Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. 2009 December 1; 19(23): 6623–6626. doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2009.10.024.

Discovery and SAR of 6-substituted-4-anilinoquinazolines as non-competitive antagonists of mGlu₅

Andrew S. Felts^{a,c}, Sam A. Saleh^{a,c}, Uyen Le^{a,c}, Alice L. Rodriguez^{a,c}, C. David Weaver^{a,c}, P. Jeffrey Conn^{a,c}, Craig W. Lindsley^{a,b,c}, and Kyle A. Emmitte^{a,c}

^aDepartment of Pharmacology, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN 37232 USA

^bDepartment of Chemistry, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37232 USA

^cVanderbilt Program in Drug Discovery, Vanderbilt Institute of Chemical Biology, Nashville, TN 37232 USA

Abstract

A high-throughput cell-based screen identified a series of 6-substituted-4-anilinoquinazolines as non-competitive antagonists of metabotropic glutamate receptor 5 (mGlu₅). This communication describes the SAR of this series and the profile of selected compounds in selectivity and radioligand binding assays.

Glutamate is the major excitatory transmitter in the mammalian CNS, exerting its effects through both ionotropic and metabotropic glutamate receptors. The metabotropic glutamate receptors (mGlu_s) belong to family C of the G-protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs). These receptors are characterized by a seven transmembrane (7TM) α -helical domain that is connected via a cysteine-rich region to a large bi-lobed extracellular amino-terminal domain. The eight mGlu_s discovered to date have been further divided according to their structure, preferred signal transduction mechanisms, and pharmacology (Group I: mGlu₁ and mGlu₅; Group II: mGlu₂ and mGlu₃; Group III: mGlu₄, mGlu₆, mGlu₇, and mGlu₈).¹

Whereas orthosteric ligands of mGlu_s bind in the amino-terminal domain of the receptor, known allosteric binding sites are located in the 7TM domain. Orthosteric ligands often suffer from poor selectivity among the mGlu_s due to a highly conserved binding site. The discovery of non-competitive antagonists, also known as negative allosteric modulators (NAMs), has offered a potential solution to such selectivity issues.² The mGlu₅ NAMs 2-methyl-6-(phenylethynyl) pyridine (MPEP)³ and 3-[(2-methyl-1,3-thiazol-4-yl)ethynyl]pyridine (MTEP)⁴ (Figure 1) have demonstrated efficacy in numerous preclinical models of disease, including pain⁵, anxiety⁶, gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD)⁷, and fragile X syndrome⁸. In addition, there have been recent positive disclosures from phase II clinical studies with two small molecule mGlu₅ NAMs, ADX10059 in GERD⁹ and acute migraine¹⁰ and fenobam (Figure 1) in fragile X syndrome¹¹. With such a large body of compelling evidence, the search for new and improved mGlu₅ NAMs remains an attractive and active area for drug discovery research.¹²

Correspondence to: Kyle A. Emmitte.

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.

We have recently reported our initial results from an effort to identify mGlu₅ antagonists from multiple diverse chemotypes.¹³ A functional cell-based high-throughput screen of a collection of 160,000 compounds identified 624 mGlu₅ antagonists. The confirmation of hits using full concentration response curves left 345 verified non-competitive antagonists of the target. Among that set of confirmed hits were a few 6-bromo-4-anilinoquinazolines. 3-Chloroaniline analog **1** (Figure 2) represented the most potent compound in our functional assay, which measures the ability of the compound to block the mobilization of calcium by an EC₈₀ concentration of glutamate in HEK293A cells expressing rat mGlu₅.¹⁴ A binding affinity determination measuring the ability of the compound to compete with the equilibrium of [³H] 3-methoxy-5-(pyridin-2-ylethynyl)pyridine¹⁵, a close structural analog of MPEP, confirmed the interaction of **1** with the known allosteric binding site.¹⁶

The quinazoline scaffold as a chemotype for mGlu₅ antagonists has been disclosed by Grünenthal GmbH in the patent literature in the form of 6-aryl-4-aminoquinazolines.¹⁷ Quinazolines were also used by Yamanouchi Pharmaceutical Company¹⁸, Eli Lilly¹⁹, and Pfizer²⁰ to design mGlu₁ antagonists. Nonetheless, an investigation of the SAR of 6-substituted-4-anilinoquinazolines as non-competitive antagonists of mGlu₅ has yet to be disclosed. The development of such SAR is the subject of this communication.

Quinazoline derivatives of interest were readily accessible through S_NAr reaction of the appropriate nucleophiles with commercially available 6-substituted-4-chloroquinazolines using microwave-assisted organic synthesis (MAOS)²¹ (Scheme 1). Such chemistry was amenable to our preferred iterative library synthesis approach, which in combination with our custom mass-directed HPLC purification system allows for rapid evaluation of new screening hits.²² Prior to biological testing, all compounds were analyzed by LCMS and determined to be ≥ 95% pure, and selected compounds were further characterized by proton NMR.²³ Initially, we decided to conduct a small scan with commercially available 3-substituted anilines while maintaining the 6-bromoquinazoline functionality (Table 1). Substitution at the 3-position of the aniline ring appeared to improve potency as unsubstituted aniline **2** was only weakly active. 3-Fluoroaniline **3** exhibited improved potency relative to **2**, while 3-bromoaniline **4** and 3-methylaniline **5** were comparable in activity to the hit compound **1**. The sensitivity of this position to subtle modifications was evident as 3-trifluoromethylaniline **6** was 7-fold less potent than **5**. 3-Methoxyaniline **7** was only weakly active, similar to **2**.

We also decided to examine various substituents at the 6-position of the quinazoline ring while maintaining the 3-chloroaniline substituent (Table 2). Other halogens at this position (**8** and **9**) were similar in potency to the hit compound (**1**). 6-Nitroquinazoline **10** had comparable activity to the 6-halogen compounds. 6-Methoxy (**11**) and 6-cyano (**12**) quinazolines were less potent. Other substituents, including larger aryl and heteroaryl groups (data not shown) were not tolerated and resulted in a complete loss of activity.

Another area of interest was the quinazoline core of the template. As such, we prepared a few modified cores (Table 3). 6-Chloroquinoline analog **14** was essentially inactive in our assay, which was a dramatic change from the potent antagonist activity observed with comparator 6-chloroquinazoline **13**. Modification of the template to afford 7-bromoisoquinoline **15** reduced the activity by approximately 25-fold relative to 6-bromoquinazoline comparator **4**. Such results further illustrate how small structural modifications within this chemotype can profoundly impact the observed mGlu₅ activity.

We also explored the concept of extending the linker between the 4-amine substituent and the aryl ring (Table 4). Both benzyl amines (**17-20**) and phenethylamines (**21-24**) were investigated. Only unsubstituted phenethylamine analog **21** exhibited any antagonist activity, albeit weak. Chloro-substituted analogs failed to demonstrate any improved activity, which

was a significant contrast to the enhanced potency of 3-chloroaniline analog **9** relative to unsubstituted analog **16**.

An additional area of interest was a survey of potential alternatives to the secondary amine linker. Such work was accomplished in the context of the 6-chloro and 6-bromoquinazolines (Table 5). The *N*-methyl (**25** and **28**) and thiol (**27** and **30**) analogs proved inactive in our assay. Only the ether analogs (**26** and **29**) demonstrated weak antagonist activity. The consequences of the secondary amine (**13** and **4**) to ether (**26** and **29**) modifications were severe, reducing potency by more than 50-fold in each case.

Once we concluded that secondary anilines were likely optimal in this series, we sought to further evaluate the SAR around that portion of the scaffold. One of the potential issues with this series was the relatively high lipophilicity of the initial screening hit **1** (cLogP = 5.49).²⁴ Having achieved a potent hit with 6-fluoroquinazoline **8** (cLogP = 4.77), we decided to examine additional substituted anilines in the context of this core (Table 6). As was the case with the 6-bromoquinazolines, unsubstituted aniline **31** and 3-trifluoromethylaniline **34** were weak antagonists. 3-Bromo aniline **32** was a potent antagonist, while 3-methyl aniline **33** was only moderately potent. The moderate potency of **33** represented a departure from the SAR observed with the 6-bromoquinazolines, where 3-methylaniline **5**, 3-chloroaniline **1**, and 3-bromoaniline **4** were essentially equipotent. The 3-cyanoaniline **35** was moderately potent, similar to **33**. Interestingly, 3-ethylaniline **36** was a weak potentiator, or positive allosteric modulator ($EC_{50} > 10 \mu M$; % Glu max = 52 ± 5 in the presence of an EC_{20} concentration of glutamate). Such a switch in mGlu₅ pharmacology has been noted and reported before in our laboratory in the context of other chemotypes.^{13,16} 3-Methoxyaniline **37** was a weak antagonist. We also prepared a few analogs (**38-41**) in order to evaluate the effect of fluoro substitution in the context of the 3-chloroaniline. In every case, fluoro substitution proved detrimental to potency. 2-Fluoro-3-chloroaniline **39** demonstrated moderate potency, while other analogs were only weak antagonists.

Having identified some molecules with good potency in our cell-based functional assay, we decided to further profile these analogs with regard to binding affinity and selectivity (Table 7). Data for MPEP is shown as a comparator. Binding affinity determinations with [³H]3-methoxy-5-(pyridin-2-ylethynyl)pyridine confirmed the interaction of **13** and **32** with the known MPEP allosteric binding site, as was the case with hit compound **1**. The same three compounds were also examined for their selectivity versus additional mGlu_s and were determined to be inactive against mGlu₂₋₄ and mGlu₇₋₈. On the other hand, each compound demonstrated moderate antagonist activity of mGlu₁ in a calcium mobilization assay.²⁵ Recent publications indicate possible links between mGlu₁ and anxiety^{6a,26} as well as pain²⁷ and fragile X²⁸. Such an overlap with regard to therapeutic applications makes the concept of dual antagonism of mGlu₁ and mGlu₅ potentially interesting.

It is worth commenting on the fact that 4-anilinoquinazolines are well established as an effective template for the design of inhibitors of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) and other members of the ErbB kinase family.²⁹ In fact, dichloro analog **9** has been reported to moderately inhibit EGFR autophosphorylation ($IC_{50} = 2.7 \mu M$) in A431 cells.³⁰ While this level of potency is markedly less than that observed toward mGlu₅ in our functional cell based assay, monitoring potential off-target activity against such kinases will be necessary in the further development of this series as mGlu₅ non-competitive antagonists.

In summary, we have identified a series of non-competitive antagonists of mGlu₅ within the 6-substituted-4-anilinoquinazoline chemotype. Although the series was chemically unrelated to MPEP, selected potent compounds were confirmed to inhibit binding of a radioligand at the MPEP allosteric binding site. While the SAR in this series was somewhat shallow, several

compounds demonstrated moderate to good potency. Of further interest was the dual activity of this series with respect to mGlu₁.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank NIDA (RO1 DA023947-01) and Seaside Therapeutics (VUMC33842) for their support of our programs in the development of non-competitive antagonist of mGlu₅. Matt Mulder, Chris Denicola, and Sichen Chang are also thanked for the purification of compounds using the mass-directed HPLC system.

References and notes

1. (a) Schoepp DD, Jane DE, Monn JA. *Neuropharmacol* 1999;38:1431–1476. (b) Conn PJ, Pin JP. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol* 1997;37:205–237. [PubMed: 9131252]
2. (a) Ritzén A, Mathiesen JM, Thomsen C. *Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol* 2005;97:202–213. [PubMed: 16176554] (b) Kew JNC. *Pharmacol Ther* 2004;104:233–244. [PubMed: 15556676]
3. Gasparini F, Lingenhöhl K, Stoehr N, Flor PJ, Heinrich M, Vranesic I, Biollaz M, Allgeier H, Heckendorn R, Urwyler S, Varney MA, Johnson EC, Hess SD, Rao SP, Sacca AI, Santori EM, Veliocelebi G, Kuhn R. *Neuropharmacol* 1999;38:1493–1503.
4. Cosford ND, Tehrani L, Roppe J, Schweiger E, Smith ND, Anderson J, Bristow L, Brodtkin J, Jiang X, McDonald I, Rao S, Washburn M, Varney MA. *J Med Chem* 2003;46:204–206. [PubMed: 12519057]
5. Zhu CZ, Wilson SG, Mikusa JP, Wismer CT, Gauvin DM, Lynch JJ, Wade CL, Decker MW, Honore P. *Eur J Pharmacol* 2004;506:107–118. [PubMed: 15588730]
6. (a) Pietraszek M, Sukhanov I, Maciejak P, Szyndler J, Gravius A, Wislowska A, Plaznik A, Bepalov AY, Danysz W. *Eur J Pharmacol* 2005;514:25–34. [PubMed: 15878321] (b) Busse CS, Brodtkin J, Tattersall D, Anderson JJ, Warren N, Tehrani L, Bristow LJ, Varney MA, Cosford NDP. *Neuropsychopharmacol* 2004;29:1971–1979. (c) Klodzinska A, Tatarczynska E, Chojnacka-Wójcik E, Nowak G, Cosford NDP, Pilc A. *Neuropharmacol* 2004;47:342–350. (d) Spooren WPJM, Vassout A, Neijt HC, Kuhn R, Gasparini F, Roux S, Porsolt RD, Gentsch C. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 2000;295:1267–1275. [PubMed: 11082464]
7. (a) Jensen J, Lehmann A, Uvebrant A, Carlsson A, Jerndal G, Nilsson K, Frisby C, Blackshaw LA, Mattsson JP. *Eur J Pharmacol* 2005;519:154–157. [PubMed: 16102747] (b) Frisby CL, Mattsson JP, Jensen JM, Lehmann A, Dent J, Blackshaw LA. *Gastroenterology* 2005;129:995–1004. [PubMed: 16143137]
8. (a) de Vrij FMS, Levenga J, van der Linde HC, Koekkoek SK, De Zeeuw CI, Nelson DL, Oostra BA, Willemsen R. *Neurobiol Disease* 2008;31:127–132. (b) Yan QJ, Rammal M, Tranfaglia M, Bauchwitz RP. *Neuropharmacol* 2005;49:1053–1066.
9. Keywood C, Wakefield M, Tack J. *Gut*. 2009;10.1136/gut.2008.162040
10. Goadsby, PJ.; Keywood, CG. Abstracts of Papers; 61st Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Neurology; Seattle, WA. April 25–May 2, 2009; Saint Paul, MN; P06.006: American Academy of Neurology;
11. Berry-Kravis EM, Hessler D, Coffey S, Hervey C, Schneider A, Yuhas J, Hutchinson J, Snape M, Tranfaglia M, Nguyen DV, Hagerman R. *J Med Genet*. 2009;10.1136/jmg.2008.063701
12. (a) Lindsley CW, Emmitte KA. *Curr Opin Drug Discovery Dev* 2009;12:446–457. (b) Gasparini F, Bilbe G, Gomez-Mancilla B, Spooren W. *Curr Opin Drug Discovery Dev* 2008;11:655–665. (c) Jaeschke G, Wettstein JG, Nordquist RE, Spooren W. *Expert Opin Ther Patents* 2008;18:123–142.
13. Rodriguez AL, Williams R, Zhou Y, Lindsley SR, Le U, Grier MD, Weaver CD, Conn PJ, Lindsley CW. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 2009;3209–3213. [PubMed: 19443219]
14. HEK293A cells expressing rat mGluR5 or BHK cells expressing rat mGluR1 were cultured and plated as previously described. The cells were loaded with a Ca²⁺-sensitive fluorescent dye and the plates were washed and placed in the Functional Drug Screening System (Hamamatsu). Test compound was applied to cells 3 seconds after baseline readings were taken. Cells were incubated with the test compounds for 140 seconds and then stimulated with an EC₂₀ concentration of glutamate; 60 seconds later an EC₈₀ concentration of agonist was added and readings taken for an additional 40 seconds. Allosteric modulation by the compounds was measured by comparing the amplitude of the responses

at the time of glutamate addition plus and minus test compound. For a more detailed description of the assay, see Sharma S, Rodriguez AL, Conn PJ, Lindsley CW. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 2008;18:4098–4101. [PubMed: 18550372]

15. Cosford NDP, Roppe J, Tehrani L, Schweiger EJ, Seiders TJ, Chaudary A, Rao S, Varney MA. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 2003;13:351–354. [PubMed: 12565928]
16. For a detailed description of the radioligand binding assay see reference 14.
17. Reich M, Oberborsch S, Kühnert S, Haurand M, Schiene K. 2007 WO 2007/104560 A1.
18. Itahana H, Uekubo T, Nozawa S, Kako H, Okada S, Totani A. 2003 JP 2003012653 A.
19. (a) Ambler SJ, Baker SR, Clark BP, Coleman DS, Foglesong RJ, Goldsworthy J, Jagdmann GE Jr, Johnson KW, Kingston AE, Owton WM, Schoepp DD, Hong JE, Schkeryantz JM, VanNieuwenhze MS, Zia-Ebrahimi MS. 2001 WO 01/32632 A2. (b) Shannon HE, Peters SC, Kingston AE. *Neuropharmacol* 2005;49:188–195.
20. Mantell SJ, Gibson KR, Osborne SA, Maw GN, Rees H, Dodd PG, Greener B, Harbottle GW, Million WA, Poinard C, England S, Carnell P, Betts AM, Monhemius R, Prime RL. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 2009;19:2190–2194. [PubMed: 19289283]
21. Shipe WD, Wolkenberg SE, Lindsley CW. *Drug Discovery Today: Technologies* 2005;2:155–161.
22. Lindsley CW, Weaver D, Jones C, Marnett L, Conn PJ. *ACS Chem Biol* 2007;2:17–20. [PubMed: 17243778]
23. For a large scale synthesis, compounds can also be purified via flash chromatography on silica gel. For example, synthesis and characterization of **1** was conducted as follows: 6-Bromo-4-chloroquinazoline (1.0 g, 4.1 mmol), 3-chloroaniline (0.524 g, 4.1 mmol), triethylamine (1.25 g, 12.4 mmol) and ethanol (10 mL) were added to a microwave vial and heated at 140 °C for 15 minutes. The ethanol was removed under reduced pressure and the crude residue was dissolved in EtOAc and washed with aq. NH₄Cl (1×), H₂O (1×), brine (1×). The organic layer was dried (MgSO₄), filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. Purification by flash chromatography on silica gel afforded 1.15 g (84%) of the title compound as an off-white solid. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 9.93 (s, 1H), 8.86 (d, *J* = 1.9 Hz, 1H), 8.68 (s, 1H), 8.11 (t, *J* = 1.8 Hz, 1H), 8.00 (dd, *J* = 8.9, 2.0 Hz, 1H), 7.84 (dd, *J* = 8.2, 1.1 Hz, 1H), 7.74 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.42 (t, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 7.18 (dd, *J* = 7.9, 1.2 Hz, 1H); ES-MS [M+1]⁺: 334.0.
24. cLogP values were calculated using ChemBioDraw Ultra, version 11.0.1 available from CambridgeSoft.
25. For a description of the mGlu₁ calcium mobilization assay see reference 14. For additional details see Niswender CM, Johnson KA, Weaver CD, Jones CK, Xiang Z, Luo Q, Rodriguez AL, Marlo JE, de Paulis T, Thompson AD, Days EL, Nalywajko T, Austin CA, Williams MB, Ayala JE, Williams R, Lindsley CW, Conn PJ. *Mol Pharmacol* 2008;74:1345–1358. [PubMed: 18664603]
26. (a) Gravius A, Barberi C, Schäfer D, Schmidt WJ, Danysz W. *Neuropharmacol* 2006;51:1146–1155. (b) Steckler T, Lavreysen H, Oliveira AM, Aerts N, Van Craenendonck H, Prickaerts J, Megens A, Lesage ASJ. *Psychopharmacol* 2005;179:198–206. (c) Klodzinska A, Tatarczynska E, Stachowicz K, Chojnacka-Wójcik E. *J Physiol Pharmacol* 2004;55:113–126. [PubMed: 15082872]
27. (a) Varty GB, Grilli M, Forlani A, Fredduzzi S, Grzelak ME, Guthrie DH, Hodgson RA, Lu SX, Nicolussi E, Pond AJ, Parker EM, Hunter JC, Higgins GA, Reggiani A, Bertorelli R. *Psychopharmacol* 2005;179:207–217. (b) Zheng GZ, Bhatia P, Daanen J, Kolasa T, Patel M, Latshaw S, El Kouhen OF, Chang R, Uchic ME, Miller L, Nakane M, Lehto SG, Honore MP, Moreland RB, Brioni JD, Stewart AO. *J Med Chem* 2005;48:7374–7388. [PubMed: 16279797] (c) Fundytus ME, Yashpal K, Chabot JG, Osborne MG, Lefebvre CD, Dray A, Henry JL, Coderre TJ. *Br J Pharmacol* 2001;132:354–367. [PubMed: 11156596]
28. Bear MF, Huber KM, Warren ST. *Trends Neurosci* 2004;27:370–377. [PubMed: 15219735]
29. Bridges AJ. *Chem Rev* 2001;101:2541–2571. [PubMed: 11749388]
30. Gazit A, Chen J, App H, McMahon G, Hirth P, Chen I, Levitzki A. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 1996;4:1203–1207.

Figure 1.
mGlu₅ NAMs MPEP, MTEP, and fenobam

$$\text{mGlu}_5 \text{ IC}_{50} = 256 \pm 68 \text{ nM}$$

$$\text{mGlu}_5 \text{ K}_i = 116 \pm 29 \text{ nM}$$

Figure 2.
mGlu₅ NAM quinazoline screening hit

Scheme 1.

Reagents and conditions: (a) 3.0 eq. of Et₃N, 1.0 eq. of R²-NH₂ or R²-NHMe, EtOH; (b) 1.2 eq. of K₂CO₃, 1.0 eq. of R²-SH or R²-OH, acetone.

Table 1

SAR of 3-substituted anilines

Compound	R	mGlu ₅ IC ₅₀ (nM) ^a	% Glu max ^b
1	Cl	256 ± 68	1.5 ± 0.3
2	H	>10,000 ^c	42 ± 13
3	F	1970 ± 235	8.8 ± 3.0
4	Br	174 ± 26	2.5 ± 0.7
5	Me	246 ± 48	1.2 ± 0.3
6	CF ₃	1720 ± 127	3.2 ± 0.6
7	OMe	>10,000 ^c	34 ± 14

^a Calcium mobilization mGlu₅ assay; values are average of n ≥ 3

^b Amplitude of response in the presence of 30 μM test compound as a percentage of maximal response (100 μM glutamate); average of n ≥ 3

^c CRC does not plateau

Table 2

SAR of 6-substituted quinazolines

Compound	R	mGlu ₅ IC ₅₀ (nM) ^a	% Glu max ^b
1	Br	256 ± 68	1.5 ± 0.3
8	F	311 ± 74	0.9 ± 0.2
9	Cl	130 ± 28	2.8 ± 0.4
10	NO ₂	274 ± 70	2.4 ± 0.6
11	OMe	1510 ± 365	13 ± 7
12	CN	>10,000 ^c	35 ± 11

^a Calcium mobilization mGlu₅ assay; values are average of n ≥ 3

^b Amplitude of response in the presence of 30 μM test compound as a percentage of maximal response (100 μM glutamate); average of n ≥ 3

^c CRC does not plateau

Table 3

Core modifications

Compound	R	A ¹	A ²	mGlu ₅ IC ₅₀ (nM) ^a	% Glu max ^b
13	Cl	N	N	124 ± 29	1.2 ± 0.1
14	Cl	N	CH	>30,000	–
4	Br	N	N	174 ± 26	2.5 ± 0.7
15	Br	CH	N	4330 ± 1200	5.4 ± 1.7

^a Calcium mobilization mGlu₅ assay; values are average of n ≥ 3

^b Amplitude of response in the presence of 30 μM test compound as a percentage of maximal response (100 μM glutamate); average of n ≥ 3

Table 4

SAR of extended linkers

Compound	R	n	mGlu ₅ IC ₅₀ (nM) ^a	% Glu max ^b
16	H	0	>10,000 ^c	31 ± 12
9	3-Cl	0	130 ± 28	2.8 ± 0.4
17	H	1	>30,000	—
18	4-Cl	1	>30,000	—
19	3-Cl	1	>30,000	—
20	2-Cl	1	>30,000	—
21	H	2	>10,000 ^c	59 ± 3
22	4-Cl	2	>30,000	—
23	3-Cl	2	>30,000	—
24	2-Cl	2	>30,000	—

^a Calcium mobilization mGlu₅ assay; values are average of n ≥ 3

^b Amplitude of response in the presence of 30 μM test compound as a percentage of maximal response (100 μM glutamate); average of n ≥ 3

^c CRC does not plateau

Table 5

Linker modification SAR

Compound	R	X	mGlu ₅ IC ₅₀ (nM) ^a	% Glu max ^b
13	Cl	NH	124 ± 29	1.2 ± 0.1
25	Cl	NMe	>30,000	–
26	Cl	O	6570 ± 1010	14 ± 8
27	Cl	S	>30,000	–
4	Br	NH	174 ± 26	2.5 ± 0.7
28	Br	NMe	>30,000	–
29	Br	O	>10,000 ^c	49 ± 14
30	Br	S	>30,000	–

^a Calcium mobilization mGlu₅ assay; values are average of n ≥ 3

^b Amplitude of response in the presence of 30 μM test compound as a percentage of maximal response (100 μM glutamate); average of n ≥ 3

^c CRC does not plateau

Table 6

Aniline SAR of 6-fluoroquinazolines

Compound	R	mGlu ₅ IC ₅₀ (nM) ^a	% Glu max ^b
8	3-Cl	311 ± 74	0.9 ± 0.2
31	H	>10,000 ^c	58 ± 8
32	3-Br	96 ± 12	0.6 ± 0.2
33	3-Me	1350 ± 201	3.5 ± 0.8
34	3-CF ₃	>10,000 ^c	32 ± 16
35	3-CN	1370 ± 198	3.5 ± 0.6
36	3-Et	weak potentiator	
37	3-OMe	>10,000 ^c	50 ± 6
38	3-Cl, 4-F	>10,000 ^c	34 ± 17
39	2-F, 3-Cl	3720 ± 573	5.2 ± 1.4
40	3-Cl, 5-F	>10,000 ^c	56 ± 8
41	2-F, 5-Cl	>10,000 ^c	58 ± 8

^a Calcium mobilization mGlu₅ assay; values are average of n ≥ 3

^b Amplitude of response in the presence of 30 μM test compound as a percentage of maximal response (100 μM glutamate); average of n ≥ 3

^c CRC does not plateau

Table 7

Binding affinity and selectivity of selected compounds

Compound	mGlu ₅ IC ₅₀ (nM) ^a	mGlu ₅ K _i (nM) ^b	mGlu ₁ IC ₅₀ (nM) ^a
MPEP	3.5 ± 1.4	4.7 ± 1.5	–
1	256 ± 68	116	398 ± 33
13	124 ± 29	249	955 ± 115
32	96 ± 12	736	713 ± 102

^a Calcium mobilization assays; values are average of n ≥ 3

^b K_i values are average of n = 2