, Rico M, Briggs JM, Antosiewicz JM, Scholtz JM, Pace CN. *J Mol Biol* 2003;325:1077. [PubMed: 12527309]
15. Tajc SG, Tolbert BS, Basavappa R, Miller BL. *J Am Chem Soc* 2004;126:10508. [PubMed: 15327286]

Figure 1.
H-bonded “Closed” conformation of **2** predicted by molecular mechanics.

Figure 2.

Extracted rows ($\delta t_2 = 6.8$ ppm) from 2-D ^1H - ^1H NOESY spectra of **2** at pH* 9.50 (100 mM bicarbonate/carbonate buffer) and **2** at pH* 3.17 in D_2O .

Table 1ITC results for ion-binding to **2** in AMPSO, pH 9.50

Ion	K (M ⁻¹)	ΔH (cal)	ΔS (cal)
Fluoride	(very weak)	-	-
Chloride	490 ± 54	870 ± 50	15.2
Bromide	680 ± 92	720 ± 44	33.8
Sulfate	0	-	-
Nitrate	0	-	-
Zinc(OTf) ₂	1410 ± 170	-2230 ± 96	7.1
Cd(OTf) ₂	1900 ± 150	-2880 ± 70	5.5