Synthesis and Use of Sulfonamide-, Sulfoxide-, or Sulfone-containing Aminoglycoside-CoA Bisubstrates as Mechanistic Probes for Aminoglycoside *N*-6'-Acetyltransferase§

Feng Gao^{a,‡}, Xuxu Yan[‡], Omar Zahr, Aaron Larsen, Kenward Vong, and Karine Auclair^{*}

Department of Chemistry, McGill University, 801 Sherbrooke Street West, Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3A 2K6

Abstract

Aminoglycoside-coenzyme A conjugates are challenging synthetic targets because of the wealth of functional groups and high polarity of the starting materials. We previously reported a one-pot synthesis of amide-linked aminoglycoside-CoA bisubstrates. These molecules are nanomolar inhibitors of aminoglycoside *N*-6'-acetyltransferase II (AAC(6')-II), an important enzyme involved in bacterial resistance to aminoglycoside antibiotics. We report here the synthesis and biological activity of five new aminoglycoside-CoA bisubstrates containing sulfonamide, sulfoxide, or sulfone groups. Interestingly, the sulfonamide-linked bisubstrate, which was expected to best mimic the tetrahedral intermediate, does not show improved inhibition when compared with amide-linked bisubstrates. On the other hand, most of the sulfone- and sulfoxide-containing bisubstrates prepared are nanomolar inhibitors of AAC(6')-II.

Keywords

antibiotic; inhibition; neamine; resistance

Aminoglycosides are broad spectrum antimicrobials. Unfortunately, widespread resistance to aminoglycosides threatens the use of this important class of antibiotics, alone or in synergistic combination with β -lactams. Resistance to aminoglycosides occurs mostly via drug modifications by enzymes such as aminoglycoside *N*-6'-acetyltransferases (AAC(6')s).– Wright and coworkers have shown that catalysis by AAC(6')-II proceeds via an ordered bi-bi mechanism in which acetyl coenzyme A (AcCoA) binds before the aminoglycoside. Attack of the aminoglycoside 6'-NH₂ at the thioester of AcCoA is believed to generate a tetrahedral intermediate, which subsequently collapses to yield a 6'-*N*-acetylaminoglycoside and CoA (Fig. 1).– Extensive mutagenic studies, and examination of the crystal structures of AAC(6')-II, have not allowed the identification of residues that may stabilize the tetrahedral intermediate.

§Detailed descriptions of experimental procedures and characterization of all compounds are available as Supporting Information.

^{*}Corresponding author: karine.auclair@mcgill.ca; Phone: 514-398-2822; Fax: 514-398-3797.

^aCurrently at Albany Molecular Research Inc., 26 Corporate Circle, P.O. Box 15098, Albany, New York 12212

[‡]These two authors contributed equally

We recently reported the use of amide-linked aminoglycoside-CoA bisubstrate inhibitors as mechanistic and structural probes of AAC(6')s. An effective regio- and chemo-selective protocol for the direct *N*-6'-derivatization of unprotected aminoglycosides was used to synthesize these inhibitors in one-pot (Fig. 1, 1a-b). These molecules exhibited nanomolar inhibition towards AAC(6')-Ii and allowed crystallization of AAC(6')-Ii in complex with an aminoglycoside derivative for the first time.

To improve inhibition and to investigate whether AAC(6')-Ii stabilizes the tetrahedral intermediate, we envisaged to prepare a second generation of bisubstrates containing either a sulfonamide, sulfoxide or sulfone, expected to better mimic the tetrahedral intermediate (Fig. 1, 2a-b, 3a-b and 4a-b). We hypothesized that if stabilization of this intermediate is important, a better mimetic would lead to increased affinity for the enzyme. Oxidized sulfides were selected for their ease of preparation, the higher polarizability of the S=O bond compared to a carbonyl, and the tetrahedral geometry at the sulfur atom. Sulfonamides have previously been used to mimic the tetrahedral intermediates involved in enzymatic catalysis by proteases arginase, dihydroorotase, and isoleucyl tRNA synthetase ($K_i = 0.04$ nM).

The crystal structures of AAC(6')-Ii in complex with AcCoA (Fig. 2), CoA or bisubstrate inhibitors all reveal the presence of two hydroxyl groups, Tyr147-OH (3.71 Å away) and Thr111-OH (4.31 Å away), near the CoA sulfur atom. We reasoned that oxidation of the sulfur atom of bisubstrates **1a-b** into sulfoxides **3a-b** or sulfones **4a-b** may also increase the affinity for the enzyme by allowing two extra H-bonds between the oxygen of S=O and these two hydrogen donors.

We report here the synthesis of bisubstrates **2b**, **3a-b**, **4a-b** and their effect on the activity of AAC(6')-Ii.

Bromomethanesulfonyl chloride (**6a**) was used as the main building block for the assembly of **1a-b**. Compound **6a** was assembled by reacting sodium bromomethylsulfonate (**5a**) with PCl_5 as previously reported (Scheme 1). Compound **5a** was prepared using a reported procedure with some modifications. Thus, sodium sulfite and dibromomethane were refluxed in a mixture of ethanol and water in the presence of a catalytic amount of tetrabutylammonium hydrogen sulfate (2 mol%), to afford crystalline product **5a**. 1,3,2'-tri-*N*-(*tert*-Butoxycarbonyl)neamine (**10**) was prepared using a known procedure. *N*-Benzyloxycarbonyloxy-5-norbornene-*endo*-2,3-dicarboximide (**7**) was used to regioselectively protect the 6'-NH₂ of neamine and generate **8** in good yield. Treatment of **8** with di-*tert*-butyl dicarbonate (Boc anhydride) protected all the remaining amino groups of neamine to yield **9**, which was debenzylated to afford **10**. Compound **10** reacted with **6a** to afford **11a**, which was deprotected to give **12a**, *N*-6'-bromomethylsulfonyl neamine (Scheme 1).

Unfortunately, bromide **12a** did not react with CoA (shown as CoA-SH in synthetic schemes). We suspected that this lack of reactivity was due to the low electrophilicity of the bromomethylene carbon. To confirm this hypothesis, we carried out two model reactions (Scheme 2) to compare the reactivity of bromomethyl sulfonamide and iodomethanesulfonamide toward sulfhydryl nucleophile. Indeed, when *N*-benzyl

bromomethanesulfonamide (Scheme 2, **13a**) was treated with *N*-acetylcysteamine (a surrogate for CoA) in an aqueous solvent for two days at RT, no product (**14**) was detectable. The iodomethanesulfonamide **13b**, however, reacted with *N*-acetylcysteamine to yield product **14** under the same conditions after 2 days at RT. Encouraged by this, we set out to prepare the corresponding iodide. A synthetic pathway similar to that described for **12a** was used. Surprisingly, removal of the Boc group followed by chromatography on silica gel led to reduction of the product to 6'-*N*-methanesulfonylneamine (**12b**). Reduction of the iodomethanesulfonamide was also observed in the model reaction but only as a minor product.

Previous studies with amide-linked bisubstrates show that linkers with $n = 2$ are slightly more potent than those with $n = 1$. We thus embarked on the synthesis of bisubstrate **2b** (Fig. 1). Retrosynthetic analysis suggests compound **15** (Scheme 3A) as a reasonable intermediate. Again, a model reaction was used to evaluate the feasibility of this synthetic approach (Scheme 3B). Not surprisingly, the β -bromosulfinamide **16a** easily eliminated to give a mixture of **16a** and the vinylsulfonylneamine **16b**. With 2.5 equivalents of base, **16b** was the only isolated product. Vinylsulfonylneamines are known to be susceptible to Michael addition by thiol groups. To optimize the reaction conditions, vinylsulfonylneamine **16b** was reacted with *N*-acetyl cysteamine (Scheme 3B). In the presence of triethylamine (TEA), the reaction was complete within 30 min and afforded adduct **17**. Next, 2-bromoethanesulfonyl chloride (**6c**) was reacted with protected neamine **10** to yield the vinylsulfonylneamine **18** after spontaneous bromide elimination (Scheme 3C). Deprotection of **18** yielded **19** as the trifluoroacetate salt. Attempts to purify this intermediate on silica gel led to decomposition of the product. Crude **19** was therefore used directly in a reaction with CoA, which yielded bisubstrate **2b** in >35% yield after reverse phase HPLC purification (only part of the sample was purified).

Bisubstrates **3a-b** and **4a-b** were next prepared by direct oxidation of the known sulfides **1a-b**. Selective oxidation of sulfides to sulfoxides has interested chemists for many years. Magnesium monoperoxyphthalate (MMPP) was reported to selectively oxidize glycosyl sulfides to sulfoxides, or sulfones in good yields. Thus MMPP appeared as the most suitable oxidant for our purpose. Unfortunately, the oxidation of **1b** with MMPP was very slow. Half of the starting material remained unchanged after one hour at RT in the presence of 3 equivalents of MMPP. Furthermore, only the sulfoxide product was observed under these conditions. Longer reaction times led to decomposition of the reactants and product. *m*-Chloroperoxybenzoic acid (*m*-CPBA), sodium periodate, *tert*-butylhydroperoxide (TBHP), Oxone, *N*-sulfonyloxaziridine, and dioxirane have also been used for the selective oxidation of sulfides to sulfoxides. Except for *N*-sulfonyloxaziridines, all of these reagents, and more, were explored for the oxidation of **1b**. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Ammonium persulfate was the best oxidant for the selective oxidation of the sulfide **1a** and **1b** to the corresponding sulfoxides **3a** and **3b** (Scheme 4). The reactions were complete within one hour when two equivalents of oxidant were used. To our knowledge, this is the first time that $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_8$ is successfully used for the selective oxidation of a sulfide containing multiple functionalities, to a sulfoxide under aqueous conditions. Bisubstrates **3a-**

b were purified by reverse phase HPLC. One of two possible diastereoisomers was major (>90%) and the minor isomer was discarded. No attempt was made to determine the absolute stereochemistry at the sulfur atom because of the prohibitive cost of CoA. As for the oxidation of the sulfides **1a** and **1b** to sulfones **4a** and **4b** respectively, oxone appeared to be the most efficient oxidant (Scheme 4).

The bisubstrates **2b**, **3a-b** and **4a-b** were tested for inhibition of AAC(6')-II. The results are shown in Table 2. The large error reported for the K_i of **4a** can be explained by the hygroscopic nature of this compound, which decreased the accuracy of weight measurements. All compounds tested were potent competitive inhibitors with K_i s ranging from low micromolar to nanomolar. Surprisingly, the bisubstrate with a sulfonamide linker (**2b**) showed a decreased inhibition compared to the corresponding amide-linked bisubstrate (**1b**). This result suggests either that the enzyme does not stabilize the tetrahedral intermediate or that **2b** is a poor mimic of the tetrahedral intermediate. The synthesis of phosphonate-linked bisubstrates is currently under way to verify these hypotheses.

In conclusion, we report here the synthesis of 5 new bisubstrates containing a sulfonamide linker, or an amide linker adjacent to sulfoxide or sulfone groups. Four of these bisubstrates were assembled in only 2 steps. We demonstrate for the first time the utility of $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_8$ in the selective oxidation of highly functionalized sulfides to sulfoxides under aqueous conditions. Although sulfonamides are expected to better mimic tetrahedral intermediates than amides, sulfonamide-linked bisubstrate **2b** showed poorer inhibition of AAC(6')-II than amide-linked inhibitor **1b**. This supports the hypothesis that AAC(6')-II may catalyze the reaction mainly via proximity effects.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) and by the Canadian Institute of Health Research (CIHR). A.L. was supported by an NSERC scholarship. F.G. and K.V. were supported by scholarship awards from the Chemical Biology Strategic Training Initiative of CIHR. The authors are grateful to G. D. Wright at McMaster University for sharing his AAC(6')-II expression plasmid.

References and notes

1. Gonzalez LSS III, Jeanne P. *Am Fam Physician*. 1998; 58:181.
2. Vakulenko SB, Mobashery S. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2003; 16:430. [PubMed: 12857776]
3. Wright GD. *Curr Opin Microbiol*. 1999; 2:499. [PubMed: 10508725]
4. Wright GD. *Curr Opin Chem Biol*. 2003; 7:563. [PubMed: 14580559]
5. Azucena E, Mobashery S. *Drug Resist Update*. 2001; 4(2):106.
6. Boehr DD, Moore IF, Wright GD. *Front Antimicrob Resist*. 2005:85.
7. Magnet S, Blanchard JS. *Chem Rev*. 2005; 105:477. [PubMed: 15700953]
8. Wright GD, Ladak P. *Antimicrob Agents Ch*. 1997; 41:956.
9. Draker KA, Wright GD. *Biochemistry*. 2004; 43:446. [PubMed: 14717599]
10. Draker KA, Northrop DB, Wright GD. *Biochemistry*. 2003; 42:6565. [PubMed: 12767240]
11. Gao F, Yan X, Baettig OM, Berghuis AM, Auclair K. *Angew Chem Int Edit*. 2005; 44:6859.

12. Gao F, Yan X, Shakya T, Baettig OM, Ait-Mohand-Brunet S, Berghuis AM, Wright GD, Auclair K. *J Med Chem.* 2006; 49:5273. [PubMed: 16913716]
13. Obreza A, Gobec S. *Curr Med Chem.* 2004; 11:3263. [PubMed: 15579012]
14. Cama E, Shin H, Christianson DW. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2003; 125:13052. [PubMed: 14570477]
15. Levenson CH, Meyer RB. *J Med Chem.* 1984; 27:228. [PubMed: 6141293]
16. Brown MJB, Mensah LM, Doyle ML, Broom NJP, Osbourne N, Forrest AK, Richardson CM, O'Hanlon PJ, Pope AJ. *Biochemistry.* 2000; 39:6003. [PubMed: 10821672]
17. Wybenga-Groot LE, Draker KA, Wright GD, Berghuis AM. *Structure.* 1999; 7:497. [PubMed: 10378269]
18. Burk DL, Ghuman N, Wybenga-Groot LE, Berghuis AM. *Protein Sci.* 2003; 12:426. [PubMed: 12592013]
19. Truce WE, Abraham DJ, Son P. *J Org Chem.* 1967; 32:990. [PubMed: 6042165]
20. Brienne MJ, Varech D, Leclercq M, Jacques J, Radembino N, Dessalles C, Mahuzier G, Gueyouche C, Bories C, et al. *J Med Chem.* 1987; 30:2232. [PubMed: 3681893]
21. Roestamadji J, Grapsas I, Mobashery S. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1995; 117:11060.
22. Note, *¹H NMR (DMSO-*d*₆, 300 MHz) δ 8.00 (s, 1H), 7.30 (m, 5H), 4.14 (d, *J* = 5.4, 2H), 3.32 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (DMSO-*d*₆, 75 MHz) δ 136.8, 129.0, 128.3, 127.8, 47.3, 40.4.*
23. Truce WE, Wellisch E. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1952; 74:2881.
24. Li M, Wu RS, Tsai JSC, Salamone SJ. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett.* 2003; 13:383. [PubMed: 12565934]
25. Reddick JJ, Cheng J, Roush WR. *Org Lett.* 2003; 5:1967. [PubMed: 12762698]
26. Zhao MM, Qu C, Lynch JE. *J Org Chem.* 2005; 70:6944. [PubMed: 16095322]
27. Baekvall J-E. *Modern Oxidation Methods.* 2004:193.
28. Legros J, Dehli JR, Bolm C. *Adv Syn Catal.* 2005; 347:19.
29. Mata EG. *Phosphorus Sulfur.* 1996; 117:231.
30. Chen BC, Murphy CK, Kumar A, Reddy RT, Clark C, Zhou P, Lewis BM, Gala D, Mergelsberg I, Scherer D, Buckley J, DiBenedetto D, Davis FA. *Org Syn.* 1996; 73:159.
31. Chen MY, Patkar LN, Lin CC. *J Org Chem.* 2004; 69:2884. [PubMed: 15074947]
32. Chen MY, Patkar LN, Chen HT, Lin CC. *Carbohydr Res.* 2003; 338:1327.
33. Davis FA, Lal SG, Durst HD. *J Org Chem.* 1988; 53:5004.
34. Kropp PJ, Breton GW, Fields JD, Tung JC, Loomis BR. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2000; 122:4280.
35. Kagan, HB. Asymmetric oxidation of sulfides. In: Ojima, I., editor. *Catalytic Asymmetric Synthesis.* Wiley-VCH; 2000. p. 327-356.
36. Velasco MA. *Synlett.* 2005; 11:1807.
37. Arjona O, Menchaca R, Plumet J. *J Org Chem.* 2001; 66:2400. [PubMed: 11281781]
38. Arai Y, Matsui M, Koizumi T. *Synthesis.* 1990; 4:320-323.
39. Brougham P, Cooper MS, Cummers DA, Heaney H, Thompson N. *Synthesis.* 1987; 11:1015-1017.
40. Kahne D, Walker S, Cheng Y, Vanengen D. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1989; 111:6881-6882.
41. Yamamoto T, Hayakawa T, Yoshino M, Hata SI, Hirayama Y. *Org Prep Proced Int.* 2000; 32:192-196.
42. Varma RS, Saini RK, Meshram HM. *Tet Lett.* 1997; 38:6525-6528.
43. Bower JF, Williams MJ. *Tet Lett.* 1994; 35:7111-7114.
44. Mirkhani V, Tangestaninejad S, Moghadam M, Mohammadpoor-Baltork I, Kargar H. *J Mol Catal.* 2005; 242:251-255.
45. Kantam ML, Neelima B, Reddy CV, Chaudhuri MK, Dehury SK. *Catal Lett.* 2004; 95:19-22.
46. Peng Y, Feng X, Cui X, Jiang Y, Chan ASC. *Synthetic Commun.* 2001; 31:2287-2296.
47. Bonadies F, De Angelis F, Locati L, Scettri A. *Tet Lett.* 1996; 37:7129-7130.
48. Webb KS. *Tet Lett.* 1994; 35:3457-3460.
49. Hajipour AR. *Iran J Sci Technol.* 1998; 22:205-207.

50. Hirano M, Tomaru J, Morimoto T. B Chem Soc Jpn. 1991; 64:3752–3754.
51. Chen M-Y, Patkar Laxmikant N, Chen H-T, Lin C-C. Carbohydr Res. 2003; 338:1327–1332.
52. Park WKC, Auer M, Jaksche H, Wong CH. J Am Chem Soc. 1996; 118:10150–10155.

Figure 1.

Proposed chemical steps catalyzed by AAC(6')-II (top). Previously reported amide-linked aminoglycoside-CoA bisubstrate inhibitors (**1a-b**) and bisubstrate inhibitors synthesized and tested here (**2a-b**, **3a-b** and **4a-b**).

Figure 2.

A) Crystal structure of AAC(6')-II in complex with AcCoA (1B87.pdb, figure produced using PyMol). The protein is represented with cartoon. Tyr147, Thr111, and AcCoA are represented with line and colored by C (green), O (red), N (blue), P (purple), and the sulfur atom of AcCoA is represented as a yellow sphere. B) Chemical structure of AcCoA and the distance between the sulfur and two amino acid residues.

Scheme 1. First synthetic attempt to prepare bisubstrate analog **2a**.

Scheme 2.

Model reaction for thiol attack at halomethanesulfonamides.

Scheme 3. Model reaction and synthesis of bisubstrate **2b**.

Scheme 4.

Optimized conditions for the syntheses of bisubstrates **3a-b** and **4a-b** via the selective oxidation of the sulfides **1a-b**.

Table 1Screening of oxidants for the selective sulfide oxidation of **1b**

Oxidant ^a	Equiv.	Sulfide	Results ^b Sulfoxide	Sulfone
MMPP	3	>90%	<10%	0
<i>m</i> CPBA	3	60%	40%	0
TBHP	3	90%	10%	0
H ₂ O ₂	3	60%	40%	0
H ₂ O ₂ Urea	3	100%	0	0
H ₂ O ₂ Na ₂ CO ₃	3		decomposition	
H ₂ O ₂ Na ₂ BO ₂	3		decomposition	
NaIO ₄	3		decomposition	
NaIO ₄	1	50%	50%	0
(NH ₄) ₂ S ₂ O ₈	1	50%	50%	0
(NH ₄) ₂ S ₂ O ₈	2	0	100%	0
Oxone ^c	1	0	60%	40%
Oxone	2	0	0	100%

^a reaction time is 1 h at RT in water;^b composition was normalized according to corresponding peak area from LC-MS;^c potassium monopersulfate as in 2KHSO₅ · KHSO₄ · K₂SO₄.

Table 2

AAC(6')-II inhibition constants (K_i) for bisubstrates **2b**, **3a-b** and **4a-b**

Inhibitor	2b	3a	3b	4a	4b
Type	competitive	competitive	competitive	competitive	competitive
K_i (μ M)	1.6 ± 0.6	0.06 ± 0.03	2.0 ± 0.7	0.27 ± 0.2	0.09 ± 0.06