Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem. 2006 December 15; 14(24): 8386–8395. doi:10.1016/j.bmc.2006.09.002.

Synthesis and evaluation of general mechanism-based inhibitors of sulfatases based on (difluoro)methyl phenol sulfate and cyclic phenyl sulfamate motifs

Sarah R. Hanson, Lisa J. Whalen, and Chi-Huey Wong *

Department of Chemistry and the Skaggs Institute of Chemical Biology, The Scripps Research Institute, 10550 North Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, California 92037, USA

Abstract

Several model mechanism-based inhibitors (MbIs) were designed and evaluated for their ability to inhibit sulfatases. The MBI motifs were based on simple aromatic sulfates, which are known to be commonly accepted substrates across this highly conserved enzyme class, so that they might be generally useful for sulfatase labeling studies. (Difluoro)methyl phenol sulfate analogs, constructed to release a reactive quinone methide trap, were not capable of irreversibly inactivating the sulfatase active site. On the other hand, the cyclic sulfamates (CySAs) demonstrated inhibition profiles consistent with an active-site directed mode of action. These molecules represent a novel scaffold for labeling sulfatases and for probing their catalytic mechanism.

Keywords

sulfatase; inhibition; mechanism-based inhibition; proteomics

1. Introduction

By cleaving sulfate esters, sulfatases modulate the activity of a broad range of biological molecules, from small cytosolic steroids to complex cell-surface carbohydrates.¹ These transformations control important cellular events, including lysosomal degradation, hormone regulation, developmental cell signaling, and bacterial pathogenesis.^{2–7} Sulfatases are a highly conserved class of enzymes in terms of structure, sequence, and mechanism.⁸ They are unique among hydrolytic enzymes in that they have a novel catalytic aldehyde residue, known as α -formyl glycine (FGly), installed post translationally from genetically encoded serine or cysteine precursors.^{9, 10} For catalysis, FGly is believed to function as an aldehyde hydrate (FGH), wherein a highly nucleophilic geminal hydroxyl performs sulfate transesterification, forming a sulfo-enzyme intermediate (FGS). The second free hydroxyl then collapses the transient FGS, reforming FGly aldehyde and releasing sulfate (Figure 1).¹¹ Numerous sulfatases from prokaryotes and eukaryotes bear a generic arylsulfatase (ARS) name, as general activity on small aryl sulfate substrates often preceded the discovery of a physiological substrate. Many still have unknown endogenous substrates, especially in bacteria.¹

*Corresponding author. Tel.: 858-784-2487; Fax: 858-784-2409; e-mail: E-mail: wong@scripps.edu.

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.

Sulfatases have a number of intriguing roles in biological systems. In humans, the importance of sulfatases is underscored by eight clinical disorders, seven of which are lysosomal storage diseases that are known to result from a deficiency in a single sulfatase enzyme.¹² In addition, these enzymes, and potentially all sulfatases, show markedly decreased activity in a rare recessive disorder known as multiple sulfatase deficiency, which has severe and often fatal clinical manifestations.⁹ Over the past 10 years, steroid sulfatase, also known as ARSC, has received considerable attention due to its connection to hormone-dependent cancers. ARSC is involved in regulating hormone levels by releasing active steroids and steroid precursors from inactive 4-*O*-sulfate conjugates. When the enzyme is upregulated, higher hormone levels can stimulate hyperproliferative cell activity, which has made ARSC an attractive target for small molecule therapeutics.¹³ Recently, sulfatases have been found at the cell-surface, where they dynamically modulate the sulfation states of heparan sulfate proteoglycans (HSPGs). To date, two endo sulfatases that cleave sulfate esters from the 6 position of *N*-acetyl glucosamine sulfate (GlcNAc-6S) in HSPGs have been elucidated.^{7, 14, 15} GalNAc-6S residues are important for binding signaling molecules such as Fibroblast Growth Factor (FGF), Epidermal Growth Factor (EGF), and wingless (Wnt). When the GalNAc-6S sulfate group is removed, these molecules can then bind to their cell-surface receptors and initiate signaling cascades. Bacterial sulfatases have also been found to manipulate sulfated oligosaccharides at the cell-surface of mucosal membranes. Such sulfatase activity has been implicated in increased bacterial colonization and severity of infection.^{16, 17}

Many biological events have been linked to sulfate ester binding, including a host of HSPG-based cell signaling events, inflammation, angiogenesis, cancer metastasis, and viral and bacterial pathogenesis.¹ In an effort to probe sulfatase involvement in these sulfate-dependent events and to further characterize their roles in physiological and pathophysiological processes, we envisaged a proteomic strategy to covalently label the sulfatase enzyme class. Sulfatases are good candidates for a general covalent trap, or mechanism-based inhibitor (Mbi), because: 1) they are highly conserved, both structurally and mechanistically, from prokaryotic to eukaryotic members, and 2) most sulfatases exhibit promiscuity with small aryl sulfate esters. Therefore, we investigated several MbIs based around the general small aryl sulfate substrate that might also be useful for labeling sulfatases (Figure 3). Herein, we synthesized (difluoromethyl)phenyl sulfates and cyclic 6- and 5-membered phenyl sulfamates structures and evaluated them for Mbi activity against an arylsulfatase. Our studies show that cyclic sulfamate scaffolds **5** and **6** inhibit sulfatases in a mechanism-based fashion.

2. Results and Discussion

2.1 Strategy and design of mechanism-based inhibitors (MbIs)

In an effort to create useful chemical labeling agents for sulfatases, we investigated MbIs based on general small aryl sulfate substrates, as depicted in Figure 2. Two Mbi themes were developed based on literature precedent. The first theme, comprised of the (difluoro)methyl phenyl sulfates (DFPSs, **2** and **3**, Figure 2B), was designed to incorporate a well-known quinone methide trapping scheme (Figure 3). The second Mbi theme, consisting of the cyclic sulfamates (CySAs, **4**, **5**, and **6**, Figure 2C), was extended from the known irreversible reactivity between linear phenyl sulfamates (such as **1**, Figure 2A) and steroid sulfatase (ARSC).¹⁸ Model compounds **1-6** were synthesized to test for their ability to inhibit sulfatases in a mechanism-based, or specific-irreversible fashion. Notably, compounds that inactivate in a mechanism-based manner exhibit several characteristics that can be easily evaluated in the lab, including: 1) time- and concentration-dependent inactivation, 2) pseudo-first order loss of activity, 3) saturatable inhibition kinetics, 4) substrate protection, 5) inactivation rates which are unaffected by exogenous nucleophiles, 6) irreversible inactivation, and 7) covalent modification of the enzyme, which can generally be inferred from activities 1-6.¹⁹ We chose

an arylsulfatase from *P. aeruginosa* (PARS) as a model sulfatase to test our compounds, since it is highly homologous to human enzymes^{20, 21} and can be produced and purified in high yield using standard recombinant and affinity purification methods.

2.2 (Difluoro)methyl phenol sulfates are competitive substrates or inhibitors of PARS

Reactive quinone methide traps have been employed to “catch” several hydrolytic enzymes.²² The chemical reaction proceeds as depicted in Figure 3. A quinone methide intermediate is released when the enzyme hydrolytically induces elimination of fluoride from a caged fluoromethyl phenyl substrate. The highly reactive Michael acceptor subsequently captures a properly disposed active site nucleophile, inactivating the enzyme. It seemed likely that the quinone methide trap concept would extend to sulfatases, especially in light of its precedent with phosphatases,²³ which have related structure and mechanism.²⁴ In fact, this method of sulfatase trapping has also been proposed by another lab during the course of our studies, although the inhibitory activity was not evaluated.²⁵ However, kinetic studies for irreversible inhibition of PARS with both *para*- and *ortho*-DFPS (**2** and **3**, respectively) did not show time and concentration-dependent inhibition. Plots of activity loss against time revealed a straight line, indicating no chemical reaction between inhibitor and enzyme active site (data not shown). Instead, these compounds are likely acting as competitive substrates or inhibitors of the enzyme. When treated as classical competitive inhibitors, the DFPS compounds show K_i values of 29 μM , for the *para* isomer, and 1.3 mM for the *ortho* isomer against PARS (Table 2). The weaker inhibition of the latter is likely due to steric interference at the *ortho* position, as synthesis and evaluation of the isostere 2-methyl-4-nitrophenol sulfate (MNPS) showed a 10-fold increase in K_m versus that of pNPS (Table 1). However, this negative influence at the *ortho* position does not preclude MNPS from being a substrate, which suggests that **2** and **3** might also be processed by the enzyme. The fact that no enzyme labeling occurs suggests that the quinone methide must either rapidly diffuse from the active site or trap a nucleophile, such as water or a non-catalytic amino acid side chain, just outside the pocket. Crystallographic studies of pNPS bound to a human ARS show a disordered phenol ring poking outside of the highly ordered sulfate-bound pocket, suggesting that an active site nucleophile would not be properly poised for attack on the quinone methide.²⁶ Studies are currently underway to determine if sulfatases may be labeled outside of the active site by the DFPS compounds.

2.3 Sulfamates and Cyclic sulfamates are irreversible inhibitors of PARS

Our next approach toward designing a general sulfatase MBI was garnered by reviewing extensive inhibition studies on human steroid sulfatase (ARSC). Over 10 years ago, aryl sulfamates were identified as irreversible inhibitors of ARSC.²⁷ Indeed, many ARSC-inhibiting scaffolds have been elaborated with sulfamate groups in order to make them more potent irreversible inhibitors.¹³ For the most part, sulfamate inhibitors have only been tested against their target ARSC. A few specificity tests, which included human arylsulfatases A and B, showed good to moderate selectivity for ARSC,¹³ most likely due to their large hydrophobic cores optimized to interact with the membrane-oriented binding pocket of ARSC.²⁸ Our experiments showed that the general ARSC pharmacophore (phenyl sulfamate, **1**) also acted as an MBI of PARS. Experiments showed time- and concentration-dependent inhibition of PARS that follow pseudo-first order and saturable inhibition kinetics, similarly to the ARSC enzyme (K_i 4.2 μM , Table 2).²⁹ This result served nicely to validate our assumption that a general small phenyl sulfate-type MBI would work across the highly conserved sulfatase enzyme class.

Inactivation of sulfatases by phenyl sulfamates could occur by several pathways, as illustrated in Figure 4. Although the precise nature is still unknown, dead-end adducts might result from an irreversible transesterification, sulfamoylation of a catalytic histidine or lysine, formation of a stable sulfonylimine species, or an intramolecular Schiff base between the catalytic residues

lysine and FGly. Several studies have found an inhibition dependence on the pK_a of various phenyl sulfamates, suggesting that inactivation occurs either concomitantly with, or following, liberation of the associated phenol.^{30, 31} Additionally, radioactive protein was not detected after incubating ARSC with the labeled MBI [³H] estradiol-3-*O*-sulfamate, indicating release of sulfamate from its steroid core.¹³ Likewise, in our experiments, when *para* nitrophenol sulfamate was incubated with PARS, a deep yellow solution resulted, indicating liberation of pNP. This situation is not ideal for enzyme labeling, as the covalent modification does not leave any kind of useful chemical handle to attach a reporting group for further analysis of the inactivated protein. However, we imagined that if the sulfamate were cyclized onto the phenyl core, then, in the case of irreversible transesterification, the sulfamate ring might be opened up, while maintaining covalent attachment to both the phenyl ring and the enzyme (Figure 3B). In the case of sulfonamide capture, the phenyl ring would also be maintained in the dead-end adduct. Either of these scenarios would provide an opportunity to attach useful reporting groups onto the phenyl ring for further mechanistic and proteomic studies. To explore this modified inhibition route, several simple 5- and 6-membered cyclic sulfamate rings (CySAs 4-6, Figure 2C) were designed and tested.

Cyclic sulfamates (CySAs **5** and **6**) conformed to well-established criteria for mechanism-based or specific-irreversible inhibition (Figure 5-9, data shown for **5**). To begin, biochemical profiles reveal that they impart time- and concentration-dependent loss of activity against PARS, which is the hallmark of an irreversible chemical reaction occurring between inhibitor and enzyme active site (Figure 5). The kinetics of inhibition were biphasic in nature beginning with a fast inactivation phase followed by a slower phase at latter time points (biphasic inactivation is visible in Figure 7). This behavior has been noted in previous studies of sulfamate inhibitors against ARSC and may indicate a combination of inactivation events.²⁹ However, in the initial few minutes of CySA inactivation, pseudo-first order reaction rates were observed, as seen in Figure 5, from which apparent inactivation rates (k_{obs}) were derived and analyzed by the methods of Kitz and Wilson (see Table 2 for kinetic parameters).³³ Kinetic plots, shown in Figure 6, reveal clear saturation kinetics at higher concentrations of CySA. Such a plateau in inactivation is indicative of an enzyme-inhibitor binding event during the inactivation process, similarly to substrate binding in Michaelis-Menten enzyme kinetics. Interestingly, the CySA **4** profile demonstrated varying inactivation slopes for the same inhibitor concentration. In particular, they became more shallow when the inhibitor was dissolved in aqueous buffer for longer periods of time (less inactivation was recorded), suggesting that the compound was unstable. LCMS analysis of **5** and **6** showed compounds to be intact after 48 h in buffer; however, the peaks for **4** were no longer detected after 5 h. Due to instability, CySA **4** was not evaluated further. In the course of our studies, steroidal oxathiazines (modified estrone cores equipped with the CySA 4 functionality) were reported to be stable ARSC inhibitors,³² however, mechanism-based inhibition was not examined.

Further evidence implicating CySAs **5** and **6** in an active site directed mode of action was obtained by comparing inactivation rates in the presence of the known substrate, pNPS, and exogenous nucleophiles. Theoretically, the equilibrium achieved between substrate and enzyme and substrate-enzyme complex should protect from the formation of enzyme-inhibitor complex that ultimately leads to inactivation. As depicted in Figure 7, when substrate was dosed into the incubation mixture at 25 μ M, a significant amount of PARS activity remained when compared to the control levels, without any pNPS. In fact, at a concentration above 500 μ M pNPS, which is twice the concentration of **5**, no significant loss of PARS activity was observed over the measured time course. Likewise, since mechanism based inhibition leading to enzyme-adduct should be solely a function of binding, catalysis, and then inactivation, all within the active site, exogenous nucleophiles should not affect the inactivation rates. In a case where an electrophilic reactive species were diffusing from the active site before re-entering to cause inactivation, exogenous nucleophiles would be expected to quench these intermediates

resulting in much slower inactivation rates. In addition, if the molecules were unstable to exogenous nucleophiles, or were susceptible to activation by them, dramatic changes in inactivation rates would also be expected (as seen previously with CySA **4**). To address this issue, representative amino acid nucleophiles, including β -mercaptoethanol (cysteine-type), imidazole (histidine-type), and lysine were added to a standard time- and concentration-dependent inactivation assay using CySA inhibitors. As shown in Figure 8, addition of biological nucleophiles at 1 mM to incubation mixtures containing either 1 or 0.5 mM of **5** or **6** did not show any appreciable difference in inactivation rates. Together, these results strongly support that sulfatase inactivation by CySA requires initial catalytic turnover in the active site.

Tight binding inhibitors, which are often included in the realm of mechanism-based inhibitors, also display time- and concentration-dependent inhibition, substrate protection, and unaffected inhibition rates in the presence of nucleophiles; however, they do not chemically modify the enzyme. To distinguish between an irreversible and a tight-binding inhibitor, extended dialysis is often used. In the case of the tight-binding inhibitor, dialysis over long periods of time in the presence of large volumes of buffer should cause the molecule to dissociate, resulting in the return of enzyme activity; whereas a covalently labeled enzyme will never regain activity. As shown in Figure 9, after an overnight incubation with CySAs **5** and **6**, PARS remained inactive, even after 4 days of dialysis. In comparison, PARS incubated with high concentrations of the substrate pNPS steadily regained activity, quickly achieving untreated enzyme activity. This data further substantiates that PARS is irreversibly inactivated by CySAs **5** and **6**.

Interestingly, previous structure-activity relationships with ARSC showed that *N*-alkylation of phenol sulfamates resulted in much weaker, competitive inhibitors.³⁴ However, herein, it is demonstrated that by cyclizing the sulfamate to the phenol core, irreversible inhibition can be maintained. Possibly, abrogation of activity by *N*-alkylation is a steric effect. Crystallographic studies show that the sulfate binding pocket is a narrow, highly polar environment that is unlikely to tolerate much more bulk than afforded by the sulfate group.^{11, 21, 28, 35}

Apparently, the more rigidly confined cyclic sulfamates are capable of presenting their reactive moiety into the sulfatase active site, although higher K_i values when compared with the smaller phenol sulfamate **1** indicate a less ideal binding situation (Table 2). Given that inactivation still occurs when using CySA inhibitors, it seems unlikely that a sulfonimine moiety is not the dead-end adduct generally caused by sulfamate inactivation (Figure 4). However, the inactivation rates, which are likely a combination of several rate constants leading to active site modification, of CySAs **5** and **6** differ slightly from **1**, indicating that their rate-limiting steps may be different, or they might have a different inhibition route altogether. One possibility for sulfamate inactivation that has not been proposed previously is that the sulfamate nitrogen deprotonates one of the two active site lysines that are in close proximity to FGly prompting the formation of an irreversible internal Schiff base. Research into the precise nature of the dead-end adducts caused by the CySAs is ongoing.

3. Conclusion

Sulfatases are an interesting class of enzymes with emerging biological relevance in the fields of cancer, developmental cell signaling, and pathogenesis. Their involvement in cleaving sulfate esters in the heparan sulfate proteoglycans makes them particularly attractive as chemoenzymatic tools to manipulate and study the myriad of intricate sulfate-dependent binding events that occur at the cell-surface. Our interest in discovering and monitoring the activity of sulfatases led to the investigation of potential mechanism-based inhibitors (MbIs) that could also function as useful reactive labels (Figure 3). We modeled our MbIs around small aryl sulfates, which are broadly accepted as substrates across the sulfatase enzyme class. In support, we tested a known MBI of human steroid sulfatase, the phenyl sulfamate motif, and showed that it is also active against an arylsulfatase from bacteria (PARS) when displayed on

a simple phenyl ring (**1**). Furthermore, by cyclizing the sulfamate motif to 5- and 6-membered rings (CySA **6** and **5**, respectively), novel specific-irreversible inhibition was observed. This behavior lends some new insight into the mechanism of dead-end inactivation of sulfatases by phenyl sulfamates (Figure 4). For example, the sulfonimine adduct is unlikely to be irreversible covalent adduct since the CySA structures preclude such formation. Also, barring that sulfamates trigger the formation of an internal Schiff base, it seems likely that the CySAs might covalently label the enzyme while leaving the phenol ring still attached (Figure 3). Currently, studies are underway to determine precisely how CySAs shut down sulfatase activity. Also, we are working toward appending the phenol with different reporter groups, including biotin and fluorescent molecules, so that the labeled enzymes can be selected for further studies, such as activity-based proteomic profiling.³⁶

4. Experimental

4.1 Chemistry

Commercially available reagents were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and used as supplied unless stated otherwise. Solvents were purified and dried by standard procedures and distilled prior to use. Flash chromatography was performed with Silia P Flash Silica Gel (40–63 μM , 60 $\text{\AA}$, Silicycle). Thin-layer chromatography was performed with EMD silica gel 60 F₂₅₄, regular phase precoated plates. Proton NMR spectra (¹H NMR) were recorded at 500 MHz or 400 MHz. Chemical shifts are expressed in parts per million (δ) and are referenced to residual protium in the NMR solvent: CD₂HOD, δ 3.31; CHCl₃, δ 7.26. Carbon NMR (¹³C NMR) spectra were recorded at 100 MHz. Chemical shifts (δ ppm) are referenced to the carbon signal for the solvent: CD₃OD, 49.15; CDCl₃, 77.23. Liquid chromatography mass spectral (LCMS) analysis was performed using an Agilent 1100 LC coupled to an Agilent 1100 single quad mass spectrometer with 4.6mm $\times$ 50mm C8 column and the mobile phases of 100% H₂O/0.1% formic acid and 100% ACN/0.1% formic acid.

4.1.1 Synthesis of 2-methyl 4-nitrophenol sulfate (MNPS)—Sulfonation of 2-methyl 4-nitrophenol was carried out according to a previously developed protocol.³⁷ Briefly, in a flamed-dry flask under Ar, 2-methyl 4-nitrophenol (286mg, 1.86 mmol) was dissolved in a solution of carbon disulfide (2mL) and N,N-dimethylaniline (DMA, 1.2mL, 7.44 mmol) at 0° C. The dropwise addition of chlorosulfonic acid (ClSA, 86uL, 2.79 mmol) resulted in the evolution of gas and formation of two phases and then the reaction was allowed to warm to ambient temperature. After 18h, ice-cold aq. KOH (536mg, 13.4mmol, in 5mL water) was added. The aqueous phase was extracted once with warmed toluene (25 mL), twice with ether (50mL), and then concentrated in vacuo to obtain an orange solid. The product was recrystallized in basic water (pH 10) to obtain yellow crystals of the MNPS potassium salt (120mg, 0.44mmol, 24% yield for first recrystallization). ¹H NMR (D₂O, 400 MHz): 3.49 (s, 3H), 6.21 (d, 1H); 6.77 (dd, 1H); 6.86 (d, 1H). MS-ESI 231.9 [M-H]⁻.

4.1.2 Preparation of sulfamoyl chloride—A fresh solution was prepared for each reaction, based on a modified procedure.³¹ Chlorosulfonyl isocyanate (1.2 mL, 14.1 mmol, 5 eq) was dissolved in CH₂Cl₂ (7 mL) under Ar at rt, then cooled to 0 °C. In a separate flask, formic acid (99%, 0.54 mL, 5 eq) was dissolved in CH₂Cl₂ (3 mL) at rt. The formic acid solution was then added dropwise to the isocyanate slowly dropwise over 10 min. Slow, steady evolution of CO₂ was observed; eventually a fine white precipitate formed. After 10 min, the ice bath was removed and the reaction was warmed to rt, then stirred for 1 h, before use in the next reaction.

4.1.3 Synthesis of phenyl sulfamates (1**)**—Using a standard procedure for sulfamoylation,³¹ phenol (1.2 mmol, 1.0 eq.) was dissolved in DMF and cooled to 0°C under anhydrous conditions. To the phenolic solution, sodium hydride (3.6mmol, 3.0 eq.) was added

over 10 minutes and allowed to stir for one hour. A solution of freshly prepared sulfamoyl chloride (6.2 mmol, 5 eq, section 4.1.2) was subsequently added over 5 minutes and the reaction was warmed to ambient temperature. After 2h, the reaction was quenched with methanol and partitioned between EtOAc and brine. The organic layer was dried over MgSO_4 and purified on silica using a 1:30 EtOAc: CH_2Cl_2 solvent system to produce the white solid **1** (0.98mmol in 82% yield). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 400 MHz): 7.31-7.33 (m, 3H); 7.39-7.43 (m, 2H). ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 100 MHz): δ 124.94, 130.24, 132.79. MS-ESI 172.0 $[\text{M-H}]^-$.

4.1.4 Synthesis of (difluoro)methyl phenyl sulfates (DFPS, para-2 and ortho-3)

—To a room temperature solution of salicylaldehyde (1mL, 9.4 mmol) and cesium carbonate (3.36g, 10.3 mmol) in DMF (5mL) was added benzyl bromide (1.23 mL, 10.3 mmol), under anhydrous conditions. After 6h, the reaction was extracted with EtOAc and water. The organic layer was concentrated and flashed over silica (1:20 EtOAc to Hexanes) to produce a clear oil (1.88g, 8.9 mmol, 97% yield). The benzylated product (1.6g, 7.5mmol) was subsequently dissolved in dry CH_2Cl_2 (4mL) and treated with DAST (1.68mL, 12.8mmol), a drop of dry MeOH was introduced to catalyze the reaction. The reaction was quenched with sat. aq. NaHCO_3 after 5h, extracted three times with CH_2Cl_2 (100mL), and then purified by flash chromatography (3:100 EtOAc to Hexanes) to yield a clear oil (1.3 g, 5.6mmol, 75% yield). The resulting (difluoro)methyl benzyl phenol (640mg, 2.7 mmol) was submitted to hydorgenolysis under acidic conditions using Pearlman's catalyst ($\text{Pd}(\text{OH})_2$, cat.) in MeOH (12mL) with AcOH (0.6mL) under an atmosphere of hydrogen. The unstable phenol was quickly passed through Celite, concentrated, and sulfonated using chlorosulfonic acid, (273uL, 4.1mmol) and DMA (1.56 mL, 12.3 mmol) as described in section 4.1.1. The DFPS product was purified by flash chromatography (1:4 MeOH to CH_2Cl_2 with 0.1% TEA) and then passed through an ion exchange resin (Sephadex C25, washed with 1M NaOH and equilibrated in H_2O) to obtain the sodium salt (483mg, 42% over 2 steps). **2 (para isomer)**: ^1H NMR (D_2O , 400 MHz): δ 6.81 (t, $J=56.0$ Hz, 1H); 7.40 (d, $J=8.4$ Hz, 2H); 7.61 (d, $J=8.4$ Hz, 2H). ^{13}C NMR (D_2O , 100 MHz): δ 119.9, 125.0, 125.5, 125.6 (t, $J=170$ Hz), 160.4. ^{19}F NMR (D_2O , 400 MHz) 109.1 (2F). MS-ESI 223.0 $[\text{M-H}]^-$. **3 (ortho isomer)**: ^1H NMR (MeOD, 400 MHz): δ 7.09 (t, $J=37$ Hz, 1H); 7.26 (m, 1H); 7.43-7.57 (m, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (MeOD, 100 MHz): δ 113.0 (t, $J=159$ Hz) 123.6, 126.3, 126.8 (t, $J=2.8$ Hz), 132.7, 164.6. ^{19}F NMR (MeOD, 400 MHz) 112.7 (2F). MS-ESI 223.0 $[\text{M-H}]^-$.

4.1.5 Synthesis of 6-membered unsaturated cyclic sulfamate (4)—Salicylaldehyde (0.3 mL, 2.8 mmol) was dissolved in CH_2Cl_2 (14 mL) under Ar at rt. Triethylamine (1.8 mL, 14.1 mmol) was added to the reaction which was then cooled to 0 °C. The freshly prepared sulfamoyl chloride (14.1 mmol, section 4.1.2) was then added to the salicylaldehyde dropwise by cannula over 15 min. After stirring overnight, the reaction was dark red. It was re-cooled to 0 °C then quenched with sat. aq. NH_4Cl . The reaction was then washed once with water and the layers were separated. The aqueous phase was washed once with CH_2Cl_2 , then the combined organic layers were washed once with sat. aq. NaCl, dried over Na_2SO_4 , and concentrated to give a red syrup. The syrup was adsorbed on silica gel, using CH_2Cl_2 as solvent, then purified by flash chromatography over 100 mL silica, eluting with 9:1 hexanes:EtOAc, 8:2 hexanes:EtOAc, and 6:4 hexanes:EtOAc, yielding 0.17 g (33%) of a pinkish solid. Upon exposure to air for 1 h, solutions containing the product turned a faint pink color. ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 400 MHz): δ 8.69 (s, 1H); 7.79-7.75 (m, 1H); 7.72 (dd, $J=1.6, 7.7$ Hz, 1H); 7.46 (dt, $J=0.9, 7.6$ Hz, 1H); 7.28 (d, $J=8.2$ Hz, 1H). ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 100 MHz): δ 167.9, 154.0, 137.7, 130.9, 126.2, 118.5, 115.2.

4.1.6 Synthesis of 6-membered cyclic sulfamate (5)—Compound **4** (0.17 g, 0.9 mmol, 1 eq) was dissolved in CH_3OH (5 mL) under Ar then cooled to 0 °C. NaBH_4 (38 mg, 1.0 mmol, 1.1 eq) was added to the reaction. After 30 min, TLC (1:1 hexanes:EtOAc) showed completion

of the reaction. Silica gel was added and the reaction was concentrated to dryness, then flashed over 100 mL silica, eluting with 8:2 hexanes:EtOAc then 7:3 hexanes:EtOAc. This provided 0.073 g (43%) of a white solid. ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 400 MHz): δ 7.34-7.30 (m, 1H); 7.25-7.16 (m, 2H); 6.98 (dd, J = 8.3, 0.99 Hz, 1H); 4.58 (s, 2H). ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 100 MHz): 154.0, 129.9, 127.9, 125.9, 120.5, 119.2, 46.9. MS-ESI 184.0 $[\text{M-H}]^-$.

4.1.7 Synthesis of 5-membered cyclic sulfamate (6)—Prepared according to Method B in Andersen et al,³⁸ with the exception that sodium azide was used for removal of the tosylate group³⁹

4.2 Biology

Commercially available reagents were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and used as supplied unless stated otherwise. The PARS gene was kindly provided by Professor Michael Kertesz on the plasmid pME4322. All assays were performed in triplicate in Costar 96-well microtiter plates, black for fluorescent assays or clear for colorimetric assays. Responses were monitored using a Fusion spectrophotometer (Perkin Elmer).

4.2.1 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Arylsulfatase: subcloning, expression and purification

(ARS) from *P. aeruginosa* (PARS) was chosen because it is a tractable and well characterized sulfatase, showing high homology with human enzymes.^{20, 21} The gene (*astA*) was amplified via standard polymerase chain reaction (PCR) using Vent polymerase from vector pME4322.²⁰ The forward gene primer (5'-CAATTCCTCTAGAAATTTG-3') was engineered to contain the XbaI restriction site, while the reverse gene primer (5'-GGTGGTGGTGGCTCGAGTCGTCGCCAGGAAAGGCG-3') contained a XhoI restriction site and C-terminal hexahistidine tag. The amplified fragment was doubly digested (XhoI, XbaI; New England Biolabs) and ligated (T4 DNA ligase, Roche) into pET28a (Invitrogen) linearized under identical restriction conditions. The new subclone, pSH1.2 was sequenced for accuracy and transformed into DH10B for storage. To obtain PARS protein, pSH1.2 was transformed into BL21(DE3) *Escherichia coli* (Invitrogen) cells and grown to OD₆₀₀ of 0.8 in Luria-Bertani (LB) broth under constant agitation (250rpm) and temperature (37°C). IPTG was then added to a final concentration of 1mM and the cells were allowed to expand for 6h at 37°C. Cells were spun down (3000 rpm, 20 min), washed with phosphate-buffered saline (from PBS tables), re-pelleted, and frozen at -20°C. The cell pellet was reconstituted in cell lysis buffer (50 mM phosphate, 150 mM NaCl, 10 mM imidazole, pH 8.0) and passed three times through a French Press (15,000 psi). Cellular debris was cleared by centrifugation (10,000 rpm, 20 min) and the soluble lysate was passed through a nickel-NTA affinity purification column under gravity. Native purification proceeded as described (Qiagen, Native purification protocol). Protein was dialyzed (mini dialysis units, MWC 10 kDa, Pierce), concentrated to 3 mg/mL in 100 mM tris, pH 7.5 with 20% v/v glycerol and stored at -20°C. Protein dilutions at 0.1 mg/mL were stable for at least a month at 4°C.

4.2.2 Catalytic assay—Sulfatase activity was determined by incubating PARS (1 $\mu\text{g/mL}$) in sulfatase assay buffer (100 μM 4-methylumbelliferone sulfate (4MUS), 100mM Tris, pH 8.9) at 30°C. Formation of 4-methylumbelliferone was monitored spectrophotometrically (λ_{ex} 360, λ_{em} 450) over 2 min. In addition two other colorimetric substrates of PARS were evaluated including commercially available *p*-nitrophenol sulfate (pNPS) and synthetic 2-methyl 4-nitrophenol sulfate (MNPS). In both cases, the release of a nitrophenol (NP) species was monitored at 402 nm. Common kinetic parameters such as K_m and K_i for competitive inhibition were determined using standard non-linear fitting techniques according to standard Michaelis-Menten enzyme kinetic equations (Prism Graph). All assays were performed in triplicate for accuracy.

4.2.3 Time- and concentration-dependent inactivation assay—PARS was incubated with various inhibitor concentrations from 0.25 - 2 minute time intervals, before being diluted into sulfatase assay buffer to measure catalytic activity. The values for remaining activity (A) for a given inhibitor concentration at a given time were converted into natural log percentage values of the original enzyme activity (A_0) and were plotted against total incubation time (t) to determine the nature of inhibition. As determined by Kitz and Wilson, in the case of specific, or active site-directed, irreversible inhibition, a saturable pseudo first order rate constant (k_{obs}) for inactivation is observed over time, as described by Equations 1 and 2.³³

$$\ln A/A_0 = -k_{inact} * t / (1 + K_I/I) \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

$$k_{obs} = -k_{inact} / (1 + K_I/I) \quad (\text{Eq. 2})$$

$$1/k_{obs} = 1/k_{inact} - K_I / (K_{inact} * I) \quad (\text{Eq. 3})$$

When the double-reciprocal of Equation 1 is replotted, as described in Equation 3, saturable inactivation is revealed by nonzero intercepts at y ($1/k_{inact}$, where k_{inact} is the apparent zero order rate constant for enzyme inactivation) and x ($1/K_I$, where K_I is the Michaelis constant for inhibitor). Notably, the double reciprocal plot of a non-specific irreversible inhibitor, such as a general acylating agent, would proceed through the origin.³³

4.2.4 Substrate protection and exogenous nucleophiles—Time- and concentration-dependent inactivation of PARS was evaluated in the presence of a known sulfatase substrate and representative amino acid nucleophiles. Activity was monitored as described previously (4.2.3), except that either a general sulfatase substrate, pNPS, or an exogenous nucleophile was added to the incubation mixture. In order to determine if a sulfatase substrate provided protection against inhibitor inactivation, the concentration of pNPS was varied from 0.025-1 mM in the presence of inhibitor. For studying the affects that exogenous nucleophiles have on inactivation rates, β -mercaptoethanol (cysteine-type behavior), imidazole (histidine-like behavior), and lysine, were added to a final concentration of 1 mM in the presence of inhibitor. In all cases, inactivation rates were compared with PARS and inhibitor-only controls.

4.2.5 Recovery of activity following inactivation—PARS (10 $\mu\text{g/mL}$) was mixed with 5 mM inhibitor. Additionally, control samples of PARS incubated alone, as well as, in the presence of 5mM pNPS were performed. After an overnight incubation, the samples were subjected to extensive dialysis in microdialysis units (Pierce). Dialysis buffer (1L, 100 mM Tris buffer, pH 8.9) was changed every 3h for the first 12h and then every 12h for the remainder of the experiment. At various time points, 5 μL aliquots of dialysate were removed and diluted 1/20 in sulfatase assay buffer to determine catalytic activity. Activities were normalized to percentage activity of untreated and undialyzed protein standard.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the NIH and the Skaggs Institute for Chemical Biology. The authors kindly thank Professor Michael Kertesz for providing the PARS gene. SRH acknowledges predoctoral support from the ARCS foundation. LJW would like to thank the Skaggs Institute of Chemical Biology for a postdoctoral fellowship.

References

1. Hanson SR, Best MD, Wong CH. Sulfatases: structure, mechanism, biological activity, inhibition, and synthetic utility. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl* 2004;43(43):5736–63. [PubMed: 15493058]
2. Neufeld, EFMJ. The Mucopolysaccharidoses. In: Scriver, CR.; B, MD.; Sly, WS.; Valle, D., editors. *The Metabolic & Molecular Bases of Inherited Disease*. Vol. 8. Vol. III. McGraw-Hill; New York: 1999. p. 3421-3452.
3. Ballabio, A.; Shapiro, LJ. Steroid Sulfatase Deficiency and X-linked Ichthyosis. In: Scriver, CR.; B, MD.; Sly, WS.; Valle, D., editors. *The Metabolic & Molecular Bases of Inherited Disease*. Vol. 8. Vol. III. McGraw-Hill; New York: 1999. p. 4241-4261.
4. von Figura, K.; Gieselmann, V.; J, J. Metachromatic Leukodystrophy. In: Scriver, CR.; B, MD.; Sly, WS.; Valle, D., editors. *The Metabolic & Molecular Bases of Inherited Disease*. Vol. 8. Vol. III. McGraw-Hill; New York: 1999. p. 3695-3724.
5. Hopwood, JJ.; Ballabio, A. Multiple Sulfatase Deficiency and the Nature of the Sulfatase Family. In: Scriver, CR.; B, MD.; Sly, WS.; Valle, D., editors. *The Metabolic & Molecular Bases of Inherited Disease*. Vol. 8. Vol. III. McGraw-Hill; New York: 1999. p. 3725-3732.
6. Robertson AM, Wright DP. Bacterial glycosulphatases and sulphomucin degradation. *Can J Gastroenterol* 1997;11(4):361–366. [PubMed: 9218863]
7. Dhoot GK, Gustafsson MK, Ai X, Sun W, Standiford DM, Emerson CP Jr. Regulation of Wnt Signaling and Embryo Patterning by an Extracellular Sulfatase. *Science* 2001;293(5535):1663–1666. [PubMed: 11533491]
8. Schirmer A, Kolter R. Computational analysis of bacterial sulfatases and their modifying enzymes. *Chem Biol* 1998;5(8):R181–R186. [PubMed: 9710560]
9. Uhlhorn-Dierks G, Kolter T, Sandhoff K. How does nature cleave sulfuric acid esters? A novel posttranslational modification of sulfatases. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 1998;37(18):2453–2455.
10. Sardiello M, Annunziata I, Roma G, Ballabio A. Sulfatases and sulfatase modifying factors: an exclusive and promiscuous relationship. *Hum Mol Genet* 2005;14(21):3203–3217. [PubMed: 16174644]
11. Lukatela G, Krauss N, Theis K, Selmer T, Gieselmann V, von Figura K, Saenger W. Crystal structure of human arylsulfatase A: The aldehyde function and the metal ion at the active site suggest a novel mechanism for sulfate ester hydrolysis. *Biochemistry* 1998;37(11):3654–3664. [PubMed: 9521684]
12. Parenti G, Meroni G, Ballabio A. The sulfatase gene family. *Curr Opin Genet Dev* 1997;7(3):386–391. [PubMed: 9229115]
13. Nussbaumer P, Billich A. Steroid sulfatase inhibitors. *Med Res Rev* 2004;24(4):529–76. [PubMed: 15170594]
14. Ai X, Do AT, Lozynska O, Kusche-Gullberg M, Lindahl U, Emerson CP Jr. QSulf1 remodels the 6-O sulfation states of cell surface heparan sulfate proteoglycans to promote Wnt signaling. *J Cell Biol* 2003;162(2):341–351. [PubMed: 12860968]
15. Lai J, Chien J, Staub J, Avula R, Greene EL, Matthews TA, Smith DI, Kaufmann SH, Roberts LR, Shridhar V. Loss of HSulf-1 Up-regulates Heparin-binding Growth Factor Signaling in Cancer. *J Biol Chem* 2003;278(25):23107–23117. [PubMed: 12686563]
16. Robertson, AM.; Corfield, AP. *Mucin Degradation and its Significance in Inflammatory Conditions of the GI tract*. Kluwer Academic Publishers; Great Britain: 1999. p. 222-261.
17. Robertson AM, Wiggins R, Horner PJ, Greenwood R, Crowley T, Fernandes A, Berry M, Corfield AP. A Novel Bacterial Mucinase, Glycosulfatase, Is Associated with Bacterial Vaginosis. *J Clin Microbiol* 2005;43(11):5504–5508. [PubMed: 16272477]
18. Winum JY, Scozzafava A, Montero JL, Supuran CT. Sulfamates and their therapeutic potential. *Med Res Rev* 2005;25(2):186–228. [PubMed: 15478125]
19. Abeles RH, Maycock AL. Suicide Enzyme Inactivators. *Accounts of Chemical Research* 1976;9(9): 313–319.
20. Beil S, Kehrli H, James P, Staudenmann W, Cook AM, Leisinger T, Kertesz MA. Purification and Characterization of the Arylsulfatase Synthesized by *Pseudomonas-Aeruginosa* Pao During Growth in Sulfate-Free Medium and Cloning of the Arylsulfatase Gene (Atsa). *Eur J Biochem* 1995;229(2): 385–394. [PubMed: 7744061]

21. Boltes I, Czapinska H, Kahnert A, von Bulow R, Dierks T, Schmidt B, von Figura K, Kertesz MA, Uson I. 1.3 angstrom structure of arylsulfatase from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* establishes the catalytic mechanism of sulfate ester cleavage in the sulfatase family. *Structure* 2001;9(6):483–491. [PubMed: 11435113]
22. Speers AE, Cravatt BF. Profiling Enzyme Activities In Vivo Using Click Chemistry Methods. *Chemistry & Biology* 2004;11(4):535–546. [PubMed: 15123248]
23. Cesaro-Tadic S, Lagos D, Honegger A, Rickard JH, Partridge LJ, Blackburn GM, Pluckthun A. Turnover-based in vitro selection and evolution of biocatalysts from a fully synthetic antibody library. *Nat Biotechnol* 2003;21(6):679–85. [PubMed: 12754520]
24. O'Brien PJ, Herschlag D. Sulfatase activity of E-coli alkaline phosphatase demonstrates a functional link to arylsulfatases, an evolutionarily related enzyme family. *J Am Chem Soc* 1998;120(47):12369–12370.
25. Liu Y, Lien IFF, Ruttgaizer S, Dove P, Taylor SD. Synthesis and Protection of Aryl Sulfates Using the 2,2,2-Trichloroethyl Moiety. *Org Lett* 2004;6(2):209–212. [PubMed: 14723530]
26. von Bulow R, Schmidt B, Dierks T, von Figura K, Uson I. Crystal structure of an enzyme-substrate complex provides insight into the interaction between human arylsulfatase A and its substrates during catalysis. *J Mol Biol* 2001;305(2):269–277. [PubMed: 11124905]
27. Howarth NM, Purohit A, Reed MJ, Potter BVL. Estrone Sulfamates - Potent Inhibitors of Estrone Sulfatase with Therapeutic Potential. *J Med Chem* 1994;37(2):219–221. [PubMed: 8295207]
28. Hernandez-Guzman FG, Higashiyama T, Pangborn W, Osawa Y, Ghosh D. Structure of Human Estrone Sulfatase Suggests Functional Roles of Membrane Association. *J Biol Chem* 2003;278(25):22989–22997. [PubMed: 12657638]
29. Purohit A, Williams GJ, Howarth NM, Potter BVL, Reed MJ. Inactivation of Steroid Sulfatase by an Active-Site-Directed Inhibitor, Estrone-3-O-Sulfamate. *Biochemistry* 1995;34(36):11508–11514. [PubMed: 7547880]
30. Woo LWL, Purohit A, Malini B, Reed MJ, Potter BVL. Potent active site-directed inhibition of steroid sulphatase by tricyclic coumarin-based sulphamates. *Chem Biol* 2000;7(10):773–791. [PubMed: 11033081]
31. Ahmed S, James K, Owen CP, Patel CK, Sampson L. The mechanism of the irreversible inhibition of estrone sulfatase (ES) through the consideration of a range of methane- and amino-sulfonate-based compounds. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 2002;12(9):1279–1282. [PubMed: 11965370]
32. Peters RH, Chao WR, Sato B, Shigeno K, Zaveri NT, Tanabe M. Steroidal oxathiazine inhibitors of estrone sulfatase. *Steroids* 2003;68(1):97–110. [PubMed: 12475726]
33. Kitz R, Wilson IB. Esters of methanesulfonic acid as irreversible inhibitors of acetylcholinesterase. *J Biol Chem* 1962;237:3245–9. [PubMed: 14033211]
34. Woo LWL, Purohit A, Reed MJ, Potter BVL. Oestrone 3-O-(N-acetyl)sulphamate, a potential molecular probe of the active site of oestrone sulphatase. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 1997;7(24):3075–3080.
35. Bond CS, Clements PR, Ashby SJ, Collyer CA, Harrop SJ, Hopwood JJ, Guss JM. Structure of a human lysosomal sulfatase. *Structure* 1997;5(2):277–289. [PubMed: 9032078]
36. Jessani N, Cravatt BF. The development and application of methods for activity-based protein profiling. *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology* 2004;8(1):54–59. [PubMed: 15036157]
37. Chapman E, Bryan MC, Wong CH. Mechanistic studies of beta - arylsulfotransferase IV. *PNAS* 2003;100(3):910–915. [PubMed: 12547913]
38. Andersen KK, Bray DD, Chumpradit S, Clark ME, Habgood GJ, Hubbard CD, Young KM. 1,2,3-Benzoxathiazole 2,2-Dioxides - Synthesis, Mechanism of Hydrolysis, and Reactions with Nucleophiles. *Journal of Organic Chemistry* 1991;56(23):6508–6516.
39. Andersen KK, Kociulek MG. Acidity of Cyclic Sulfamates - Study of Substituted 1,2,3-Benzoxathiazole 2,2-Dioxides and Theoretical Investigation of the Effect of Conformation on Acidity. *Journal of Organic Chemistry* 1995;60(7):2003–2007.

Figure 1.

A. Phenyl sulfamate

B. (Difluoromethyl)phenyl sulfates

C. Cyclic sulfamates

Figure 2.

Figure 3.

Figure 4.

Figure 5.

Figure 6.

Figure 7.

Figure 8.

Figure 9.

Table 1

Kinetic parameters for PARS substrates

Substrate	K_m (μM)
4MUS	6.6
pNPS	42
MNPS	550

Table 2

Kinetic parameters for PARS inhibitors

Inhibitor	Type	K_i (μM)	k_{inact} (min^{-1})	$t_{1/2}$ (s)	Stability (h) *
phenyl sulfamate (1)	irreversible	4.5	1.23	33.80	24
oDFPS (2)	competitive	1302	NA	NA	NA
pDFPS (3)	competitive	29	NA	NA	NA
CySA 4	irreversible	NA	NA	NA	<1
CySA 5	irreversible	975	0.57	72.95	48+
CySA 6	irreversible	401	0.66	63.00	48+

* monitored in sulfatase assay buffer by LCMS