Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem. 2007 November 1; 15(21): 6667–6677. doi:10.1016/j.bmc.2007.08.007.

Development of Tyrocidine A Analogues with Improved Antibacterial Activity

Michael A. Marques¹, Diane M. Citron², and Clay C. Wang^{*,1}

¹ Department of Pharmacology and Department of Chemistry, University of Southern California, 1985 Zonal Ave, Los Angeles California 90089

² Microbial Research Lab, Los Angeles County, University of Southern California Medical Center, 1801 East Marengo Street 2G-24, Los Angeles, California 90033

Abstract

The development of new antibacterial therapeutic agents capable of halting microbial resistance is a chief pursuit in clinical medicine. Classes of antibiotics that target and destroy bacterial membranes are attractive due to the decreased likelihood that bacteria will be able to generate resistance to this mechanism. The amphipathic cyclic decapeptide, Tyrocidine A, is a model for this class of antibiotics. Tyrocidine A is composed of a hydrophobic and a hydrophilic face, allowing for insertion into bacterial membranes, creating porous channels and destroying membrane integrity. We have used a combination of molecular modeling and solid phase synthesis to prepare Tyrocidine A and analogues **1–8**. The minimum inhibitory concentrations (MIC's) of these compounds were determined for a host of gram positive species and *E. coli* as a representative gram negative bacterium. Analogues **2** and **5** demonstrated moderate 2 to 8-fold increases in antibacterial activity over the parent Tyrocidine A for a variety of pathogenic microbes. (Best MIC's for *E. coli* 32 µg/mL and 2 µg/mL for most gram positives) Examination of the structure activity relationship between the analogues demonstrated a preference for increased amphipathicity but did not show a clear preference for increasing hydrophilicity versus hydrophobicity in improving antibacterial activity. Of note, movement of positively charged lysine residues or neutral pentafluorophenyl residues to different positions within the cyclopeptide ring system demonstrated improvements in antibacterial activity.

Introduction

The market share for antibiotics is greater than \$25 billion per year. Unfortunately, the emergence of highly resistant microbe strains is increasingly limiting the effectiveness of our current arsenal of therapeutics, making drugs such as vancomycin, daptomycin, the streptogramins, and linezolid, which were previously reserved for highly resistant bacterial strains, our last and only line of defense. Even now, resistance to these highly potent drugs is being seen clinically.^{1–5} Making matters worse, there is less motivation on the part of pharmaceutical companies to spend billions on research and development of a novel antibiotic when bacterial resistance is likely to occur rapidly.^{6–8}

*Corresponding Author: Clay C. Wang, Department of Pharmacology and Department of Chemistry, University of Southern California, 1985 Zonal Ave, Los Angeles, California 90089, Phone: (323) 442-1670, Fax: (323) 442-1365, E-mail: clayw@usc.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.

Antimicrobial agents fall into one of several classes: β -lactams, β -lactamase inhibitors, aminoglycosides, tetracyclines, rifamycins, macrolides, lincosamides, glycopeptides, streptogramins, sulphonamides, oxazolidinones, quinolones, gramicidins and others.⁷ These compounds target a variety of bacterial systems including DNA replication, transcription, folic acid metabolism, protein synthesis, and cell wall synthesis/integrity. Each class has its own specificities or coverage for a variety of bacteria. The means by which bacteria acquire resistance to such an expansive array of agents is highly variable and complex. It has been proposed that antimicrobial agents that target individual enzymes are the most likely to induce resistance, whereas therapeutics that target several structures irreversibly generate resistance at a slower rate.⁹ The clearest mechanisms of genetic resistance include: inactivation of the drug, modification of the target active site, modified permeability of the cell wall, upregulation of the target enzyme, or the complete bypass of inhibited steps.^{10, 11}

With so many different paths to resistance, the goal of generating successful new therapeutics to combat infection is also challenging. There are several common methodologies for accomplishing this task.^{12, 13} With the advancements in genomic sequencing technologies, there has been a hope that novel targets that are less prone to cross resistance can be developed.^{14, 15} Unfortunately, deciphering bacterial genomes has not yet lead to a wealth of new targets or therapeutics. Further, as mentioned above, even new classes of antimicrobials such as the oxazolidinones have met with resistant bacterial strains.^{4, 16–18}

More commonly, entirely new generations of drugs within a class have been produced by making structural changes to existing scaffolds, perhaps the most notable being the penicillins, cephalosporins, quinolones, tetracyclines, and macrolides.^{6, 18–22} In light of this method, we have selected Tyrocidine A, a natural product related to Gramicidin S as a platform for study (Figure 1). Polypeptide antimicrobials are not new to the field of microbiology. Nature has long used linear and cyclic polypeptides as natural defenses against competing or pathogenic bacteria.^{23–25} Natural peptide antibiotics such as the gramicidins and polymyxins have been used extensively for topical therapy with excellent results. Furthermore, cyclic peptide derivatives such as the streptogramins (quinupristin/daflopristin), glycopeptides (vancomycin, teicoplanin) and lipopeptides (daptomycin) have been fundamental in controlling severe bacterial infections.

Recently, Gramicidin S and Tyrocidine A have received a great deal of attention due to their highly desirable mechanism of action. Both compounds are decapeptide natural products isolated from *Bacillus subtilis*.^{26, 27} Structurally, the compounds differ only slightly with respect to their primary sequence. Both compounds are known to form a β -type secondary structure leading to an amphipathic molecule.^{28–33} More specifically, one face of the molecule is hydrophobic, while the other is hydrophilic. The β -type structure, and associated amphipathicity, imparts Gramicidin S and Tyrocidine A with their specific antibacterial mechanism. These cyclic amphipathic peptides are known to associate with bacterial membranes, causing them to destabilize, lose structural integrity and ultimately fragment, resulting in bacterial cell death.^{34–38} It seems that the hydrophilic residues of the cyclopeptide associate with the negatively charged phosphate groups of the bacterial lipids, while the hydrophobic groups form a nonselective porous channel.

The amphipathic cyclopeptides demonstrate a mixed selectivity for bacterial membranes, mildly preferring to associate with the highly negative phosphates found on bacterial walls, as opposed to the zwitterionic phospholipids found in eukaryotes.²⁵ Furthermore, the cholesterol content of eukaryotic membranes helps to stabilize and protect against binding of these cyclopeptides.³⁹ It is noteworthy that bacteria have not yet demonstrated appreciable resistance to this class of antibiotics, making them attractive for further study.^{23, 25} Due to the fact that the target of these cyclopeptides is the bacterial membrane, pathogens would have

to alter their membrane composition and organization to achieve resistance, a much more complicated and costly process than simply the mutation of an enzymatic binding site.

With the favorable attributes of the cyclopeptides recognized, we have set out to improve the collective understanding of their structure activity relationship (SAR) using Tyrocidine A as our point of reference. The question arises, how does altering the overall hydrophobicity, hydrophilicity, and amphipathicity of the cyclopeptide beta-sheet affect the drug's ability to inhibit bacterial growth. Using molecular modeling, we rationalized generating a small set of Tyrocidine A analogues with specific point amino acid substitutions that would affect either the polar or non-polar face of the amphipathic cyclopeptide. A solid-phase synthetic methodology was used to prepare the parent compound, Tyrocidine A, as well as eight other closely related analogues **1–8** (Figures 2 and 3). These novel analogues were then tested against a host of clinically important gram-positive and select gram-negative bacterial strains to further correlate structure to function.

Results

The retention time of each compound was measured by reverse phased LCMS, with retention time correlating with overall predicted hydrophobicity/hydrophilicity. Molecular modeling clearly depicted both the hydrophobic and hydrophilic faces of the Tyrocidine A scaffold (Figure 4). Hydrophobicity/hydrophilicity was modulated by the placement of positive charges or the incorporation of pentafluorophenyl residues. The order of increasing hydrophobicity for Tyrocidine A and analogues **1–8** was as follows: **2** > **8** > **1** > **7** > **5** > **6** > Tyrocidine A > **3** > **4** (Table 1).

The parent compound, Tyrocidine A, exhibited only moderate antibacterial activity ranging from greater than 128 µg/mL for *E. coli* to 16 µg/mL for the remaining gram positive bacteria (Table 2). Analogue **1** showed a similar profile as Tyrocidine A. Compounds **2** and **3** showed a marked improvement in antibacterial potency, with an MIC improving from 2 to 8-fold over the parent Tyrocidine A. Of note, compound **2** was the only compound exhibiting activity against the gram negative *E. coli*. Compound **4** displayed the least antibacterial activity with an MIC range from 32 µg/mL to greater than 256 µg/mL. Compound **5** demonstrated the most potent and broadest antibacterial properties of all the compounds tested, with MIC's increasing from 2 to 8-fold over the parent Tyrocidine A. Compounds **6–7** demonstrated similar antibacterial profiles with moderate improvement in activity against gram positive pathogens compared to Tyrocidine A. Compound **8** demonstrated improved activity against both gram positive pathogens, and the selected gram negative pathogen *E. coli*.

Daptomycin exhibited broad activity and high potency ranging from greater than 128 µg/mL for *E. coli* to 2-to-0.5 µg/mL for the gram positive bacteria. As previously reported, daptomycin is a membrane disrupting cyclic lipopeptide with broad therapeutic activity, however, its *in vitro* potency has a dependency on calcium concentration.^{40, 41} To determine if Tyrocidine A and the novel analogues shared the same dependency on calcium concentration, we screened activity at the standard calcium concentration of 25 mg/L, as well as the reported maximal value for daptomycin of 50 mg/L. Broadly, increasing the calcium concentrations from 25 to 50 mg/L for Tyrocidine A and analogues moderately decreased antibacterial activity. In contrast, daptomycin showed a marked increase in potency with increasing calcium concentration as previously reported.⁴⁰

Discussion

Several groups have been studying the structure activity relationships of streptogramin cyclopeptides Gramicidin S^{34, 35, 42–48} and Tyrocidine A (Figure 1).^{49–53} Initial work with

Gramicidin S analogues has yielded a handful of useful facts concerning the structure activity relationships of these cyclopeptides. Studies have found that bacteriocidal and hemolytic properties are influenced by several properties: rings size/rigidity, hydrophobicity, and amphipathicity.^{44–47, 54} A collection of similar studies have been conducted for the cyclopeptide Tyrocidine A. Guo et al. has demonstrated that by using an alanine substitution screen, minor changes in the peptide composition of Tyrocidine A can yield improvements in antibacterial potency.⁵² More specifically, by making point substitutions that alter the amphipathicity of the Tyrocidine analogue the antibacterial activity may be systematically improved. Other recent studies by Kohli et al. have demonstrated the utility of using nonribosomal polyketide synthetase (NRPS) technology for generating a privileged library of Tyrocidine A analogues that exhibit moderate changes in antibacterial properties.⁵⁰ The previous success of these groups at modulating antibacterial properties by using simple alanine screens and point amino-acid substitutions is highly encouraging and sets the stage for our work.

While the use of NRPS enzymes is an elegant approach, the ability to complete a total synthesis on resin with a single purification step is a clearly attractive option, which we chose to utilize. A further advantage to the complete solid phase synthesis approach was being able to introduce point mutation without concern for affecting enzymatic activity. This methodology makes use of a commercially available sulfamabutyryl safety catch resin. A linear peptide may be loaded onto the resin by standard solid phase techniques, the protecting groups removed, and the resin subject to cyclative cleavage by treatment with diisopropylethylamine in THF (Figure 2). A recent study by Tariq et al. showed that both biosynthetic and chemical mediated cyclizations were successful for generating streptogramin-tyrocidine derivatives, but that the chemical cyclative cleavage was superior for generating quantities necessary for bioassay.⁵⁵ Using similar solid phase synthesis techniques, we were able to prepare the natural product Tyrocidine A, and eight closely related analogues **1–8**. Of note, yields were substantially improved by using a combination of HOAt in place of HOBt, NMP in place of DMF, and heating the coupling reactions at 38 °C.^{51, 52} In contrast to biosynthetic methods, the synergistic benefits of easily modulating the chemical structure without regard for affecting enzyme efficiency, coupled with simplified loading and purification steps that provide milligram quantities of product for assay, validate the protocol.

Previously, a substantial body of work by Kondejewski et al. on the the Gramicidin S scaffold examined how specific changes in hydrophobicity, hydrophilicity, amphipathicity, affinity for negative phospholipid substrate, and cycle size all have intricate interlocking relationships.^{44–47} Such analysis remains to be accomplished for the Tyrocidin A scaffold. Thus far, the majority of work done to understand the intricate interplay between structure and function Tyrocidine A has involved alanine screens or a small positional library without much discussion of how these point substitutions may affect the overall geometric or electronic properties of the cyclopeptide in question.^{50, 52} Discussion is predominantly limited to antibacterial and hemolytic assay results. Granted, there has yet to be definitive structural evidence of how these antibiotics associate with the cellular membrane, and molecular modeling must be treated with mild skepticism due to the variable degree of possible conformations these cyclopeptides may take. However, the structure of the cyclopeptide backbone for Gramicidine S and Tyrocidine A is generally agreed upon, and the assignment of individual residues within the structure to either the hydrophobic or hydrophilic face by modeling seems reasonable.^{56–59}

The overall beta sheet conformation of these cyclopeptides is stabilized by intramolecular hydrogen bonding between the carbonyl oxygen and the distal amides on the opposing side of the cyclopeptide.^{60–62} It is likely that this structural organization is what allows these linear peptides to self-cyclize using a pure solid phase chemistry approach, as well as proving to be

highly efficient substrates for NRPS enzymes.^{49, 51, 60} Further, this beta sheet conformation plays a key role in the cyclopeptides ability to disrupt bacterial membranes.^{34–38} The covalent linkage of the cyclopeptide locks in the beta sheet conformation of Tyrocidine A allowing for topographic organization and presentation of given substituents to either the hydrophobic or hydrophilic face of the molecule. We can take advantage of the locked conformation provided by Tyrocidine by choosing to manipulate the substituents presented on either the hydrophobic or hydrophilic face of the cyclopeptide.

Figure 4 shows the putative hydrophobic and hydrophilic faces of Tyrocidine A. We used this model to select positions Phe³ and Tyr⁷ on the hydrophobic face, along with positions DPhe⁴ and Gln⁶ on the hydrophilic face for amino acid substitution. Compound **1** with a substitution of a polar charged D-Lys⁴ in place of a hydrophobic D-Phe⁴ on the hydrophilic face of the cyclopeptide showed decreased antibacterial activity in comparison to Tyrocidine A. This result is mildly surprising in light of the fact that adding an additional positive charge positioned on the hydrophilic face of the amphipathic cyclopeptide would arguably increase the analogues affinity for the negatively charged bacterial membrane. Of note, further increasing the charge of compound **1** by adding another lysine residue (Gln⁶ → Lys⁶ compound **2**), markedly improves the antibacterial properties, providing as much as an 8-fold improvement over the parent Tyrocidine A (Table 2). The increased charges of compounds **2** and **8** provides them with an improved activity toward the gram negative *E. coli*, indicating that future efforts may be focused on tuning these compounds to target both gram negative and gram positive pathogens.

Compound **5**, similar to compound **1**, has a single lysine addition, however, the substitution is at a different position in the cyclopeptide. Interestingly, unlike compound **1**, which showed poor antimicrobial activity when a single lysine substitution was made (DPhe⁴ → DLys⁴), there is a substantial increase in antimicrobial activity when the lysine is positioned at a different point in the cyclopeptide (Gln⁶ → Lys⁶) as in compound **5**. Such a comparison supports our reasoning that simply increasing charge does not directly lead to an increase in antimicrobial properties, and that it is in fact a more complicated interplay of structure vs. activity exists.

Substitution of the Phe³ and Tyr⁷ residues on the hydrophobic face of Tyrocidine A with pentafluorophenyl (PFPh) derivatives provided mixed results. The PFPh residue is particularly interesting due to its similar surface area but dramatically modified electronic and hydrophobic nature when compared to Phe. Analogue **3**, with a single PFPh substitution (Phe³ → PFPh³), showed increased gram positive antibacterial activity similar to that of compound **2** but failed to show gram negative activity (Table 2). Movement of the PFPh substitution across the cyclopeptide to a different position, as is demonstrated for compound **6** (Tyr⁷ → PFPh⁷) maintains a similar antibacterial potency overall, but shows moderate improvements in certain gram positive strains. Interestingly, addition of a second PFPh substitution, **4** (Phe³ → PFPh³) (Tyr⁷ → PFPh⁷), virtually abolished antibacterial activity across the spectrum of strains tested.

Combining lysine and pentafluorophenyl substitutions within the same molecule proved successful in increasing the overall antibacterial activity of compounds **7** and **8** when compared to the parent Tyrocidine A. Similar to compound **2**, compound **8** demonstrated a modest increase in activity against the gram negative pathogen *E. coli*., further supporting that these compounds may eventually be tuned to target gram negative pathogens.

With respect to delineating the importance of hydrophilicity versus hydrophobicity in improving antibacterial activity, this study has shown that there is not a clear preference for a single parameter in determining activity. Of note, simply adding positive charge to the

hydrophilic face of Tyrocidine A does not result in improved antibacterial activity, demonstrated by **1**. Further, most analogues showed significantly increased antibacterial properties over the parent Tyrocidine A, while having substantially different electronic profiles. For example, while compounds **2** and **8** had the greatest positive charge and hydrophilicity, compounds **3** and **6** had a markedly increased hydrophobic nature and only a single positive charge on the hydrophilic face (Table 1). Such a similarity between the activities of these two groups respectively seems to indicate that increasing amphipathicity, either by increasing hydrophobicity or hydrophilicity on an individual face, results in a moderate increase in antibacterial activity. This is in contrast to previous studies with Gramicidin S analogues assayed against gram negative bacteria, which demonstrated a negative correlation with increasing amphipathicity.⁴⁶ Compound **4** demonstrates that there may be a limit to how much we can increase the overall amphipathicity of Tyrocidine A before activity is lost.

The substantially improved antibacterial profile of compound **5** versus **1** seems to indicate that the actual ring position of charged residues, and not just the placement of the charge itself on the hydrophilic face of the compound, may be of importance. The notion that residue position and not simply facial substitution may be a factor in moderating activity is supported, albeit to a lesser extent, by the improvement of antibacterial activity of compound **6** when compared to **3** for strains of MRSE, VRE, and *E. faecalis*.

It is noteworthy that Tyrocidine A and analogues, while sharing the same mechanism of action as daptomycin, do not share the same dependence on calcium.⁴⁰ Further, the addition of calcium actually decreases the measured in vitro activity for Tyrocidine A and its analogues. Whether this difference in calcium dependence would have an implication for differences in molecular mechanism seems unclear.

Conclusion

With antibacterial resistance increasing at an alarming rate, the development of new antibacterial therapeutic agents capable of staving off microbial resistance is a chief concern in clinical medicine.^{7, 18, 63} One class of antibiotics, those that target and destroy bacterial membranes, is attractive due to the decreased likelihood that bacteria will be able to generate resistance to this mechanism.^{23–25} The amphipathic cyclic decapeptide, Tyrocidine A is a model system for this class of antibiotics.^{26, 27}

We have been able to use molecular modeling and solid phase synthetic techniques to design and efficiently synthesize Tyrocidine A and multiple novel analogues with improved antibacterial activity. Further, we have shown that the relationship between increasing hydrophilicity, by the substitution of positive charge on the polar face of the amphipathic structure, does not necessarily provide an increase in antibacterial activity, and that charge/residue placement may be of increasing importance. Overall, we have demonstrated that an increase in amphipathicity within a finite range improves antibacterial activity. A substantial increase in the hydrophobic nature of Tyrocidine A by substitution with multiple pentafluorophenyl residues demonstrates a marked decrease in antibacterial activity, indicating a narrower window for electrochemical modification than originally envisioned. Finally, we demonstrated Tyrocidine A analogues do not have the same in vitro reliance on calcium concentration as demonstrated by our comparator daptomycin.

Moving forward there are a variety of other questions that we would like to address. For example, we chose to use lysine as our means of introducing positive charge but would the antimicrobial activities be moderated differently by delivery of positive charge through a different functionality or linker length? We were able to demonstrate an increase in gram negative antibacterial activity by substituting the analogues with multiple positive charges and

the ability to tune these compounds for both gram negative and gram positive pathogens with some sort of selectivity is certainly of interest. Testing these compounds against a larger panel of clinically important gram negative pathogens is in order.

Materials & Methods

General

Methanol, diethylether, acetonitrile and dichloromethane (all HPLC grade) were purchased from VWR San Diego, CA, and used without further purification. Anhydrous Tetrahydrofuran (THF), Dimethylformamide (DMF), 1-Methyl-2-pyrrolidinone (NMP), 1,3-Diisopropylcarbodiimide (DIC), piperidine, diisopropylethylamine (DIEA), 1-methylimidazole (NMI), activated aluminum oxide, iodoacetonitrile, *d*6-dimethylsulfoxide, and Sigmacoat were purchased from Alrich St. Louis, MO. 4-Sulfamylbutyryl AM resin (1.1 mmol/g) (01-64-0152), Fmoc and Boc amino acids, and all other solid phase coupling reagents were purchased from Novabiochem San Diego, CA. Fluorinated amino acid derivatives were purchased from PepTech Corp Burlington, MA.

Analytical and preparatory HPLC was acquired using a Waters 600 controller equipped with a 2487 dual wavelength detector and RCM 8 × 10 semi-prep C18 column. Mass spectra was acquired using a Thermo/Finnigan LCMS equipped with an Altech 10mm × 2.1 mm C18 column (43871), autosampler, and triple wavelength detector. UV spectra were acquired using a Shimadzu UV-2401 spectrophotometer. NMR spectra were acquired using a Varian 400 Hz instrument.

Molecular Modeling

A molecular model of Tyrocidine A was constructed with a semi-empirical energy minimization (PM3) using the Spartan Essential Software Package (2000). Modeling allowed visualization of amino acid side chains reported to be on either the hydrophobic or hydrophilic face of the amphipathic cyclopeptide (Figure 4).^{50, 52, 57, 59} Positions Phe³ and Tyr⁷ on the hydrophobic face, along with positions DPhe⁴ and Gln⁶ on the hydrophilic face were selected for amino acid substitution. To ensure that an observed change in antibacterial activity could be attributed to an individual structural modification, only a single progressive amino acid substitution was made between Tyrocidine A and each respective analogue (Figure 3).

Solid Phase Synthesis (Resin Loading)

Tyrocidine A and subsequent analogues were synthesized using manual solid phase synthesis Fmoc and Boc protocols. A glass resin reaction vessel was pre-treated with Sigmacoat before use to prevent resin from sticking to the glass surface during shaking. Loading of the sulfamylbutyryl AM resin was accomplished as follows. Sulfamylbutyryl AM resin (1g, 1.1 mmol), DCM (4mL) and DMF (1mL) was added to the glass reaction vessel and shaken at room temperature for 20 minutes. The resin was then drained. A mixture of Fmoc-Leu-OH (1.94 g, 5.5 mmol), 1-methylimidazole (452 mg, 436 μ L, 5.5 mmol), 1,3-Diisopropylcarbodiimide (DIC) (694 mg, 851 μ L, 5.5 mmol), DCM (4mL) and DMF (1mL) was added to the resin and the mixture was shaken for 24 h at room temperature. After 24 hours, the resin was washed and the loading procedure was repeated a second time as described above. Resin loading was near quantitative as determined by UV assay.⁶⁴ Following resin loading, the resin was washed with DMF, DCM, MeOH, and Et₂O, dried under vacuum and stored at 4 °C for later use.

Manual Solid Phase Synthesis

To a solid phase reaction vessel charged with 0.2 g of resin pre-loaded with Fmoc-Leu was added DMF (2mL) and allowed to swell at room temperature for 20 min. The resin was then drained and washed with 20% piperidine in DMF (continuous flow for 30 sec), followed by the addition of more 20% piperidine in DMF (4mL) and shaking at room temperature for 30 min to accomplish Fmoc deprotection. Following deprotection, the resin was washed thoroughly with DMF in preparation for the coupling step. In a separate 20 mL glass vial, a mixture of Fmoc-Orn(Boc)-OH (500 mg, 1.1 mmol), HOBt (149 mg, 1.1 mmol), DIC (139 mg, 171 μ L, 1.1 mmol), and DMF (2mL) was agitated until homogenous and allowed to stand for 10 min. This mixture was then added to the solid phase reaction vessel containing the deprotected H₂N-Leu-R resin and shaken for 3–4 hours at room temperature. Following coupling, the resin was washed thoroughly with DMF in preparation for the next round of deprotection and coupling. If the resin was to be coupled at a later time, it was washed with a series of DMF, DCM, MeOH, and Et₂O, dried under vacuum and stored for later use. The coupling of all subsequent amino acids to synthesize resin bound linear derivatives of Tyrocidine A and **1–4** was accomplished as described above.

Modified Coupling Conditions

It is noteworthy that changing the above conditions by replacing HOBt with HOAt, utilizing NMP in place of DMF, and heating the reactions to 38 °C provided compounds **5–8** in significantly greater quantities.

Safety Catch Linker Activation

Following attachment of the terminal amino acid, the resin was washed with NMP in preparation for resin activation. To a 10 mL syringe equipped with a 2 μ m filter tip was added activated basic alumina (200 mg), NMP (3.5 mL), DIEA (180 μ L), and iodoacetonitrile (280 μ L). The mixture was then filtered into the reaction vessel containing the unactivated resin. The vessel was then wrapped in aluminum foil to exclude light and shaken at room temperature for 24 h. Following 24 h the mixture was filtered and the resin washed with DMF and DCM in preparation for orthogonal Boc and O-tBu deblocking.

Orthogonal Deprotection

A mixture of TFA:Phenol:TIPS:H₂O (88:5:5:1) was freshly prepared and stored at 4 °C for subsequent use. To the activated resin prepared as described above was added 3 mL of the TFA:Phenol:TIPS:H₂O deblocking mixture. The mixture was shaken at room temperature for 2 h. Following deprotection, the resin was washed with DCM and THF in preparation for on resin self-cyclization of the linear peptide.

Resin Self-Cyclization and Cleavage

The resin was washed with THF as described above. Following washing, a 20% solution of DIEA in THF (2.5 mL) was added and the mixture was shaken at room temperature for 24 h. After 24 h the resin was filtered and washed with THF (2 $\times$ 2 mL) and all filtrates were combined in a round bottom flask. The solvent was evaporated to provide a viscous solution or solid, depending on the compound. In all cases a small amount of methanol (200–400 μ L) was added to the round bottom to dissolve the solid or dilute the solution. The mixture was then transferred to a 1.5 mL eppendorf tube. To the eppendorf tube was added cold Et₂O to provide a white precipitate. The eppendorf tube was centrifuged at 14,000 rpm at 4 °C for 5 min to provide a solid white pellet. The eppendorf tube was decanted, the pellet taken up in 200 μ L of methanol and subject to a second round precipitation. The pellet was then taken up in 500 μ L of acetonitrile, flash frozen with liquid nitrogen and subject to lyophilization to provide the final cyclized products (Tyrocidine A and analogues **1–8**) as a fine white solids. It is noteworthy

that with different structural variants, such as the fluorinated derivatives that show some solubility in the MeOH/Et₂O precipitation mixture, the use of 0.1% TFA in place of Et₂O is more effective.

Purification and Characterization

In most cases, precipitated products were shown to be sufficiently pure by HPLC and HNMR, and reported yields are based on recovery following precipitation and lyophilization. Compounds that were not pure by precipitation were subjected to reverse phase preparatory HPLC purification. The HPLC purification protocol is as follows: no more than 15 mg of crude precipitate was dissolved in MeOH (1 mL) and loaded onto the HPLC equipped with a 5 mL injection loop and Waters 8 × 10 semi-prep C18 column. The solvent system was a 0.1% TFA (solvent A) and acetonitrile (solvent B) mixture. The method consisted of a ramp from 0% to 10% B over 5 min, followed by 10% to 80% B over 50 min, followed by 80% to 100% B over 5 min, with a flow rate of 3mL/min. The column was then washed at 100% B for 5 min, followed by re-equilibration to 100% A for the next run. HPLC spectra were recorded at 220 nm. HPLC fractions were analyzed by LCMS. The LCMS was equipped with an Altech 10mm × 2.1 mm C18 column and was run using a solvent mixture of 1% phosphoric acid (solvent A) and acetonitrile (solvent B). Briefly, 25 microliters of a dilute samples were autoinjected to the LCMS and the standard method consisted of the following: the column was equilibrated at 10% B running at 125 µL/min followed by a ramp from 10–15% B over 5 min, followed by 15–80% B over 30 min, followed by 80–100% B over 5 min. The column was then washed for 2 min at 100% B, followed by re-equilibration. Tyrocidine A and analogue **1–8** retention times were recorded and used as an indicator of their hydrophobicity. Pooling of the appropriate fractions followed by lyophilization provided pure cyclized compounds.

Tyrocidine A

Isolated as a fine white powder (7.4 mg 2.7% Yield) after HPLC purification of the appropriate fractions. ¹HNMR (400 MHz, D₆-DMSO, 25 °C); 9.27 (s, 1H), 9.16 (s, 1H), 9.02 (m, 2H), 8.91 (d, 1H, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 8.70 (d, 1H, *J* = 4.4 Hz), 8.43 (d, 1H, *J* = 10 Hz), 8.01 (s, 1H), 7.91 (d, 1H, *J* = 7.6 Hz), 7.45 (s, 1H), 7.39 (d, 2H, *J* = 8.4 Hz), 7.23-7.01 (m, 16H), 6.92 (d, 2H, *J* = 8.4 Hz), 6.61 (d, 2H, *J* = 8.4 Hz), 5.57 (m, 1H), 5.26 (m, 1H), 4.55-4.42 (m, 4H), 4.35-4.25 (m, 2H), 4.06 (d, 1H, *J* = 8.4), 3.80 (m, 1H), 3.09-2.70 (m, 8H), 2.19 (m, 2H), 1.99 (m, 4H), 1.62 (m, 4H), 1.43 (m, 2H), 1.21 (m, 2H), 1.00-0.85 (m, 12H), 0.36 (br, 2H); ES-MS *m/z* 1270.88 (M+H 1270.66 calc. C₆₆H₈₈N₁₃O₁₃). Retention time LCMS = 18.8 min

(1): Isolated as a fine white powder (7.2 mg 3.5% Yield) after HPLC purification of the appropriate fractions. ¹HNMR (400 MHz, D₆-DMSO, 25 °C); 9.26 (s, 1H), 9.17 (s, 1H), 8.99 (d, 1H, *J* = 9.2 Hz), 8.86 (s, 1H), 8.73 (d, 1H, *J* = 9.2 Hz), 8.66 (s, 1H), 8.31 (d, 1H, *J* = 10 Hz), 8.23 (m, 1H), 7.93 (s, 1H), 7.38-7.12 (m, 11H), 6.91 (d, 2H, *J* = 8.4 Hz), 6.61 (d, 2H, *J* = 8.4 Hz), 5.10 (m, 1H), 4.74 (m, 1H), 4.58 (m, 1H), 4.50 (m, 1H), 4.45 (m, 1H), 4.37 (m, 1H), 4.27 (m, 1H), 4.14 (m, 1H), 3.76 (m, 1H), 3.0-2.6 (m, 6H), 1.64 (m, 3H), 1.47 (m, 3H), 1.34 (m, 2H), 1.23 (m, 2H), 0.92-0.78 (m, 12), 0.40 (br, 2H); ES-MS *m/z* 1251.69 (M+H 1251.69 calc. C₆₃H₉₁N₁₄O₁₃). Retention time LCMS 11.1 min

(2): Isolated as a fine white powder after precipitation purification (15 mg 5.4% Yield) ¹HNMR (400 MHz, D₆-DMSO, 25 °C); 9.27 (s, 1H), 9.00 (d, 1H, *J* = 9.2 Hz), 8.86 (s, 1H), 8.75 (d, 1H, *J* = 9.2 Hz), 8.24 (d, 2H, *J* = 9.2), 7.99 (d, 1H, *J* = 4 Hz), 7.93 (s, 1H), 7.36-7.12 (m, 14H), 6.92 (d, 2H, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 6.63 (d, 2H, *J* = 8.4), 5.10, (s, 1H), 4.73 (m, 1H), 4.57 (m, 1H), 4.43 (m, 1H), 4.37 (m, 1H), 4.27 (m, 1H), 4.14 (d, 1H, *J* = 8.4 Hz), 4.09 (s, 1H), 3.70 (m, 1H), 2.98-2.54 (m, 6H), 1.64 (s, 3H), 1.48 (m, 6H), 1.34 (m, 5H), 1.24 (m, 2H), 1.18-1.0 (m, 3H), 0.94-0.70 (m, 12H), 0.38 (br, 2H); ES-MS *m/z* 1251.88 (M+H 1251.73 calc. C₆₄H₉₅N₁₄O₁₂). Retention time LCMS 9.7 min

(3): Isolated as a fine white powder after precipitation purification (21 mg 7.0% Yield) ^1H NMR (400 MHz, $\text{D}_6\text{-DMSO}$, 25 °C); 9.27 (d, 1H, $J = 9.6$ Hz), 9.18 (s, 1H), 9.10 (s, 1H), 9.03 (d, 1H, $J = 6$ Hz), 8.96 (d, 1H, $J = 9.2$ Hz), 8.69 (s, 1H), 8.40 (d, 1H, $J = 9.6$ Hz), 8.03 (s, 1H), 7.87 (d, 1H, $J = 8.4$ Hz), 7.44 (m, 6H), 7.24-7.09 (m, 12H), 6.94 (d, 2H, $J = 8.4$ Hz), 6.63 (d, 2H, $J = 8.8$ Hz), 5.50 (m, 1H), 5.11 (m, 1H), 4.53 (m, 3H), 4.31 (m, 1H), 4.22 (m, 1H), 4.17 (m, 1H), 3.81 (m, 1H), 3.01-2.67 (m, 12H), 2.00 (m, 2H), 1.66 (m, 7H), 1.25 (m, 9H), 0.92 (m, 12), 0.81 (br, 2H); ES-MS m/z 1361.03 (M+H 1360.62 calc. $\text{C}_{66}\text{H}_{83}\text{F}_5\text{N}_{13}\text{O}_{13}$). Retention time LCMS 19.4 min

(4): Isolated as a fine white powder (8.4 mg 2.7% Yield) after HPLC purification of the appropriate fractions. ^1H NMR (400 MHz, $\text{D}_6\text{-DMSO}$, 25 °C); 9.28 (d, 1H, $J = 9.6$ Hz), 9.11 (s, 1H), 9.07 (d, 1H, $J = 7.2$ Hz), 9.00 (d, 1H, $J = 9.2$ Hz), 8.67 (s, 1H), 8.63 (d, 1H, $J = 10$ Hz), 8.04 (s, 1H), 7.84 (d, 1H, $J = 8.4$ Hz), 7.64 (d, 1H, $J = 8$ Hz), 7.41 (d, 1H, $J = 10$ Hz), 7.35 (d, 1H, $J = 12.4$ Hz), 7.25-7.09 (m, 11H), 6.88 (s, 1H), 5.49 (m, 1H), 5.13 (m, 1H), 4.78 (m, 1H), 4.52 (m, 3H), 4.21 (m, 1H), 4.17 (m, 1H), 3.84 (m, 1H), 3.23-2.68 (m, 8H), 2.03 (m, 2H), 1.91 (m, 4H), 1.5-1.23 (m, 6H), 0.93-0.76 (m, 12H), 0.47 (br, 2H); ES-MS m/z 1434.63 (M+H 1434.57 calc. $\text{C}_{66}\text{H}_{78}\text{F}_{10}\text{N}_{13}\text{O}_{12}$). Retention time LCMS 19.4 min

(5): Isolated as a fine white powder after precipitation purification (45.2 mg 16.1% Yield). ^1H NMR (400 MHz, $\text{D}_6\text{-DMSO}$, 25 °C); 9.07 (d, 1H, $J = 7.2$ Hz), 8.95 (d, 1H, $J = 8.8$ Hz), 8.81 (d, 1H, $J = 8.4$ Hz), 8.34 (d, 1H, $J = 9.6$ Hz), 8.00 (m, 4H), 7.36 (m, 2H), 7.26-7.04 (m, 20H), 6.93 (d, 2H, $J = 8.4$ Hz), 6.63 (d, 2H, $J = 8.4$ Hz), 5.62 (m, 1H), 5.21 (m, 1H), 4.54-4.47 (m, 4H), 4.31-4.25 (m, 2H), 4.05 (d, 1H, $J = 8.0$ Hz), 3.73 (s, 1H), 3.34-2.53 (m, 10H), 2.44-2.39 (m, 3H), 2.33 (m, 1H), 2.19-2.00 (m, 4H), 1.60-1.17 (m, 20H), 0.93-0.89 (m, 12H), 0.32 (br, 2H); ES-MS m/z 1270.70 (M+H 1270.70 calc. $\text{C}_{67}\text{H}_{92}\text{N}_{13}\text{O}_{12}$). Retention time LCMS 15.25 min

(6): Isolated as a fine white powder after precipitation purification (59 mg 20% Yield). ^1H NMR (400 MHz, $\text{D}_6\text{-DMSO}$, 25 °C); 9.28 (s, 1H), 9.06 (m, 2H), 8.96 (d, 1H, $J = 10$ Hz), 8.65 (m, 1H), 8.03 (s, 1H), 7.88 (d, 1H, $J = 8.4$ Hz), 7.60 (d, 1H, $J = 8$ Hz), 7.32-7.03 (m, 15H), 6.87 (s, 1H), 5.57 (m, 1H), 5.29 (m, 1H), 4.56-4.42 (m, 4H), 4.28 (m, 2H), 4.05 (d, 1H, $J = 8.0$ Hz), 3.84 (m, 1H), 3.15-2.65 (m, 8H), 2.43-1.98 (m, 6H), 1.68 (m, 4H), 1.61-1.21 (m, 7H), 0.93-0.88 (m, 12H), 0.34 (br, 2H); ES-MS m/z 1344.77 (M+H 1344.62 calc. $\text{C}_{66}\text{H}_{83}\text{F}_5\text{N}_{13}\text{O}_{12}$). Retention time LCMS 18.65 min

(7): Isolated as a fine white powder after precipitation purification (40.4 mg 13.5% Yield). ^1H NMR (400 MHz, $\text{D}_6\text{-DMSO}$, 25 °C); 9.19 (s, 1H), 9.00 (m, 2H), 8.87 (d, 1H, $J = 8$ Hz), 8.28 (d, 1H, $J = 9.2$), 7.96 (m, 1H), 7.86 (m, 1H), 7.41 (m, 2H), 7.22-7.07 (m, 10H), 6.92 (d, 2H, $J = 8.8$ Hz), 6.62 (d, 2H, $J = 8.8$ Hz), 5.45 (m, 1H), 5.05 (m, 1H), 4.73 (m, 1H), 4.47 (m, 2H), 4.27-4.21 (m, 4H), 4.13 (d, 1H, $J = 8.0$ Hz), 3.73 (m, 1H), 3.10-2.64 (m, 8H), 1.70-1.21 (m, 12H), 0.94-0.81 (m, 12H); ES-MS m/z 1360.81 (M+H 1360.65 calc. $\text{C}_{67}\text{H}_{87}\text{F}_5\text{N}_{13}\text{O}_{12}$). Retention time LCMS 12.39 min

(8): Isolated as a fine white powder after precipitation purification (26.1 mg 8.8% Yield). ^1H NMR (400 MHz, $\text{D}_6\text{-DMSO}$, 25 °C); 8.91 (s, 1H), 8.81 (s, 1H), 8.19 (m, 2H), 7.97-7.84 (m, 4H), 7.43-7.24 (m, 6H), 6.94 (d, 2H, $J = 7.6$ Hz), 6.63 (d, 2H, $J = 8$ Hz), 4.92 (m, 1H), 4.80 (m, 1H), 4.46 (m, 2H), 4.34-4.20 (m, 4H), 4.02 (m, 1H), 3.88 (m, 1H), 3.10-2.55 (m, 6H), 1.50-1.11 (m, 24H), 0.88-0.83 (m, 12H); ES-MS m/z 1341.78 (M+H 1341.68 calc. $\text{C}_{64}\text{H}_{90}\text{F}_5\text{N}_{14}\text{O}_{12}$). Retention time LCMS 9.80 min

Bacterial Inhibition Assays

The *in vitro* activities of Tyrocidine-A, **1–8**, and daptomycin were measured using a microdilution method (CLSI) according to standard procedures.⁶⁵ The compounds were

dissolved in cation adjusted Mueller-Hinton broth (CAMHB) or a small amount of dimethyl sulfoxide (dms), followed by broth. Serial twofold dilutions were prepared in CAMHB in micro titer trays. Daptomycin and vancomycin were also tested as controls.

Bacterial strains—The test organisms were *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 33592 (oxacillin-resistant), *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 29213 (oxacillin-susceptible), *Staphylococcus epidermidis* (clinical isolate MRL 19010), *Enterococcus faecalis* ATCC 29212, *Enterococcus faecalis* (clinical isolate MRL 17001, vancomycin-resistant), *Bacillus subtilis* (clinical isolate MRL 18734), *Bacillus cereus* (clinical isolate MRL 18731), and *Escherichia coli* ATCC 25922.

Method—Overnight cultures of the strains were suspended in saline to equal the 0.5 McFarland turbidity standard. They were further diluted 1:100 in CAMHB and added to the wells containing the diluted compounds. Drug-free wells were quantitatively subcultured to determine the actual colony counts in the test. The trays were incubated overnight at 36C. After growth had occurred, they were examined using an inverted mirror apparatus. The MIC was the concentration that completely inhibited growth of the organisms.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by the National Institutes of Health through the NIH Roadmap for Medical Research, Grant (1R01GM075857-01). Information on this RFA (RM-05-013) can be found at (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-RM-05-013.html>, links to nine initiatives are found here <http://nihroadmap.nih.gov>). We would also like to thank the Baxter Foundation for fellowship to M.A.M., and A.P. and K.W. for help with instrumentation and fruitful conversation.

References

1. Chang S, Sievert DM, Hageman JC, Boulton ML, Tenover FC, Downes FP, Shah S, Rudrik JT, Pupp GR, Brown WJ, Cardo D, Fridkin SK. Infection with vancomycin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* containing the vanA resistance gene. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2003;348(14):1342–1347. [PubMed: 12672861]
2. Jones RN, Farrell DJ, Morrissey I. Quinupristin-dalfopristin resistance in *Streptococcus pneumoniae*: Novel L22 ribosomal protein mutation in two clinical isolates from the SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveillance Program. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 2003;47(8):2696–2698. [PubMed: 12878545]
3. Sievert DM, Boulton ML, Stoltman G, Johnson D, Stobierski MG, Downes FP, Somsel PA, Rudrik JT, Brown W, Hafeez W, Lundstrom T, Flanagan E, Johnson R, Mitchell J. *Staphylococcus aureus* resistant to vancomycin - United States, 2002 (Reprinted from MMWR, vol 51, pg 565–567, 2002). *Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association* 2002;288(7):824–825.
4. Tsiodras S, Gold HS, Sakoulas G, Eliopoulos GM, Wennersten C, Venkataraman L, Moellering RC, Ferraro MJ. Linezolid resistance in a clinical isolate of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Lancet* 2001;358(9277):207–208. [PubMed: 11476839]
5. Cui LZ, Tominaga E, Neoh HM, Hiramatsu K. Correlation between reduced daptomycin susceptibility and vancomycin resistance in vancomycin-intermediate *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 2006;50(3):1079–1082. [PubMed: 16495273]
6. Bax RP. Antibiotic resistance: A view from the pharmaceutical industry. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 1997;24:S151–S153. [PubMed: 8994797]
7. Coates A, Hu YM, Bax R, Page C. The future challenges facing the development of new antimicrobial drugs. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery* 2002;1(11):895–910.
8. Cohen ML. Epidemiology of Drug-Resistance - Implications for a Postantimicrobial Era. *Science* 1992;257(5073):1050–1055. [PubMed: 1509255]
9. Spratt BG. Resistance to antibiotics mediated by target alterations. *Science* 1994;264:388–393. [PubMed: 8153626]

10. Sefton AM. Mechanisms of antimicrobial resistance - Their clinical relevance in the new millennium. *Drugs* 2002;62(4):557–566. [PubMed: 11893225]
11. Walsh C. Molecular mechanisms that confer antibacterial drug resistance. *Nature* 2000;406(6797):775–781. [PubMed: 10963607]
12. Silver L, Bostian K. Screening of Natural-Products for Antimicrobial Agents. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases* 1990;9(7):455–461.
13. Walsh C. Where will new antibiotics come from? *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 2003;1(1):65–70.
14. Rosamund J, Allsop A. Harnessing the power of the genome in the search for new antibiotics. *Science* 2000;287:1973–1976. [PubMed: 10720317]
15. Tettelin F. Finding drug targets in microbial genomes. *Drug Discovery Today* 2001;(6):887–892. [PubMed: 11522517]
16. Gonzales RD, Schreckenberger PC, Graham MB, Kelkar S, DenBesten K, Quinn JP. Infections due to vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium* resistant to linezolid. *Lancet* 2001;357(9263):1179–1179. [PubMed: 11323048]
17. Pai MP, Rodvold KA, Schreckenberger PC, Gonzales RD, Petrolatti JM, Quinn JP. Risk factors associated with the development of infection with linezolid- and vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium*. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2002;35(10):1269–1272. [PubMed: 12410489]
18. Bax RP, Anderson R, Crew J, Fletcher P, Johnson T, Kaplan E, Knaus B, Kristinsson K, Malek M, Strandberg L. Antibiotic resistance - what can we do? *Nature Medicine* 1998;4(5):545–546.
19. Souli M, Kontopidou FV, Koratzanis E, Antoniadou A, Giannitsioti E, Evangelopoulou P, Kannavaki S, Giamarellou H. In vitro activity of tigecycline against multiple-drug-resistant, including pan-resistant, gram-negative and gram-positive clinical isolates from Greek hospitals. *Antimicrobial Agents & Chemotherapy* 2006;50(9):3166–9. [PubMed: 16940120]
20. Rose WE, Rybak MJ. Tigecycline: first of a new class of antimicrobial agents. *Pharmacotherapy* 2006;26(8):1099–110. [PubMed: 16863487]
21. Fraise AP. Tigecycline: the answer to beta-lactam and fluoroquinolone resistance? *Journal of Infection* 2006;53(5):293–300. [PubMed: 16876253]
22. Doan TL, Fung HB, Mehta D, Riska PF. Tigecycline: a glycylcycline antimicrobial agent. *Clinical Therapeutics* 2006;28(8):1079–106. [PubMed: 16982286]
23. Hancock REW, Chapple DS. Peptide antibiotics. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* 1999;43(6):1317–1323. [PubMed: 10348745]
24. Zasloff M. Antimicrobial peptides in health and disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2002;347(15):1199–1200. [PubMed: 12374882]
25. Zasloff M. Antimicrobial peptides of multicellular organisms. *Nature* 2002;415(6870):389–395. [PubMed: 11807545]
26. Hotchkiss RD, Dubos RJ. Bactericidal fractions from an aerobic sporulating bacillus. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 1940;136(3):803–804.
27. Hotchkiss RD, Dubos RJ. The isolation of bactericidal substances from cultures of *Bacillus brevis*. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 1941;141(1):155–162.
28. Jelokhani-Niaraki M, Prenner EJ, Kay CM, McElhaney RN, Hodges RS. Conformation and interaction of the cyclic cationic antimicrobial peptides in lipid bilayers. *Journal of Peptide Research* 2002;60(1):23–36. [PubMed: 12081624]
29. Jelokhani-Niaraki M, Prenner EJ, Kondejewski LH, Kay CM, McElhaney RN, Hodges RS. Molecular state of the cyclic analogs of gramicidin S in solution and micellar environments. *Biophysical Journal* 2000;78(1):286A–286A.
30. Jelokhani-Niaraki M, Prenner EJ, Kondejewski LH, Kay CM, McElhaney RN, Hodges RS. Conformation and other biophysical properties of cyclic antimicrobial peptides in aqueous solutions. *Journal of Peptide Research* 2001;58(4):293–306. [PubMed: 11606214]
31. Jones CR, Sikakana CT, Hehir S, Kuo MC, Gibbons WA. Quantitation of Nuclear Overhauser Effect Methods for Total Conformational-Analysis of Peptides in Solution - Application to Gramicidin-S. *Biophysical Journal* 1978;24(3):815–832. [PubMed: 83886]

32. Jones CR, Sikakana CT, Kuo MC, Gibbons WA. Interproton Distances for Beta-Turn Residues of Peptide Gramicidin-S Determined from Nuclear Overhauser Effect Ratios. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 1978;100(18):5960–5961.
33. Kato T, Izumiya N. Conformations of Di-N-Methylleucine Gramicidin-S and N-Methylleucine Gramicidin-S Compatible with Sidedness Hypothesis. *Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta* 1977;493(1): 235–238. [PubMed: 69449]
34. Lewis R, Prenner EJ, Kiricsi M, Jelokhani-Niaraki M, Hodges RS, McElhaney RN. Structure activity relationships of Gramicidin S analogues: implications for rational design of antimicrobial peptides. *Biophysical Journal* 2005;88(1):575A–575A.
35. Prenner EJ, Jelokhani-Niaraki M, Kondejewski LH, Hodges RS, McElhaney RN. Membrane interactions of gramicidin S and biologically active analogs. *Biophysical Journal* 2000;78(1):321A–321A.
36. Salgado J, Grage SL, Kondejewski LH, Hodges RS, McElhaney RN, Ulrich AS. Membrane-bound structure and alignment of the antimicrobial beta-sheet peptide gramicidin S derived from angular and distance constraints by solid state F-19-NMR. *Journal of Biomolecular Nmr* 2001;21(3):191–208. [PubMed: 11775737]
37. Shai Y. Mechanism of the binding, insertion and destabilization of phospholipid bilayer membranes by alpha-helical antimicrobial and cell non-selective membrane-lytic peptides. *Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta-Biomembranes* 1999;1462(1–2):55–70.
38. Shai Y. Mode of action of membrane active antimicrobial peptides. *Biopolymers* 2002;66(4):236–248. [PubMed: 12491537]
39. Prenner EJ, Lewis R, Jelokhani-Niaraki M, Hodges RS, McElhaney RN. Cholesterol attenuates the interaction of the antimicrobial peptide gramicidin S with phospholipid bilayer membranes. *Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta-Biomembranes* 2001;1510(1–2):83–92.
40. Fuchs PC, Barry AL, Brown SD. Daptomycin susceptibility tests: interpretive criteria, quality control, and effect of calcium on in vitro tests. *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease* 2000;38(1): 51–58. [PubMed: 11025184]
41. Ball LJ, Goult CM, Donarski JA, Micklefield J, Ramesh V. NMR structure determination and calcium binding effects of lipopeptide antibiotic daptomycin. *Organic & Biomolecular Chemistry* 2004;2(13): 1872–1878. [PubMed: 15227539]
42. Ando S, Nishikawa H, Takiguchi H, Lee S, Sugihara G. Antimicrobial Specificity and Hemolytic-Activity of Cyclized Basic Amphiphilic Beta-Structural Model Peptides and Their Interactions with Phospholipid-Bilayers. *Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta* 1993;1147(1):42–49. [PubMed: 8466930]
43. Jelokhani-Niaraki M, Kondejewski LH, Farmer SW, Hancock REW, Kay CM, Hodges RS. Diastereoisomeric analogues of gramicidin S: structure, biological activity and interaction with lipid bilayers. *Biochemical Journal* 2000;349:747–755. [PubMed: 10903135]
44. Kondejewski LH, Farmer SW, Wishart DS, Hancock REW, Hodges RS. Gramicidin S is active against both gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria. *International Journal of Peptide and Protein Research* 1996;47(6):460–466. [PubMed: 8836773]
45. Kondejewski LH, Farmer SW, Wishart DS, Kay CM, Hancock REW, Hodges RS. Modulation of structure and antibacterial and hemolytic activity by ring size in cyclic gramicidin S analogs. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 1996;271(41):25261–25268. [PubMed: 8810288]
46. Kondejewski LH, Jelokhani-Niaraki M, Farmer SW, Lix B, Kay CM, Sykes BD, Hancock REW, Hodges RS. Dissociation of antimicrobial and hemolytic activities in cyclic peptide diastereomers by systematic alterations in amphipathicity. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 1999;274(19):13181–13192. [PubMed: 10224074]
47. Kondejewski LH, Lee DL, Jelokhani-Niaraki M, Farmer SW, Hancock REW, Hodges RS. Optimization of microbial specificity in cyclic peptides by modulation of hydrophobicity within a defined structural framework. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 2002;277(1):67–74. [PubMed: 11682479]
48. McInnes C, Kondejewski LH, Hodges RS, Sykes BD. Development of the structural basis for antimicrobial and hemolytic activities of peptides based on gramicidin S and design of novel analogs using NMR spectroscopy. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 2000;275(19):14287–14294. [PubMed: 10799508]

49. Bu XZ, Wu XM, Xie GY, Guo ZH. Synthesis of tyrocidine A and its analogues by spontaneous cyclization in aqueous solution. *Organic Letters* 2002;4(17):2893–2895. [PubMed: 12182582]
50. Kohli RM, Walsh CT, Burkart MD. Biomimetic synthesis and optimization of cyclic peptide antibiotics. *Nature* 2002;418(6898):658–661. [PubMed: 12167866]
51. Qin CG, Bu XZ, Wu XM, Guo ZH. A chemical approach to generate molecular diversity based on the scaffold of cyclic decapeptide antibiotic tyrocidine A. *Journal of Combinatorial Chemistry* 2003;5(4):353–355. [PubMed: 12857101]
52. Qin CG, Zhong XF, Bu XZ, Ng NLJ, Guo ZH. Dissociation of antibacterial and hemolytic activities of an amphipathic peptide antibiotic. *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry* 2003;46(23):4830–4833. [PubMed: 14584933]
53. Rutenbe, Ma; Mach, B. Studies on Amino Acid Substitution in Biosynthesis of Antibiotic Polypeptide Tyrocidine. *Biochemistry* 1966;5(9):2864. [PubMed: 5961872]
54. Katayama T, Nakao K, Akamatsu M, Ueno T, Fujita T. Quantitative Structure-Hydrophobicity and Structure-Activity-Relationships of Antibacterial Gramicidin-S Analogs. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences* 1994;83(9):1357–1362. [PubMed: 7530304]
55. Mukhtar TA, Koteva KP, Wright GD. Chimeric streptogramin-tyrocidine antibiotics that overcome streptogramin resistance. *Chemistry & Biology* 2005;12(2):229–235. [PubMed: 15734650]
56. Kuo MC, Drakenberg T, Gibbons WA. Study of Proton Relaxation Mechanisms, Stereochemistry, and Dynamics of the Decapeptide Tyrocidine-A. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 1980;102(2):520–524.
57. Kuo MC, Gibbons WA. Determination of Individual Side-Chain Conformations, Tertiary Conformations, and Molecular Topography of Tyrocidine-a from Scalar Coupling-Constants and Chemical-Shifts. *Biochemistry* 1979;18(26):5855–5867. [PubMed: 229903]
58. Kuo MC, Gibbons WA. Total Assignments, Including 4 Aromatic Residues, and Sequence Confirmation of the Decapeptide Tyrocidine-a Using Difference Double-Resonance - Qualitative Nuclear Overhauser Effect Criteria for Beta Turn and Antiparallel Beta-Pleated Sheet Conformations. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 1979;254(14):6278–6287. [PubMed: 221496]
59. Kuo MC, Gibbons WA. Nuclear Overhauser Effect and Cross-Relaxation Rate Determinations of Dihedral and Trans-Annular Interproton Distances in the Decapeptide Tyrocidine-A. *Biophysical Journal* 1980;32(2):807–836. [PubMed: 6266536]
60. Trauger JW, Kohli RM, Walsh CT. Cyclization of backbone-substituted peptides catalyzed by the thioesterase domain from the tyrocidine nonribosomal peptide synthetase. *Biochemistry* 2001;40(24):7092–7098. [PubMed: 11401554]
61. Kohli RM, Trauger JW, Schwarzer D, Marahiel MA, Walsh CT. Generality of peptide cyclization catalyzed by isolated thioesterase domains of nonribosomal peptide synthetases. *Biochemistry* 2001;40(24):7099–7108. [PubMed: 11401555]
62. Trauger JW, Kohli RM, Mootz HD, Marahiel MA, Walsh CT. Peptide cyclization catalysed by the thioesterase domain of tyrocidine synthetase. *Nature* 2000;407(6801):215–218. [PubMed: 11001063]
63. Bax R, Mullan N, Verhoef J. The millennium bugs - the need for and development of new antibacterials. *International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents* 2000;16(1):51–59. [PubMed: 11185414]
64. Kay C, Lorthioir OE, Parr NJ, Congreve M, McKeown SC, Scicinski JJ, Ley SV. Solid-phase reaction monitoring - Chemical derivatization and off-bead analysis. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 2000;71(2):110–118. [PubMed: 11288066]
65. CLSI. CLSI Document M100-S16. Vol. 7. Vol. 26. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; Wayne, Pennsylvania: 2006. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Seseptibility Testing; Sixteenth Informational Supplement; p. M100-S16.

Gramicidin S

Tyrocidine A

Figure 1.
Structures of amphipathic cyclopeptides Gramicidin S and Tyrocidine A

Figure 2.

Solid phase synthesis of Tyrocidine A and analogues **1–8**. i) Linker Activation with 25 equiv IACN, 11 equiv DIEA, in NMP; ii) Deprotection with TFA: Phenol: TIPS:H₂O (88:5:5:2), R.T. 2 h; iii) Cyclative cleavage with 20% DIEA in THF, R.T. 24 h. **R1** = Phe or Pentafluorophenylalanine (PFPh), **R2** = DLys or DPhe, **R3** = Gln or Lys, **R4** = Tyr or PFPh.

Figure 3.
Structure of Tyrocidine A and analogues 1–8. Residue substitutions on the hydrophilic and hydrophobic faces shown in bold above.

Figure 4. Hydrophobic and hydrophilic faces of Tyrocidine A. a) Residues on hydrophobic face: Phe³, Asn⁵, Tyr⁷, Val⁸, Leu¹⁰. b) Chemical structure of Tyrocidine A. c) Residues on hydrophilic face: DPhe¹, DPhe⁴, Gln⁶, Orn⁹.

Table 1
LCMS Retention Times for Tyrocidine A & Analogues 1–8

Compound	Charge ^a	R _t (min) ^b
Tyrocidine A	+1	18.8
(1)	+2	11.1
(2)	+3	9.7
(3)	+1	19.4
(4)	+1	27.2 ^c
(5)	+2	15.3
(6)	+1	18.7
(7)	+2	12.4
(8)	+3	9.8

^a Charge based on number of primary amines.

^b Retention time by reversed phase LCMS.

^c Retention time correlates to hydrophilicity: increasing hydrophilicity leads to shorter retention time. Addition of pentafluorophenyl (PFPhe) residues decreases hydrophilicity.

Table 2
Minimum Inhibitory Concentrations for Tyrocidine A Analogues (µg/mL)^a

Organism ^b	Strain ^c	Tyr A	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	Daptomycin
MRSA	ATCC 33592	32	64	16	16	>256	4	16	8	8	1
MSSA	ATCC 29213	32	32	16	8	>256	4	16	16	8	1
E. faecalis	ATCC 29212	16	64	32	4	32	2	2	4	16	1
E. coli ^e	ATCC25922	>128	128	32	>256	>256	128	>256	>256	32	>128
MRSE	MRL19010	16	32	4	8	256	2	2	4	4	1
VRE	MRL 17001	16	32	8	8	32	2	2	4	4	2
B. subtilis	MRL 18734	16	16	2	4	128	2	8	8	2	1
B. cereus	MRL 18731	16	64	16	4	256	2	8	8	4	0.5

^a Inhibitory concentration required to completely inhibit bacterial growth

^b all gram positive bacteria with the exception of E. coli; MRSA = methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus; MSSA = methicillin-susceptible Staphylococcus aureus; E. faecalis = Enterococcus faecalis; E. coli = Escherichia coli; MRSE = methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus epidermidis; VRE = vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus; B. subtilis = Bacillus subtilis and B. cereus = Bacillus cereus.

^c MRL clinical isolates from USC-LAC Hospital

^d Calcium supplemented to 50 mg/L (normal 25 mg/L). Tyrocidine analogues did not show the same calcium dependence.

^e E. coli is a gram negative bacterium.