Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. 2010 January 1; 20(1): 252. doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2009.10.122.

Antimalarial Activity of Azadipeptide Nitriles

Reik Löser^{a,c,*}, Jiri Gut^b, Philip J. Rosenthal^b, Maxim Frizler^c, Michael Gütschow^c, and Katherine T. Andrews^{d,e,f}

^a Institute for Molecular Bioscience, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

^b School of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, University of California at San Francisco, San Francisco, USA

^c Pharmazeutisches Institut, Pharmazeutische Chemie I, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn, Germany

^d Eskitis Institute for Cell and Molecular Therapies, Griffith University, Nathan, Queensland, Australia

^e Queensland Institute for Medical Research, Herston, Queensland, Australia

^f Griffith Medical Research College, a joint program of Griffith University and QIMR, Herston, Queensland, Australia

Abstract

Azadipeptide nitriles – novel cysteine protease inhibitors – display structure-dependent antimalarial activity against both chloroquine-sensitive and chloroquine-resistant lines of cultured *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria parasites. Inhibition of parasite's haemoglobin-degrading cysteine proteases was also investigated, revealing the azadipeptide nitriles as potent inhibitors of falcipain-2 and -3. A correlation between the cysteine protease-inhibiting activity and the antimalarial potential of the compounds was observed. These first generation azadipeptide nitriles represent a promising new class of compounds for antimalarial drug development.

Keywords

malaria; azadipeptide nitriles; *P. falciparum*; falcipains; cysteine protease inhibitors

Malaria remains one of the world's most devastating infectious diseases, with around 500 million clinical cases and 1–2 million deaths annually.¹ Malaria is caused by infection with protozoan parasites of the genus *Plasmodium*, with the four main species that infect humans being *P. falciparum*, which is responsible for most morbidity and mortality, *P. vivax*, *P. malariae*, and *P. ovale*. More than 40% of the global population is at risk of malaria, particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa and regions of Asia. There is currently no licensed malaria vaccine and although there are several antimalarial drugs that are used clinically for chemoprophylaxis and treatment, the usefulness of most of these therapies is under threat due to drug resistance. Chloroquine was once the mainstay of antimalarial therapy. However, this drug is now

*Corresponding author, present address: Forschungszentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, Institut für Radiopharmazie, Bautzner Landstraße 400, 01328 Dresden, Germany. Tel.: +49 351 2603658; fax: +49 351 2603232. r.loeser@fzd.de.

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.

ineffective against *P. falciparum* in most regions of the world,² and clinical treatment failures have recently been reported for other antimalarial drugs, including Artemisinin-based combination therapies (ACTs).^{3–5} To address this enormous public health issue, there is an urgent need to identify and develop new antimalarial drugs.

Essential processes within the parasite, particularly those that are unique to *Plasmodium* and not the host, represent good targets for new antimalarial drugs.⁶ One of the best studied pathways is the process of haemoglobin degradation whereby, as it grows and matures, the intra-erythrocytic form of the parasite imports red cell cytosol into a compartment called the food vacuole.⁷ Within the food vacuole haemoglobin is proteolytically degraded by the partially redundant activity of papain-like cysteine proteases (falcipains) and aspartic proteases (plasmepsins) to ultimately form amino acids that are utilized by the parasite to grow and replicate.^{8, 9} The *P. falciparum* falcipains involved in haemoglobin catabolism (falcipain-2, falcipain-2', and falcipain-3) are recognized as promising new antimalarial drug targets.¹⁰

Inhibitors for papain-like cysteine proteases are mainly derived from peptides with electrophilic entities that are susceptible to covalent interaction with the thiol at the active site of the cysteine protease.^{11, 12} Peptide-derived vinylsulfones have been developed as irreversible inhibitors of cysteine proteases¹³ and their ability to impair parasite development *in vivo* has been shown.¹⁴ However, vinyl sulfones are also known to interact with the active site of the proteasome.¹⁵ Peptide nitriles have received increasing attention in recent years as the cyano group gives rise to a preferred interaction with the active-site thiol by the formation of an enzyme-bound thioimide that can result in potent enzyme inhibition.^{16–18} The isoelectronic replacement of the C α H-unit by a nitrogen atom in the P¹ position of dipeptide nitriles leads to a dramatic increase in the inhibitory potency, and the concurrent methylation of the P²-P¹ peptide bond to better stability against proteolytic degradation.¹⁹ Such improvements are encouraging research towards the medical application of these peptide analogues. Herein we report on the antimalarial potential of a panel of these azadipeptide nitriles.

The inhibitors used in this study have been synthesized as described¹⁹ and their antimalarial effect was determined against cultured *P. falciparum* infected erythrocytes using standard isotopic growth-inhibition assays. Assays were carried out using a chloroquine-sensitive (3D7)²⁰ and a chloroquine-resistant (Dd2)21 *P. falciparum* line, essentially as previously described.^{22–24}

Compounds **4** and **5** (Table 1), both bearing phenylalanine in P² and phenylethyl and pentyl in P¹, respectively, displayed the best activity against *P. falciparum* parasites, with IC₅₀ values of ~4 and ~3 μ M, respectively. The length of the substituent in the P¹ position may be important, as shortening the phenylethyl moiety in **4** to benzyl in **3** resulted in slightly reduced activity (IC₅₀ ~4 μ M vs ~7 μ M). Reduction of the P¹ substituent of the derivatives **5**, **4**, and **3** to a simple methyl group (compound **1**) led to decreased activity. This suggests the P¹ residue to be important for the antimalarial activity of the azadipeptide nitriles. When comparing the analogues **1** and **2**, differing in the Phe and Leu moiety in P², no significant difference was obvious. The isoelectronic replacement of the nitrogen adjacent to the cyano group by a CH unit resulted in a loss of activity. This applies to compound **6** – the direct carbon analogue of **1** – as well as to the carba-desmethyl analogue **7**, demonstrating the importance of the azadipeptide nitrile scaffold for the antimalarial properties of these dipeptide derivatives. For all compounds tested, there was no difference in IC₅₀ values for the chloroquine sensitive versus the chloroquine resistant *P. falciparum* lines.

We next examined the ability of the azadipeptide nitriles to inhibit the papain-like proteases of *P. falciparum* using recombinant falcipain-2 and -3.²⁵ For falcipain-2 the best inhibitor was

2, bearing a Leu side chain in the P² position and exhibiting an IC₅₀ value of 59 nM. In contrast, the corresponding Phe-derived analogue **1** inhibited the same enzyme with ~10-fold less activity (IC₅₀ 570 nM). Replacing the methyl substituent in the P¹ position of that derivative by benzyl (compound **3**) nearly doubled the IC₅₀ value. Extension of the benzyl residue to phenylethyl as well as its replacement by a pentyl moiety increased the affinity to falcipain-2 (compounds **4** and **5** versus compound **3**). Compared to the parent compound **1**, the carbon analogues **6** and **7** were considerably less potent. Similar to falcipain-2, falcipain-3 was better inhibited by the Leu-derived compound **2** than by the Phe derivative **1**. The inhibition of this enzyme by **1** was poor with an IC₅₀ of only 18 µM. Interestingly, the affinity of **1** could be sequentially increased by extending its P¹ methyl group over benzyl and phenylethyl to pentyl, with the latter compound **5** exhibiting an IC₅₀ of 110 nM against falcipain-3. Such a trend could not be observed for the related enzyme papain. When comparing compounds **1** and **6** at falcipain-3, it becomes obvious that the potency of the azadipeptide nitrile **1** is similar to that of its carba-desmethyl analogue **6**. This did not apply to falcipain-2 and papain or to thiol-dependent human cathepsins¹⁹ and may indicate a stronger hydrogen bond interaction of falcipain-3 to the P²-P¹ amide bond. However, the direct carbon analogue of **1**, *i.e.* compound **7**, was an even weaker inhibitor of falcipain-3. The substrate specificity of the two *P. falciparum* cysteine proteases has been extensively studied with regard to the non-primed binding sites.^{26–29} For small substrates, a pronounced specificity for Leu in the P² position could be confirmed for both enzymes, while more promiscuity was observed for the processing of bigger substrates and haemoglobin.²⁹ Concerning the S² preference, the results obtained with falcipain-2 and -3 are in accordance with their known substrate specificity, as the Leu derivative **2** shows considerably stronger inhibition than **1**, bearing a Phe side chain in P². As for other papain-like proteases, the P¹ specificity is less strict. For falcipain-2 and -3, Arg and Lys and Arg and Gln were best accepted, respectively,²⁹ suggesting the S¹ pocket of the enzyme to be deep but rather shallow. This might be reflected by the observation that compound **5** with a pentyl moiety in P¹ is fairly potent against both enzymes. However, it remains unclear whether the S¹ pocket can be addressed by the azadipeptide nitriles, as their backbone geometry is slightly different compared to their carbon analogues.

The finding that the growth of *P. falciparum* was more potently inhibited by the azadipeptide nitriles (**1–5**) than by the carbon analogues **6** and **7** is similar to the inhibition observed for the isolated cysteine proteases. This suggests a correlation of the enzyme inhibitory and the anti-malarial activity in this series of compounds. However, there are differences in the structure-activity relationships when considering the isolated enzymes, particularly falcipain-2, and the parasite. On the one hand, compounds **4** and **5**, which inhibited the parasites' growth with IC₅₀ values equal to or less than 5 µM, also showed a pronounced enzyme inhibitory activity (IC₅₀ < 500 nM). On the other hand, with the Leu derivative **2**, exhibiting an IC₅₀ value of 59 nM against falcipain-2, a weaker growth inhibition (IC₅₀ ~17 µM) was achieved. Thus, the physicochemical properties of the inhibitors may influence the anti-malarial properties. Calculation of the logD values (using the programme Marvin 3.0, Chemaxon; Table 1) indicated the azadipeptide nitriles to be slightly less lipophilic than their carbon-based counterparts (**1** and **2** vs **6** and **7**). Furthermore, extension of the residue in P¹ led to a significant increase in the lipophilicity as the compounds **3–5** exhibit logD values greater than 4. Generally, the lipophilicity of an antimalarial agent is important, as three different membranes need to be passed before the compounds can enter the parasite.³⁰

The effects of the compounds on the recombinant enzymes exceeded those on the parasites' growth by one order of magnitude. This might reflect the redundancy of enzymes involved in haemoglobin degradation in the malaria parasite. As already mentioned, besides the falcipain-2 and -3, four different pepsin-like aspartic proteases, the plasmepsins, participate in the protein digestion inside the food vacuole.^{31, 32} Such a difference in the activities towards the single enzymes and the parasite in the intraerythrocytic stage was also observed with cysteine protease

inhibitors of other chemotypes^{33, 34} as well as with diamine-based plasmepsin inhibitors.³⁵ The synergistic action of a combination of cysteine and aspartic protease inhibitors on the inhibition of parasites' growth has been shown.³⁶

In summary, these data indicate that azadipeptide nitriles are a new class of antimalarial compounds with *in vitro* whole cell activity of the compounds correlating with the inhibitory activity against the trophozoite cysteine proteases. These results provide a good starting point for further work towards the development of this class of compounds for antimalarial use. This should be achievable by introducing a greater structural variety into the P¹ position of the azadipeptide nitriles, which is quite feasible from a synthetic point of view.

Acknowledgments

We thank Prof. David P. Fairlie, Brisbane, Australia, for helpful discussions. RL is grateful to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for a postdoctoral scholarship (LO1165/2-1). This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health, USA, and the NRW International Graduate Research School Biotech-Pharma, Germany. PJR is a Doris Duke Charitable Foundation Distinguished Clinical Scientist.

References and notes

1. WHO. World Malaria Report. 2008
2. Hyde JE. FEBS J 2007;274:4688. [PubMed: 17824955]
3. WHO. Report of the World Health Organization: Guidelines for the treatment of malaria. 2006
4. Wongsrichanalai C, Meshnick SR. Emerg Infect Dis 2008;14:716. [PubMed: 18439351]
5. Dondorp AM, Nosten F, Yi P, Das D, Phyto AP, Tarning J, Lwin KM, Arie F, Hanpithakpong W, Lee SJ, Ringwald P, Silamut K, Imwong M, Chotivanich K, Lim P, Herdman T, An SS, Yeung S, Singhasivanon P, Day NP, Lindegardh N, Socheat D, White NJ. N Engl J Med 2009;361:455. [PubMed: 19641202]
6. Garcia Linares GE, Rodriguez JB. Curr Med Chem 2007;14:289. [PubMed: 17305534]
7. Goldberg DE. Sem Cell Biol 1993;4:355.
8. Rosenthal PJ. Int J Parasitol 2004;34:1489. [PubMed: 15582526]
9. Ersmark K, Samuelson B, Hallberg A. Med Res Rev 2006;26:626. [PubMed: 16838300]
10. Rosenthal PJ, Sijwali PS, Singh A, Shenai BR. Curr Pharm Des 2002;8:1659. [PubMed: 12132997]
11. Lecaille F, Kaleta J, Brömme D. Chem Rev 2002;102:4459. [PubMed: 12475197]
12. Vicik R, Busemann M, Baumann K, Schirmeister T. Curr Top Med Chem 2006;6:331. [PubMed: 16611146]
13. Brömme D, Klaus JL, Okamoto K, Rasnick D, Palmer JT. Biochem J 1996;315:85. [PubMed: 8670136]
14. Olson JE, Garson KL, Semenov A, Rosenthal PJ. Bioorg Med Chem 1999;7:633. [PubMed: 10353642]
15. Verdoes M, Florea BI, van der Marel GA, Overkleeft HS. Eur J Org Chem 2009:3301.
16. Moon JB, Coleman RS, Hanzlik RP. J Am Chem Soc 1986;108:1350.
17. Ward YD, Thomson DS, Frye LL, Cywin CL, Morwick T, Emmanuel MJ, Zindell R, McNeil D, Bekkali Y, Girardot M, Hrapchak M, DeTuri M, Crane K, White D, Pav S, Wang Y, Hao MH, Grygon CA, Labadia ME, Freeman DM, Davidson W, Hopkins JL, Brown ML, Spero DM. J Med Chem 2002;45:5471. [PubMed: 12459015]
18. Löser R, Schilling K, Dimmig E, Gütschow M. J Med Chem 2005;48:7688. [PubMed: 16302809]
19. Löser R, Frizler M, Schilling K, Gütschow M. Angew Chem Int Ed 2008;47:4331.
20. Wellems T, Oduola A, Fenton B, Desjardins R, Panton L, do Rosario V. Rev Brasil Genet 1988;11:813.
21. Walliker D, Quakyi IA, Wellems TE, McCutchan TF, Szarfman A, London WT, Corcoran LM, Burkot TR, Carter R. Science 1987;236:1661. [PubMed: 3299700]

22. Andrews KT, Tran TN, Lucke AJ, Kahnberg P, Le GT, Boyle GM, Gardiner DL, Skinner-Adams TS, Fairlie DP. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2008;52:1454. [PubMed: 18212103]
23. Huber W, Koella JC. *Acta Trop* 1993;55:257. [PubMed: 8147282]
24. Briefly, compounds were incubated in triplicate wells of 96 well culture dishes with synchronous ring-stage infected erythrocytes (0.25% parasitemia and 2.5% hematocrit) at different concentrations for 48 hours before adding 0.5 μ Ci [3 H]hypoxanthine and then incubating for a further 24 hours. Following harvesting onto 1450 MicroBeta filter mats (Wallac) and determining 3 H incorporation using a 1450 MicroBeta liquid scintillation counter, the percentage inhibition was calculated compared to matched controls that received DMSO vehicle alone (0.05%). The 50% inhibitory concentration values (IC_{50}) were determined using linear interpolation of inhibition curves.²³
25. Both enzymes were assayed at 25 °C using Z-Leu-Arg-AMC as substrate at a concentration of 25 μ M in 100 mM sodium acetate pH 6.0, 5 mM DTT, 0.75 % DMSO. 1 μ L of the compound dissolved in DMSO was diluted into 100 μ L of assay buffer. 50 μ L of the enzyme in assay buffer were added and the resulting mixture was incubated for 10 min. The reaction was initiated by addition of 50 μ L of assay buffer containing the substrate and read immediately in a Fluoroskan Ascent microplate spectrofluorometer. Every compound was assayed at eight different concentrations, with 50 μ M being the highest inhibitor concentration; all other concentrations were created by exponential 5fold dilution. The IC_{50} values were determined by plotting the percentage of inhibition relative to the control reaction in the absence of inhibitor over the logarithmic compound concentration by using the equation $v/v_0 = 1/(1 + 10^{\log[I]/IC_{50}})$. Data analysis was done with the programme GraphPad Prism 4 (GraphPad Software).
26. Shenai BR, Sijwali PR, Singh A, Rosenthal PJ. *J Biol Chem* 2000;275:29000. [PubMed: 10887194]
27. Sijwali PS, Shenai BR, Gut J, Singh A, Rosenthal PJ. *Biochem J* 2001;360:481. [PubMed: 11716777]
28. Ramjee MK, Flinn NS, Pemberton TP, Quibell M, Wang Y, Watts JP. *Biochem J* 2006;399:47. [PubMed: 16776649]
29. Subramanian S, Hardt M, Choe Y, Niles RK, Johansen EB, Legac J, Gut J, Kerr ID, Craik CS, Rosenthal PJ. *PLoS ONE* 2009;4:e5156. [PubMed: 19357776]
30. Charpian S, Przyborski JM. *Traffic* 2008;9:157. [PubMed: 17944805]
31. Banerjee R, Liu J, Beatty W, Pelosof L, Klemba M, Goldberg DE. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2002;99:990. [PubMed: 11782538]
32. Liu J, Istvan ES, Gluzman IY, Gross J, Goldberg DE. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2006;103:8840. [PubMed: 16731623]
33. Rosenthal PJ, Olson JE, Lee GK, Palmer JT, Klaus JL, Rasnick D. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1996;40:1600. [PubMed: 8807047]
34. Shenai BR, Belinda JL, Alvarez-Hernandez A, Chong PY, Emal CD, Neitz J, Roush WR, Rosenthal PJ. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2003;47:154. [PubMed: 12499184]
35. Hof F, Schütz A, Fäh C, Meyer S, Bur D, Liu J, Goldberg DE, Diederich F. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2006;45:2138.
36. Semenov A, Olson JE, Rosenthal PJ. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1998;42:2254. [PubMed: 9736544]

Table 1

Inhibitory effects of dipeptide nitriles **1–7** against *P. falciparum* infected erythrocytes and recombinant *P. falciparum* falcipain enzymes.

structure	<i>P. falciparum</i> IC ₅₀ (μ M)			rPf cysteine proteases IC ₅₀ (nM)		Papain ^a K _i (nM)	ClogD (pH 7.4)
	Dd2	3D7	falcipain-2	falcipain-3			
	15 $\pm$ 7	9.8 $\pm$ 6.5	570 $\pm$ 70	18000 $\pm$ 9000		3.9	2.84

structure	<i>P. falciparum</i> IC ₅₀ (μM)			<i>rPf</i> cysteine proteases IC ₅₀ (nM)		Papain ^d K _i (nM)	ClogD (pH 7.4)
	Dd2	3D7	falcipain-2	falcipain-3
18 ± 6	16 ± 3	59 ± 1	1900 ± 100	8.2	2.35
7.5 ± 1.6	7.1 ± 1.6	1000 ± 100	1600 ± 100	42	4.62	

structure	<i>P. falciparum</i> IC ₅₀ (μ M)			rPf cysteine proteases IC ₅₀ (nM)		Papain ^d K _i (nM)	ClogD (pH 7.4)
	Dd2	3D7		falcipain-2	falcipain-3		

3.6 $\pm$ 2.2 5.3 $\pm$ 2.8 430 $\pm$ 20 300 $\pm$ 30 6.3 4.87

structure	<i>P. falciparum</i> IC ₅₀ (μ M)		<i>rPj</i> cysteine proteases IC ₅₀ (nM)		Papain ^d K _i (nM)	ClogD (pH 7.4)
	Dd2	3D7	falcipain-2	falcipain-3		

2.1 $\pm$ 1.3 2.9 $\pm$ 1.0 310 $\pm$ 10 110 $\pm$ 10 10 4.45

> 25 > 25 28000 $\pm$ 4000 16000 $\pm$ 2000 2200 3.18

m reference¹⁹