Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem. 2010 February 15; 18(4): 1449–1455. doi:10.1016/j.bmc.2010.01.017.

Synthesis and Carbohydrate Binding Studies of Fluorescent α -Amidoboronic Acids and the Corresponding Bisboronic Acids

Shan Jin, Chunyuan Zhu, Yunfeng Cheng, Minyong Li, and Binghe* Wang

Departments of Chemistry and Center for Biotechnology and Drug Design, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia 30302-4098, USA

Abstract

Fluorescent boronic acids are very useful for the design and synthesis of carbohydrate sensors. In an earlier communication, we first described the effort of developing water soluble fluorescent α -amidoboronic acids, which change fluorescence upon sugar binding. In this report, we describe a general method of functionalizing such boronic acids and their applications in the preparation of bis- α -amidoboronic acids with significantly enhanced binding for oligosaccharides as compared to their monoboronic acid counterparts. The advantages of good water solubility, easy modification to generate diversity, and modularity in synthesis will make α -amidoboronic acids very useful building blocks for future synthesis of boronic acid-based fluorescent sensors.

1. Introduction

It is well-known that boronic acids are able to bind with compounds containing diols, hydroxyls, and other nucleophiles.^{1–5} Such properties have been widely explored for the design and synthesis of boronic acid-based sensors for hydroxyl group-containing compounds^{4–17} and aptamers for glycoprotein recognition.^{18, 19} Recently, the Schultz lab has developed a way to express boronic acid-modified proteins for carbohydrate recognition.²⁰ We have coined a term, boronolactin, to refer to all these boronic acid-based lectin mimics.³ Most previous efforts in the boronic acid-based sensing area have been focused on arylboronic acids for stability and availability reasons (arylboronic acids are widely available because of their applications in important synthetic reactions such as the Suzuki coupling reaction).^{21, 22} However, arylboronic acids generally lack water solubility and are hard to further functionalize. Their stability is also often a problem.^{23–25} α -Amidoboronic acids^{26, 27} form an important class of boronic acids with proven stability *in vivo*,^{25, 28} high water solubility, and known affinity for diols and hydroxyl groups. In our previous studies, α -amidoboronic acids (**D-1** and **L-1**; Figure 1) with an appropriate fluorophore appended were shown to change fluorescent properties upon sugar binding and were water soluble.²⁹ In addition, amidoboronic acids can be easily functionalized at the acyl position thus allowing for preparation of bis- or multi-boronic acids using readily established chemistry. Specifically, these boronic acids can be easily functionalized for click coupling under very mild conditions.^{30–32} Herein we describe the synthesis and evaluation of an enantiomeric pair of such bisboronic acids. The work is to demonstrate the feasibility of the chemistry and the unique (and unexpected) binding properties of the bisboronic acid products.

2. Results and Discussions

For the synthesis of the bisboronic acids **2**, we were interested in using a click reaction for tethering two boronic acid units. Therefore, we were in need of one boronic acid functionalized with an azido group and another with an alkynyl group. As shown in Scheme 1, the synthesis of the α -amidoboronic acids **1** and its corresponding bisboronic acids **2** started with 1-(chloromethyl) naphthalene **3**. The stereochemistry for the subsequent steps was controlled by using different isomers of pinanediol as the protecting group.^{33–36} Compound **5** was obtained by following literature procedures.³³ Reaction of **D-5** with lithium hexamethyldisilazane following literature procedures gave, presumably, intermediate **D-6**, which was directly acylated without purification by treating with an appropriate acid anhydride to give (–)-pinanediol amido boronate **D-7b** and **D-7c**. At this step, the introduction of different functional groups such as an azido or alkynyl group is very easy. The acid anhydrides were prepared from the corresponding carboxylic acids by treating with *N*-dicyclohexylcarbodiimide (DCC) and 4-dimethylamino pyridine (DMAP) at room temperature for 6 h.

The bisboronate **D-8** was prepared by reacting alkynylboronic acid **D-7b** and azidoboronic acids **D-7c** in the presence of Cu(I). At last, the deprotection of the pinanediol group with boron trichloride gave the final bisboronic acid **D-2**. The same synthetic route using (+)-pinanediol as the protecting group yielded **L-2**. Both isomers were characterized by NMR and MS. The enantiomeric purity was established by determining the optical rotation of each isomer and chiral HPLC.

In our previous studies, monomers of the naphthalene-based amidoboronic acid showed good water solubility in the concentration range of 1×10^{-4} to 1×10^{-6} M.²⁹ Hereby we also examined the water solubility of the synthesized bisboronic acids using UV before any binding studies. The UV absorbance of both enantiomers showed good linearity in the concentration range of 1×10^{-4} to 1×10^{-6} M. The concentration of amidoboronic acids we used for binding studies was 5×10^{-6} M, well within the range of solubility. Addition of monosaccharides to bisboronic acids induced similar fluorescent intensity changes as the monomers (**1**) in aqueous phosphate buffer. In our previous studies of monoboronic acid **D-1**, the fluorescent intensity decreased by 80%, 34%, and 33% upon binding with D-fructose, D-glucose and D-sorbitol with apparent binding constants being 46 M^{-1} , 1.5 M^{-1} and 102 M^{-1} respectively (Table 1).²⁹ In this study, for bisboronic acid **D-2**, the fluorescent intensity decreased by a maximum of 50% upon binding with D-fructose (0.5 mM to 20 mM), and the binding constant was 372 M^{-1} , which was 7-fold higher than that of the monomer **D-1** (Figure 2 and Table 1). This increase in binding constants from monoboronic acids to bisboronic acids was observed for all the carbohydrates we studied (Table 1). For example, the binding constants between the bisboronic acid and glucose, mannose, galactose, and sorbitol were all at least 8-fold higher than that of the monoamidoboronic acids. It needs to be noted that the order of the binding constants of α -amidoboronic acids **1** and bisboronic acids **2** with different monosaccharides was the same as that of arylboronic acids (Table 1).^{4–6, 37} The observed increase in binding of bisboronic acids for monosaccharides is intriguing. In order to see whether the spatial arrangements of the boronic acids would accommodate bidentate binding with fructose and other monosaccharides, the conformational features of the two bisboronic acids were examined using computational chemistry. Specifically, the structures of bisboronic acids were optimized by DFT method B3LYP and the 6-31+G(d,p) base set along with the PCM solvation model implemented in the Gaussian 03 program, as described in our previous studies.^{16, 17} Modelling results are depicted in Figure 3. The distance between the boronic acid pair for both the bisboronic acids is about $\sim 10 \text{ \AA}$, which is possible for bidentate binding with any of the monosaccharides. However, we did not conduct further computational work because of a lack of experimental evidence as to the binding positions. It should be noted that there is no

experimental evidence to prove bidentate binding. Therefore, both mono- and bidentate binding modes are distinct possibilities.

Another very interesting property of the bisboronic acids is their ability to bind disaccharides maltose and lactose with K_a in the range of 35–45 M^{-1} . There have been some other boronic acid-based receptors that show strong binding to either maltose or lactose.^{38, 39} To the best of our knowledge, these bisboronic acids represent the first examples of significant binding to both of these two disaccharides by any bisboronic acid-based fluorescent sensors.

With the improved affinity for mono- and di-saccharides in mind, we were also interested in studying the binding of these two bisboronic acids with oligosaccharides. Therefore, the binding affinity of the synthesized bisboronic acids with several tetrasaccharides (sodium salt of neocarratetraose-41-*O*-sulphate (**T1**), *N*, *N'*, *N''*, *N'''* tetraacetyl chitotetraose (**T2**), and lacto-*N*-tetraose (**T3**), Figure 4) was also determined. As shown in the Table 2, the apparent association constants (K_a) of **L-2** with **T1**, **T2**, and **T3** were 2422, 12611, and 18107 M^{-1} respectively. **D-2** has slightly different binding constants with the three tetrasaccharides from that of **L-2**, showing some very small stereo-discrimination. As a control, we also studied the binding of these three tetrasaccharides with the mono- α -amidoboronic acids (**D-1** and **L-1**). Interestingly, no fluorescent property change was observed of the monoboronic acids (**D-1** and **L-1**) with the addition of 5 mM of these 3 tetrasaccharides. Such results mean that the binding constants between the monoamidoboronic acids and the tetrasaccharides were far less than 200 M^{-1} and much smaller than the corresponding binding constants with the bisboronic acids (Table 2). The significantly enhanced binding affinities of the bisboronic acids for the tetrasaccharides, compared with the monoboronic acids (Table 1), suggest that single-pair functional interactions were not enough for tight binding of the bisboronic acids with these tetrasaccharides. When compared against the binding with mono- and di-saccharides, the binding constants of these bisboronic acids with the three tetrasaccharides were also much higher. This is especially true when comparing with the binding to disaccharides. However, at this time we have no structural information, which explains why these bisboronic acids showed improved binding for the three tetrasaccharides studied. It should be noted that the ability for a bisboronic acid to bind to an oligosaccharide containing only pyranose sugars is very significant since most biologically important glycans on cell surface are composed of pyranose sugars.¹⁵

It is interesting to note that no noticeable difference was observed between the D and L isomers in their binding with carbohydrates and in their spectral changes even for the bisboronic acids' binding with tetrasaccharides.²⁹ The binding constants for the L- and D-enantiomers with D-sugars were very similar (Table 1). For example, the apparent association constants (K_a) of **L-2** with D-sorbitol, D-maltose, and lacto-*N*-tetraose (**T3**) were 819, 20, and 18107 M^{-1} respectively. On the other hand, the apparent association constants (K_a) of **D-2** with D-sorbitol, D-maltose, and lacto-*N*-tetraose (**T3**) were 754, 29, and 19148 M^{-1} respectively. Such results were surprising to us because the boronic acids have at least one chiral center and are enantiomerically pure. One would have expected to see some discrimination between enantiomers (**L-1** vs. **D-1** and **L-2** vs. **D-2**) in binding with a chiral molecule (sugar) since the end complexes are diastereomers in both cases. The similarity in binding constants between enantiomers suggests that the only functional group that was involved in binding was the boronic acid moiety and both the amido group and the naphthalene group were not involved in a substantial way in binding. Therefore, in order to take advantage of the chiral nature of amidoboronic acid for enantiomeric discrimination, as well as to achieve better selectivity for specific carbohydrates, additional interaction points and rigid linkers are needed.

Among the three tetrasaccharides, the binding affinity of **T1** is substantially smaller than that of **T2** and **T3**. In search for possible reasons for this difference, one can examine several factors:

(1) presence of diol groups that bind to the boronic acid unit, (2) the number of such diol groups, and (3) the relative distance and orientation of these diol groups. If one examines diol “sites” on each carbohydrate that could engage in cyclic boronate formation, one could only find 4,6-diols that are known to form such complexes.^{5, 40, 41} **T1** and **T2** have one such “site” each, and **T3** has three. Because **T2** and **T3** have similar binding constants with **D-2** and **L-2**, the sheer number of such binding “sites” is obviously not the reason contributing to the different affinities. As described earlier, these three tetrasaccharides do not induce fluorescent property changes in the monoboronic acids (**L-1** and **D-1**). This means that mono-functional group interactions would not be enough for the observed binding between the bisboronic acids with the tetrasaccharides. Since **T1** and **T2** only have one diol pair each, the second interaction point is most likely a single hydroxyl group, which is known to be an important contributing factor for tight interactions with a boronic acid,⁵ while for **T3**, binding could involve two pairs of diols. However, a detailed understanding of why **D-2** and **L-2** would bind **T2** and **T3** more tightly than **T1** has not been achieved. We have attempted computational chemistry work to answer this question. However, since the binding sites are not known, there are too many possible permutations to allow for high-level calculations in order to achieve reliable answers.

3. Conclusions

We have demonstrated the synthesis and binding evaluation of the first pair of bisamidoboronic acids. First, these α -amidoboronic acids showed good water-solubility and significant fluorescent intensity changes upon binding with different carbohydrates. Second, the bisboronic acids showed greater binding affinities for monosaccharides such as glucose, fructose, and sorbitol than monoamidoboronic acids. Third, these two bisboronic acids represent the first examples of bisboronic acid fluorescent sensors that show significant binding to both maltose and lactose. Their ability to bind saccharides containing only pyranose sugars is very significant. Fourth, in binding with 3 tetrasaccharides, the bisboronic acids have much higher affinity than the corresponding monoboronic acids (almost no binding), indicating (but not proving) bidentate binding. Fifth, the ability for the bisboronic acids to bind to **T2** implies that the postulated bidentate binding may involve interactions between a boronic acid and a single hydroxyl group. Sixth, one unexpected finding of the study is the lack of stereochemical discrimination in these chiral amidoboronic acids. One reason could be that the side-chain functional groups were not engage in binding at all and the other reason could be that no bidentate binding was involved. Though we have demonstrated the promising potential of bisamidoboronic acids, it is clear that much more needs to be done to fully take advantage of the utility of amidoboronic acids for sensor design and synthesis.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Financial support from the Molecular Basis of Disease program at Georgia State University, Georgia Cancer Coalition, Georgia Research Alliance, and the National Institutes of Health (CA123329, CA113917, GM084933, and GM084933) is gratefully acknowledged.

References and notes

1. Sugihara JM, Bowman CM. *J Am Chem Soc* 1958;80:2443.
2. Lorand JP, Edwards JO. *J Org Chem* 1959;24:769.
3. Yan J, Fang H, Wang B. *Med Res Rev* 2005;25:490. [PubMed: 16025498]
4. James TD, Shinkai S. *Top Curr Chem* 2002;218:159.

5. Jin S, Cheng YF, Reid S, Li M, Wang B. *Med Res Rev*. 2009 in press. 10.1002/med.20155
6. Hall, DG. *Boronic Acids*. Wiley-VCH; 2004.
7. Jiang S, Rusin O, Escobedo JO, Kim KK, Yang Y, Fakode S, Warner IM, Strongin RM. *J Am Chem Soc* 2006;128:12221. [PubMed: 16967973]
8. Cao HS, Heagy MD. *J Fluorescence* 2004;14:569.
9. Berube M, Dowlut M, Hall DG. *J Org Chem* 2008;73:6471. [PubMed: 18549270]
10. Duggan PJ, Offermann DA. *Aust J Chem* 2007;60:829.
11. Zhang T, Anslyn EV. *Org Lett* 2006;8:1649. [PubMed: 16597132]
12. Houston TA, Levonis SM, Kiefel MJ. *Aust J Chem* 2007;60:811.
13. James, TD. *Creative Chemical Sensor Systems*. Vol. 277. 2007. p. 107
14. Zou Y, Broughton DL, Bicker KL, Thompson PR, Lavigne JJ. *ChemBioChem* 2007;8:2048. [PubMed: 17924602]
15. Sorensen MD, Martins R, Hindsgaul O. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2007;46:2403.
16. Jin S, Li M, Zhu C, Tran V, Wang B. *ChemBioChem* 2008;9:1431. [PubMed: 18494023]
17. Jin S, Wang J, Li M, Wang B. *Chem Eur J* 2008;14:2795.
18. Lin N, Yan J, Huang Z, Altier C, Yan J, Carrasco N, Suyemoto M, Johnson L, Fang H, Wang Q, Wang S, Wang B. *Nucl Acid Res*. 2007;10.1093/nar/gkl1091
19. Manimala JC, Wiskur SL, Ellington AD, Anslyn EV. *J Am Chem Soc* 2004;126:16515. [PubMed: 15600355]
20. Brustad E, Bushey ML, Lee JW, Groff D, Liu W, Schultz PG. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2008;47:8220.
21. Miyaura N, Suzuki A. *Chem Rev* 1995;95:2457.
22. Molander GA, Jean-Gerard L. *J Org Chem* 2009;74:1297. [PubMed: 19133770]
23. Larock RC, Gupta SK, Brown HC. *J Am Chem Soc* 1972;94:4371.
24. Fischer FC, Havings E. *Recl Trav Chim Pays-Bas* 1974;93:21.
25. Wu S, Waugh W, Stella VJ. *J Pharm Sci* 2000;89:758. [PubMed: 10824134]
26. Matteson DS. *Med Res Rev* 2008;28:233. [PubMed: 17849483]
27. Lai JH, Liu Y, Wu W, Zhou Y, Maw HH, Bachovchin WW, Bhat KL, Bock CW. *J Org Chem* 2006;71:512. [PubMed: 16408958]
28. Bross PF, Kane R, Farrell AT, Abraham S, Benson K, Brower ME, Bradley S, Gobburu JV, Goheer A, Lee SL, Leighton J, Liang CY, Lostritto RT, McGuinn WD, Morse DE, Rahman A, Rosario LA, Verbois SL, Williams G, Wang YC, Pazdur R. *Clin Cancer Res* 2004;10:3954. [PubMed: 15217925]
29. Jin S, Zhu C, Li M, Wang B. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 2009;19:1596. [PubMed: 19243941]
30. Kolb HC, Finn MG, Sharpless KB. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2001;40:2004.
31. Huisgen R. *Angew Chem Int Edit* 1963;2:565.
32. Tornøe CW, Christensen C, Meldal M. *J Org Chem* 2002;67:3057. [PubMed: 11975567]
33. Martichonok V, Jones JB. *J Am Chem Soc* 1996;118:950.
34. Matteson DS, Beedle EC. *Tetrahedron Lett* 1987;28:4499.
35. Matteson DS, Michnick TJ, Willett RD, Patterson CD. *Organometallics* 1989;8:726.
36. Matteson DS, Sadhu KM, Peterson ML. *J Am Chem Soc* 1986;108:810.
37. Springsteen G, Wang B. *Tetrahedron* 2002;58:5291.
38. Phillips MD, James TD. *J Fluoresc* 2004;14:549. [PubMed: 15617262]
39. Xue C, Cai F, Liu H. *Chem Eur J* 2008;14:1648.
40. Dowlut M, Hall DG. *J Am Chem Soc* 2006;128:4226. [PubMed: 16568987]
41. Norrild JC, Eggert H. *J Am Chem Soc* 1995;117:1479.

Figure 1.
Enantiomeric pairs of α -amidoboronic acids **1** and the corresponding bisboronic acids **2**.

Figure 2.

(A) Fluorescent spectral changes of boronic acid **D-2** (5×10^{-6} M) upon addition of D-fructose (0.5 mM to 20 mM) in phosphate buffer (0.1 M) at pH 7.4: $\lambda_{\text{ex}} = 280$ nm, $\lambda_{\text{em}} = 334$ nm; (B) fluorescent spectral changes of **D-2** (5×10^{-6} M) upon addition of D-maltose (7 mM to 100 mM) in phosphate buffer (0.1 M) at pH 7.4: $\lambda_{\text{ex}} = 280$ nm, $\lambda_{\text{em}} = 334$ nm; (C) fluorescent spectral changes of **D-2** (5×10^{-6} M) upon addition of Neocarratetraose-41-*O*-sulphate (Na^+) (**T1**) (0.02 mM to 0.25 mM) in phosphate buffer (0.1 M) at pH 7.4: $\lambda_{\text{ex}} = 280$ nm, $\lambda_{\text{em}} = 334$ nm; (D) binding curve of **D-2** upon addition of D-fructose; (E) binding curve of **D-2** upon addition of D-maltose; (F) binding curve of **D-2** upon addition of **T1**;

Figure 3.
The DFT optimized structures for **L-2**. Hydrogen atoms are not shown for clear depiction. The distances between the boronic acid pairs are labelled as angstrom (Å)

Figure 4.

Structures of the saccharides that were used for binding studies with α -amidoboronic acids **1** and the corresponding bisboronic acids **2**.

Scheme 1.
 Synthesis route of **D-1** and **D-2**

Table 1

Apparent association constants (K_a) of amidoboronic acids with different sugars

K_a (M^{-1})	D-fructose	D-glucose	D-sorbitol	D-galactose	D-mannose	D-mannitol	D-maltose	α -D-lactose	β -D-lactose
L-1	46 ± 2^a	2 ± 0^a	102 ± 1^a	4 ± 0	4 ± 0	65 ± 11	1 ± 0	1 ± 0	1 ± 0
D-1	55 ± 8^a	2 ± 0^a	100 ± 6^a	3 ± 0	4 ± 0	55 ± 6	1 ± 0	1 ± 0	1 ± 0
L-2	497 ± 49	25 ± 7	819 ± 57	86 ± 12	52 ± 5	254 ± 26	20 ± 4	36 ± 7	25 ± 3
D-2	372 ± 57	13 ± 3	754 ± 87	48 ± 7	39 ± 5	286 ± 68	29 ± 12	46 ± 3	35 ± 3

Binding studies were conducted in phosphate buffer (0.1 M) at pH 7.4 ([boronic acid] = 5×10^{-6} M).

^a data are from reference [30].

Table 2

Apparent association constants (K_a) of bisboronic acids **D-2** and **L-2** with three tetrasaccharides

K_a (M^{-1})	T1: Neocarratetraose-41-<i>O</i>-sulphate (Na^+)	T2: <i>N, N', N'', N'''</i> Tetra-acetyl chitotetraose	T3: Lacto-<i>N</i>-tetraose
D-2	2422 $\pm$ 292	12611 $\pm$ 2160	18107 $\pm$ 1260
L-2	3154 $\pm$ 282	12568 $\pm$ 1150	19148 $\pm$ 2747

Binding studies were conducted in phosphate buffer (0.1 M) at pH 7.4 ([boronic acid] = 5×10^{-6} M)