Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem. 2012 September 15; 20(18): 5642–5648. doi:10.1016/j.bmc.2012.07.004.

Riluzole prodrugs for melanoma and ALS: design, synthesis, and in vitro metabolic profiling

Mark E. McDonnell^a, Matthew D. Vera^a, Benjamin E. Blass^a, Jeffrey C. Pelletier^a, Richard C. King^b, Carmen Fernandez-Metzler^b, Garry R. Smith^a, Jay Wrobel^a, Suzie Chen^c, and Allen B. Reitz^{a,*}

^aFox Chase Chemical Diversity Center, Inc., 3805 Old Easton Road, Doylestown, PA 18902

^bPharmaCadence Analytical Services, LLC, 2880 Bergey Road, Suite AA, Hatfield, PA 19440

^cDepartment of Chemical Biology, Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy, 164 Frelinghuysen Road, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854

Abstract

Riluzole (**1**) is an approved therapeutic for the treatment of ALS and has also demonstrated antimelanoma activity in metabotropic glutamate GRM1 positive cell lines, a mouse xenograft assay and human clinical trials. Highly variable drug exposure following oral administration among patients, likely due to variable first pass effects from heterogeneous CYP1A2 expression, hinders its clinical use. In an effort to mitigate effects of this clearance pathway and uniformly administer riluzole at efficacious exposure levels, several classes of prodrugs of riluzole were designed, synthesized, and evaluated in multiple in vitro stability assays to predict in vivo drug levels. The optimal prodrug would possess the following profile: stability while transiting the digestive system, stability towards first pass metabolism, and metabolic lability in the plasma releasing riluzole. (*S*)-O-Benzyl serine derivative **9** was identified as the most promising therapeutically acceptable prodrug.

Keywords

Riluzole; Prodrug; Cancer; Melanoma; Cyp1A2

Introduction

The glutamatergic system plays a key role in tumor biology.^{1–7} The growth inhibition of various human tumors including colon adenocarcinomas, breast, gliomas, and lung carcinomas by specific antagonists to ionotropic glutamate receptors has been reported.^{2,6} Furthermore, implanted glioma cells with high levels of glutamate release showed a distinct growth advantage.² We have evaluated riluzole (**1**; Scheme 1), the only currently FDA-approved drug for the treatment of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS),⁸ for potential anti-

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

*Corresponding author. Tel.215-589-6435. Fax. 215-589-6335. AReitz@fc-cdci.com.

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.

Supplementary material available. Table of data used for Figure 2.

cancer activity, as it inhibits glutamate release, thus lowering the potential for glutamatergic system signaling and function.^{9–10}

Riluzole blocks the release of glutamic acid and thus lessens the response mediated by the metabotropic glutamate receptor GRM1 (mGluR1), and also functions as a putative weak antagonist of certain glutamate receptors. We have shown a reduction in the number of viable cells after treatment with riluzole in two different GRM1-positive cell lines (C8161 and SKMEL187) while two different GRM1-negative human melanoma cell lines (UACC930 and C81-61) or normal human melanocytes (HEM) were much less sensitive under similar conditions.¹¹ Furthermore, we have also demonstrated a correlation between a decrease in levels of released glutamate and number of viable cells in riluzole-treated C8161 cells.¹¹ These results support the notion that high glutamate release may promote tumor cell growth.^{1–7}

Metastatic melanoma has few treatment options. Surgical resection is the primary modality for cutaneous malignant melanoma but results in local recurrence rates as high as 50%. For a long time the therapeutic standard of care was dacarbazine, a highly cytotoxic drug with severe side effects including vomiting, headache and hair loss.^{12,13} Treatment with dacarbazine has a median progression-free enhancement of survival time of only 1.5 months. Recently, two new drugs showed survival benefit in randomized phase III clinical trials. Ipilimumab, a human monoclonal anti-immunosuppressive antibody against the immune check-point CTLA-4 inhibitory receptor enhanced life expectancy and Vemurafenib, a small molecule inhibiting mutated BRAF, improved overall survival for several months in most melanoma patients with mutated BRAF.^{14,15} Despite these advances, the clinical responses are not durable and relapse of melanoma is a near-certainty. There is a need for new melanoma treatments that are both disease-modifying and effective in treating patients that are refractory to current treatments. Riluzole, a generally non-toxic drug for which there is significant clinical data available, is the only FDA-approved treatment specifically for ALS.¹⁶ We tested the efficacy of riluzole in melanoma patients with a poor prognosis and severely limited treatment options.¹⁷ Riluzole demonstrated efficacy in this patient group in recently completed phase 0 and phase 2 clinical trials.¹⁷ These results, along with the mild side-effect profile that riluzole has shown among ALS patients, suggests this drug has significant potential for use as an improved treatment for metastatic melanoma.

The clinical use of riluzole is characterized by extensive hepatic metabolism and an exceptionally high level of patient-to-patient variability in drug exposure, due to variable first pass elimination effects caused by heterogeneous expression of the cytochrome P450 isoform CYP1A2.^{18–21} N-hydroxylation of riluzole by CYP1A2 to give **2** is quickly followed by O-glucuronidation to **3** and subsequent elimination (Scheme 1).²¹ In order to circumvent the first pass metabolism by CYP1A2 we devised a prodrug approach where the riluzole exocyclic nitrogen is masked as a functional group not anticipated to be recognized by CYP1A2 as a substrate for oxidation. A successful prodrug would be stable in the gastrointestinal (GI) tract upon oral administration, stable to first pass hepatic metabolism and then cleaved in plasma or at the target tissue to liberate riluzole. Herein we report the identification and selection of a riluzole prodrug suitable for in vivo testing based on the design, synthesis, and rapid in vitro evaluation of the 23 potential riluzole prodrugs shown in Figure 1.

Results and discussion

The preparation of prodrugs from amine-containing drugs and drug candidates is well described in the literature.^{22–24} Scheme 2 shows the preparation of potential riluzole-derived

prodrugs involving conversion of the exocyclic amine to single alpha-amino amides (**4** – **10**), carbamates (**11** – **18**), succinamides (**19** – **23**) and amide linkages from γ -aminobutyric acids (**24**, **25**). Plasma bound amidases and esterases would be expected to cleave **4** – **10** and **11** – **18**, respectively, to give riluzole directly (Scheme 3, Eqs. 1 and 2).²³ Esterases would also act on succinates **20** and **21** and amidases on **22** and **23** to afford resulting acid **19** (Scheme 3, Eq. 4), which would then cyclize to succinic anhydride and riluzole.²⁵ Amines **24** and **25** would release **1** in a pH dependent manner (Scheme 3, Eq. 3),²⁶ and metabolic reduction of *ortho*-nitrophenyl amide analog **26** to the corresponding amino derivative would liberate riluzole as well (Scheme 3, Eq. 5).²⁷

To determine suitability as prodrugs, compounds **4** – **26** were first tested for stability in various in vitro assays including simulated gastric fluid (SGF), simulated intestinal fluid (SIF), mouse and human liver microsomes (mLM, hLM), as well as mouse and human plasma (mPS, hPS).²⁸ Mouse assays were included to predict in vivo stability for eventual murine xenograft assays. The data are shown graphically in Figure 2.²⁹ Individual assay results indicate disappearance of prodrug, as a percent of the original concentration, after the incubation times indicated. In order to be considered for further study, compounds should be stable in simulated gastric fluid (SGF) and simulated intestinal fluid (SIF) as well as liver microsomes (LM) to predict intact absorption into the plasma. Instability in plasma was assumed to predict in vivo release of the active species required for tumor exposure. Compounds were found to be stable in the SGF assay, however, amino acid derivatives **4** – **6**, morpholino succinamide **23**, and 4-aminobutyrate analog **25** were rapidly degraded in the SIF assay. Interestingly, γ -aminobutyrate analogue **24** is significantly more stable than substituted aminobutyrate **25**. This stability difference was attributed to the Thorpe-Ingold effect in which the *gem*-dialkyl substitution enhances intramolecular cyclization.³⁰ Stability in the LM assays suggest first pass liver metabolism will be insignificant and systemic exposure will be high.³¹ Hence, derivatives **6**, **10**, **13**, **14**, **18** – **21**, **24** and **26** were excluded for further consideration due to instability to LMs. Finally, varying levels of instability were seen with **5**, **6**, **9** and **20** in the mouse and human plasma assays suggesting the parent substance, riluzole, was being released via plasma amidases.

Comparison of all data indicated that **9** had the most promising balance of stability in the intestinal and microsomal assays, and desired lability in the plasma assays. Therefore, this compound was subjected to more extensive analysis to determine half-lives of prodrug disappearance in SGF, SIF, hLM and hPS assays (Table 1). Riluzole was also detected in the hPS assay. The data from these studies support compound **9** as a candidate prodrug that will traverse the GI tract and not be metabolized by the liver.

Riluzole is predominantly metabolized by the CYP1A2 isozyme¹⁹ which is expressed heterogeneously in the population. This leads to variable bioavailability and drug exposure among patients with one report indicating riluzole exposure per kilogram of body weight at 48.7 $\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{h}/\text{L}/\text{Kg}$ with a standard deviation of 40.9 (189 patients).¹⁸ Before considering prodrug **9** for in vivo evaluation, we wanted to ensure that this compound itself was not a substrate for oxidative metabolism by CYP1A2 compared to riluzole. Therefore, both riluzole and **9** were subjected to stability assays in liver microsomes from two individual donors expressing high and low CYP1A2 activity, respectively. Microsome baseline activity was determined by disappearance of the CYP1A2 substrate positive control phenacetin accompanied by the appearance of acetaminophen. As expected, riluzole was metabolized to a greater extent in high activity CYP1A2 microsomes (47% remaining at 30 mins)²⁰ than in low CYP1A2 activity microsomes (100% remaining at 30 mins). Prodrug **9** was not metabolized to a significant extent in either microsome samples with or without the co-factor NADPH (70% remaining at 30 mins), indicating the prodrug is a poor substrate for the CYP1A2 isozyme (Table 2).

Conclusion

The only FDA-approved drug for ALS, riluzole, has shown promising activity in GRM1 positive melanoma cell assays, refractory melanoma clinical studies and in an in vivo xenograft assay. To stabilize highly variable exposure levels of the drug resulting from patient to patient heterogeneous CYP1A2 expression, putative prodrugs were prepared and evaluated in intestinal, microsomal, and plasma stability assays. *O*-Benzylserine derivative **9** emerged from this process and was further characterized in SGF, SIF, liver microsome, and plasma stability assays. The presence of riluzole was confirmed in the human plasma assay indicating the prodrug is indeed cleaved to provide riluzole. Additional evaluation for metabolism in microsome assays with both high and low CYP1A2 activity levels indicated **9** was most likely not a CYP1A2 substrate. Therefore, compound **9** is expected to be a riluzole prodrug that could display consistent plasma exposure levels upon in vivo administration and is therefore an ideal candidate for testing in murine xenograft efficacy models following evaluation in cell based melanocyte assays, for which data will be reported in due course.

Materials and methods

General

All chemicals and anhydrous solvents were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, Mo.) and used without additional purification. General solvents and reagents were purchased from Fisher Scientific. ¹H-NMR spectra were obtained on a Varian Mercury 300-MHz NMR. Purity (%) and mass spectral data were determined with a Waters Alliance 2695 HPLC/MS (Waters Symmetry C18, 4.6 × 75 mm, 3.5 μm) with a 2996 diode array detector from 210–400 nm; retention times are in minutes. Yields refer to the amount of product after purification and are not optimized.

General synthetic method of amide analogs **4–26** **10**, **24–26**

6-Trifluoromethoxy-benzothiazol-2-ylamine (100 mg, 0.42 mmol), a carboxylic acid (0.43 mmol), and EDCI (123 mg, 0.65 mmol) were combined in methylene chloride (5 mL) and stirred 4 days. The reaction was washed with 0.1N HCl (2×10mL), dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered, and then concentrated. Chromatography on silica gel afforded the *t*-Boc protected compounds as well as compound **26** directly. Compounds **4–10**, **24**, and **25** were dissolved in 4N HCl and 1,4-dioxane and stirred 3 hr. at ambient temperature. The reactions were then concentrated to afford the products.

(*S*)-2-Amino-N-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-propionamide (**4**)

Yield: 71%; white powder. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 8.57 (s, 1H), 8.18 (s, 1H), 7.88 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.46 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 4.78–3.63 (m, 1H), 1.46 (d, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 3H). HPLC-MS *m/z* (M⁺) 305.9; T_r=3.58 (95%).

(*R*)-2-Amino-N-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-propionamide (**5**)

Yield: 59%; white powder. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO) δ 8.57 (s, 1H), 8.18 (s, 1H), 7.88 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.46 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 3.98 (bs, 3H), 1.46 (d, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 3H). HPLC-MS *m/z* (M⁺) 305.9; T_r=3.57 (>95%).

(*S*)-2-Amino-3-methyl-N-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-butyramide (**6**)

Yield: 66%; white powder. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 8.55 (s, 1H), 8.18 (s, 1H), 7.88 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.46 (d, *J* = 8.9 Hz, 1H), 4.00 (m, 1H), 3.43 (m, 2H), 3.16 (s, 4H), 2.26 (d, *J* = 6.4 Hz, 1H), 1.29–0.63 (m, 6H). HPLC-MS *m/z* (M⁺) 333.9; T_r=3.92 (>95%).

(S)-2-Amino-3-phenyl-N-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-propionamide (7)

Yield: 83%; beige powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CD_3OD) δ 7.90 (s, 1H), 8.05–7.47 (m, 2H), 7.81 (d, J = 8.9 Hz, 1H), 7.34 (dt, J = 9.7, 7.8 Hz, 2H), 7.34 (dt, J = 9.7, 7.8 Hz, 2H), 4.40 (dd, J = 8.1, 6.3 Hz, 1H), 3.46 – 3.30 (m, 2H), 3.19 (dd, J = 14.0, 8.2 Hz, 1H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 381.9; T_{R} = 4.27 (>95%).

(R)-2-Amino-3-phenyl-N-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-propionamide (8)

Yield: 72%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, $\text{DMSO}-d_6$) δ 8.75 (bs, 2H), 8.31 (s, 1H), 7.99 (d, J = 8.9 Hz, 1H), 7.59 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.42 (m, 4H), 4.53 (bs, 1H), 3.44 (s, 2H), 3.32 (m, 2H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 381.9; T_{R} = 4.21 (>95%).

(S)-2-Amino-3-benzyloxy-N-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-propionamide (9)

Yield: 66%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, $\text{DMSO}-d_6$) δ 8.66 (s, 1H), 8.19 (s, 1H), 7.88 (d, J = 8.9 Hz, 1H), 7.47 (d, J = 8.9 Hz, 1H), 7.35–7.18 (m, 5H), 4.56 (q, J = 12.3 Hz, 2H), 4.44 (s, 1H), 4.11 – 3.77 (m, 2H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 411.9; T_{R} = 4.40 (95%).

(R)-2-Amino-3-benzyloxy-N-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-propionamide (10)

Yield: 48%; buff powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, $\text{DMSO}-d_6$) δ 8.37 (d, J = 103.5 Hz, 1H), 8.20 (s, 1H), 7.89 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.48 (d, J = 9.6 Hz, 1H), 7.40–7.18 (m, 5H), 4.57 (q, J = 12.4 Hz, 2H), 4.42 (m, 2H), 4.06–3.82 (m, 1H), 3.50 (s, 1H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 411.9; T_{R} = 4.43 (>95%).

5-Aminopentanoic acid (6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-amide (24)

Yield: 77%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CD_3OD) δ 8.00–7.65 (m, 2H), 7.34 (d, J = 8.9 Hz, 1H), 3.72 (t, J = 6.6 Hz, 2H), 3.2–2.89 (m, 2H), 2.71 (t, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 2.17–1.93 (m, 2H), 1.93–1.73 (m, 2H). MS m/z ($\text{M}+\text{Na}^+$) 342.0; T_{R} = 3.45 (>95%).

2-(1-Aminomethyl-cyclohexyl)-N-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-acetamide (25)

Yield: 34%; buff powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, $\text{DMSO}-d_6$) δ 12.70 (s, 1H), 8.88 (s, 1H), 8.14 (s, 1H), 7.97 (s, 1H), 7.85 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.44 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 3.01 (d, J = 5.6 Hz, 4H), 2.90 (s, 3H), 2.80 (s, 3H), 2.74 (s, 3H), 1.47 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 3H). MS m/z (MH^+) 388.0; T_{R} = 4.03 (96%).

2-(2-Nitrophenyl)-N-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-acetamide (26)

Yield: 38%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, $\text{DMSO}-d_6$) δ 12.79 (s, 1H), 8.12 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 7.84 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.75 (d, J = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 7.62 (d, J = 5.6 Hz, 2H), 7.42 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 1H), 4.30 (s, 2H). MS m/z (M^+) 397.9; T_{R} = 5.77 (>95%).

General synthetic method for carbamate analogs 11–18

6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-ylamine (**1**, 100 mg, 0.42 mmol), chloroformate (0.74 mmol), and triethylamine (64 mg, 0.64 mmol) were combined in methylene chloride (3 mL) and stirred 24h at ambient temperature. The reaction was concentrated. The residue was treated with methanol/water (1:1, 5 mL) and the solid collected by filtration and dried under vacuum to afford product.

(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-carbamic acid methyl ester (11)

Yield: 47%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, $\text{DMSO}-d_6$) δ 8.22 (s, 1H), 7.89 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.52 (d, J = 9.0 Hz, 1H), 3.97 (s, 1H), 3.44 (s, 3H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 292.9; T_{R} = 5.26 (94%).

(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-carbamic acid ethyl ester (12)

Yield: 67%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 8.23 (s, 1H), 7.90 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.52 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 1H), 4.40 (q, J = 7.1 Hz, 2H), 1.42 (t, J = 7.1 Hz, 3H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 306.9; T_{R} = 5.62 (96%).

(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-carbamic acid propyl ester (13)

Yield: 74%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 12.15 (s, 1H), 8.10 (s, 1H), 7.77 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.39 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 1H), 4.18 (t, J = 6.7 Hz, 2H), 2.57–2.45 (m, 2H), 0.95 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 3H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 320.9; T_{R} = 5.98 (95%).

(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-carbamic acid butyl ester (14)

Yield: 56%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 12.14 (s, 1H), 8.09 (s, 1H), 7.77 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.39 (d, J = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 4.21 (t, J = 6.7 Hz, 1H), 1.73–1.31 (m, 2H), 1.32 (t, J = 6.9 Hz, 2H), 0.88 (t, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 334.9; T_{R} = 6.36 (95%).

(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-carbamic acid isobutyl ester (15)

Yield: 66%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 12.16 (s, 1H), 8.08 (s, 1H), 7.76 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.38 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 3.97 (dd, J = 18.1, 6.6 Hz, 2H), 1.96 (dt, J = 13.5, 6.8 Hz, 1H), 1.05 (d, J = 6.6 Hz, 3H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 334.9; T_{R} = 6.33 (>95%).

(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-carbamic acid hexyl ester (16)

Yield: 72%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 8.12 (s, 1H), 7.79 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.42 (d, J = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 4.24 (t, J = 6.7 Hz, 2H), 1.67 (dd, J = 14.2, 6.8 Hz, 2H), 1.35 (m, 6H), 0.91 (t, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 362.9; T_{R} = 6.97 (95%).

(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-carbamic acid 2-dimethylamino-ethyl ester (17)

Yield: 13%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, CD_3OD) δ 7.85 (s, 1H), 7.75 (d, J = 9.1 Hz, 1H), 7.42–7.27 (m, 1H), 4.86 (s, 6H), 4.64 (m, 2H), 3.58 (m, 2H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 349.8; T_{R} = 3.58 (>95%).

(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-carbamic acid 3-(dimethylamino)propyl ester (18)

Yield: 14%; beige powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 10.33 (s, 1H), 8.10 (s, 1H), 7.77 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.39 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 1H), 4.26 (dd, J = 18.9, 12.6 Hz, 2H), 3.16 (d, J = 15.6 Hz, 2H), 2.76 (d, J = 5.0 Hz, 6H), 2.30–1.77 (m, 2H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 363.9; T_{R} = 3.71 (>95%).

General synthesis method of amide analogs 19–21—6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-ylamine (100 mg, 0.42 mmol), a carboxylic acid (0.43 mmol), and EDCI (123 mg, 0.65 mmol) were combined in methylene chloride (5 mL) and stirred 4 days. The reaction was washed with 0.1N HCl (2×10mL), dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered, and then concentrated. Chromatography on silica gel afforded compounds **20**, and **21**. Compound **21** was dissolved in dichloromethane and trifluoroacetic acid (1:1). After stirring two hours the solvents were removed *in vacuo* to yield compound **19**.

N-(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-succinamic acid (19)

Yield: 71%; white powder. ^1H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 8.11 (s, 1H), 7.81 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.41 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 2.72 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 2H), 2.68–2.44 (m, 2H). HPLC-MS m/z (M^+) 334.8; T_{R} = 4.60 (>95%).

N-(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-succinamic acid methyl ester (20)

Yield: 77%; white powder. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 12.54 (s, 2H), 8.12 (s, 1H), 7.82 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.42 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 3.60 (d, *J* = 9.2 Hz, 3H), 3.03–2.58 (m, 2H), 1.76 (t, *J* = 6.6 Hz, 2H). HPLC-MS *m/z* (M⁺) 348.9; T_r = 5.23 (>95%).

N-(6-Trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-succinamic acid tert-butyl ester (21)

Yield: 33%; light yellow powder. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 12.50 (s, 1H), 8.10 (s, 1H), 7.81 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 1H), 7.40 (m, 1H), 3.59 (t, *J* = 6.6 Hz, 2H), 1.75 (t, *J* = 6.6 Hz, 2H), 1.37 (s, 9H). HPLC-MS *m/z* (MH⁺-C₄H₉) 334.8; T_r = 6.08 (95%).

Synthesis of amide analogs 22 and 23—Maleic anhydride (1 mmol) and an amine (1 mmol) were stirred in DMF (1 mL) 24h. 6-Trifluoromethoxy-benzothiazol-2-ylamine (1 mmol), HATU (1 mmol), and Et₃N (1 mmol) were the reaction was stirred an additional 24h. The reactions were purified using reverse phase chromatography to afford the desired compounds.

N-Pyridin-3-ylmethyl-N'-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-succinamide (22)

Yield: 16%; beige powder. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 12.50 (s, 1H), 8.84–8.42 (m, 2H), 8.10 (d, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.81 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 2H), 7.71 (d, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 1H), 7.35 (dd, *J* = 36.7, 27.4 Hz, 1H), 4.40 (d, *J* = 5.8 Hz, 2H), 2.78 (t, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 2H), 2.57 (t, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 2H). HPLC-MS *m/z* (M⁺) 424.9; T_r = 3.49 (95%).

N-(2-Morpholin-4-yl-ethyl)-N'-(6-trifluoromethoxybenzothiazol-2-yl)-succinamide (23)

Yield: 9%; white powder. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 12.51 (s, 1H), 9.61 (s, 1H), 8.23 (s, 1H), 8.11 (s, 1H), 7.82 (d, *J* = 8.9 Hz, 1H), 7.42 (d, *J* = 8.9 Hz, 1H), 3.96 (s, 2H), 3.64 (s, 3H), 3.44 (m, 6H), 3.18 (m, 3H), 2.76 (d, *J* = 6.4 Hz, 2H), 2.53 (dd, *J* = 15.1, 4.8 Hz, 1H). MS *m/z* (M⁺) 446.9; T_r = 3.66 (95%).

In vitro stability assays

Stability in Simulated Gastric Fluid (SGF) and Simulated Intestinal Fluid (SIF),²⁹ The compounds were prepared in a 9:1 mixture of the appropriate test component (SGF, SIF) and acetonitrile to a final concentration of 0.01 mg/mL. The samples were thoroughly mixed and maintained at 37 °C for 60 min. Each sample was injected consecutively onto an Agilent 1100 system (Luna C18, 3 μm, 50 mm × 3 mm; 1 mL/min; mobile phase of 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid in water/0.1% trifluoroacetic acid in acetonitrile) after a 60 min period. The percent prodrug conversion was calculated by comparing the area of prodrug compound versus riluzole generated. The identities of the parent compounds and conversion products were confirmed by LC/MS.

Plasma Stability: Assessment of plasma stability was carried out by individual incubations of drug candidates in fresh mouse or human control plasma at a concentration of 1 μM for 1 hour at 37°C. After which, the samples were deproteinized by addition of 2 volumes of acetonitrile containing 0.1% formic acid and internal standard, vortex mixed for 2 minutes and centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 10 minutes to pellet precipitated protein. The resulting supernatant containing the drug candidates was diluted 5-fold with water containing 0.1% formic acid and submitted to LC-MS/MS analysis. All determinations were done in triplicate. Plasma stability was expressed as percent of control remaining.

Metabolic Stability: In vitro metabolic stability was determined in pooled mouse or human liver microsomes (BD Gentest) at a protein concentration of 0.5 mg/mL in reaction buffer (100 mM KH₂PO₄, pH 7.4 and 12 mM MgCl₂). Each drug candidate was added to a final

concentration of 1 μ M. This mixture was pre-warmed to 37°C for 10 minutes prior to starting the reaction with the addition of β -Nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide 2'-phosphate reduced (NADPH) to a final concentration of 1 mM. A parallel incubation lacking NADPH served as the control. After incubation for 30 min at 37°C, the reactions were quenched by the addition of acetonitrile containing 0.1% formic acid and internal standard, vortex mixed for 2 minutes and centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 10 minutes to pellet the precipitated protein. The resulting supernatant containing the drug candidate and its potential metabolites was diluted 5-fold with water containing 0.1% formic acid and submitted to LC/MS/MS analysis. Metabolic stability was expressed as percent of control remaining.

Cyp1A2 metabolic stability: Microsomes were purchased from Invitrogen as frozen 20 mg/ml solutions. Two individual donor microsome lots were used which had a wide range of Cyp1A2 activity as measured by Invitrogen using a phenacetin dealkylation activity assay. Lot# HU8045 was determined to have a V_{max} for the demethylation of phenacetin of 94.7 μ mol/min and Lot# HU8022 was determined to have a V_{max} of 1190 μ mol/min. Individual microsome lots were used to determine the metabolic disappearance of Riluzole and Riluzole prodrug **9** using the incubation method from the **Metabolic Stability** section above.

LC-MS/MS Analysis: An aliquot from each incubation was analyzed by LC/MS/MS with SRM detection in the positive ionization mode using an ABSciex API 5500 QTrap Mass Spectrometer interfaced via the ABSciex Turbo V IonSpray source (ESI) to an Eksigent ExpressHT LC system. Best peak shape and separation from interfering matrix species was afforded by an Eksigent 3C18-CL-300, 3 μ , 50 $\times$ 1 mm column. A fast gradient, from 15 to 85% organic in 2.5 minutes, with run time of 5.0 minutes, and flow rate of 50 μ L/min was utilized. Peak areas were integrated using MultiQuant v2.0 software from ABSciex.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by a grant from the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health (R43 CA156781-01).

References

1. Cavalheiro EA, Olney JW. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2001; 98:5947–5948. [PubMed: 11371628]
2. Takano T, Lin JH, Arcuino G, Gao Q, Yang J, Nedergaard M. Nat Med. 2001; 7:1010–1015. [PubMed: 11533703]
3. Kalariti N, Pissimissis N, Koutsilieris M. Expert Opin Investig Drugs. 2005; 14:1487–1496.
4. Ackermann J, Beermann F. Pigment Cell Res. 2005; 18:315–319. [PubMed: 16029424]
5. Rzeski W, Ikonomidou C, Turski L. Biochem Pharmacol. 2002; 64:1195–1200. [PubMed: 12234599]
6. Rzeski W, Turski L, Ikonomidou C. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 2001; 98:6372–6377. [PubMed: 11331750]
7. Stepulak A, Siffringer M, Rzeski W, et al. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2005; 102:15605–15610. [PubMed: 16230611]
8. Doble A. Neurology. 1996; 47(6 Suppl 4):233S–241S.
9. Kretschmer BD, Kratzer U, Schmidt WJ. Naunyn Schmiedeberg Arch Pharmacol. 1998; 358:181–190. [PubMed: 9750003]
10. Wang SJ, Wang KY, Wang WC. Neuroscience. 2004; 125:191–201. [PubMed: 15051158]

11. Namkoong J, Shin SS, Lee HJ, et al. *Cancer Res.* 2007; 67:2298–2305. [PubMed: 17332361]
12. Shuff JH, Siker ML, Daly MD, Schultz CJ. *Clin Plas.Surg.* 2010; 37:147–160.
13. Trinh VA. *Am. J. Health Syst. Pharm.* 2008; 65(24 Suppl 9):3–8.
14. Sondak VK, Flaherty LE. *Nat. Rev. Clinical Oncology.* 2011; 8:513–515.
15. Luke JJ, Hodi FS. *Clin. Cancer Res.* 2012; 18:9–14. [PubMed: 22083257]
16. Bensimon G, Lacomblez L, Meininger V. *N Engl J Med.* 1994; 330:585–591. [PubMed: 8302340]
17. Yip D, Le MN, Chan JL-K, Lee JH, Mehnert JA, Yudd A, Kempf J, Shih WJ, Chen S, Goydos JS. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2009; 15:3896–902. [PubMed: 19458050]
18. Groeneveld GJ, Van Kan HJM, Kalmijn S, et al. *Neurology.* 2003; 61:1141–1143. [PubMed: 14581684]
19. van Kan HJM, Groeneveld GJ, Kalmijn S, Spijksma M, van den Berg LH, Guchelaar HJ. *Brit. J. Clin. Pharmacol.* 2004; 59:310–313. [PubMed: 15752377]
20. Sanderink GJ, Bournique B, Stevens J, Petry M, Martinet MJ. *Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 1997; 282:1465–1472.
21. Martinet M, Montay G, Rhodes G. *Drugs of Today.* 1997; 33:587–594.
22. Ettmayer P, Amidon GL, Clement B, Testa BJ. *Med. Chem.* 2004; 47:2393–2404.
23. Rautio J, Kumpulainen H, Heimbach T, et al. *Nat. Rev. Drug Disc.* 2008; 7:255–270.
24. Testa B. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 2004; 68:2097–2106. [PubMed: 15498500]
25. Fredholt K, Mork N, Begtrup M. *Int. J. Pharm.* 1995; 123:209–216.
26. Nam N-H, Kim Y, You Y-J, Hong D-H, Kim H-M, Ahn B-Z. *Bioorg. Med. Chem.* 2003; 11:1021–1029. [PubMed: 12614888]
27. Sykes BM, Atwell GJ, Hogg A, Wilson WR, O'Connor CJ, Denny WA. *J. Med. Chem.* 1999; 42:346–355. [PubMed: 9986704]
28. Di L, Kerns EH. *Cur. Opin. Drug Disc. Develop.* 2005; 8:495–504.
29. Baudy RB, Butera JA, Abou-Gharbia MA, Chen H, Harrison B, Jain U, Magolda R, Sze JY, Brandt MR, Cummons TA, Kowal D, Pangalos MN, Zupan B, Hoffmann UM, May M, Mugford C, Kennedy J, Childers WEJ Jr. *Med. Chem.* 2009; 52:771–778.
30. Jung ME, Piizzi G. *Chemical Reviews.* 2005; 105:1735–1766. [PubMed: 15884788]
31. Mandagere AK, Thompson TN, Hwang K-K. *J. Med. Chem.* 2002; 45:304–311. [PubMed: 11784135]
32. Assays performed by Absorption Systems, Inc.; Exton, PA:

4 R = (S)-Me **8** R = (R)-Bn

5 R = (R)-Me **9** R = (S)-CH₂OBn

6 R = (S)-*i*-Bu **10** R = (R)-CH₂OBn

7 R = (S)-Bn

11 R = Me **15** R = *s*-Bu

12 R = Et **16** R = *n*-Hx

13 R = Pr **17** R = (CH₂)₂NMe₂

14 R = Bu **18** R = (CH₂)₃NMe₂

19 R = OH

20 R = OMe

21 R = O-*t*-Bu

22 R = NHCH₂-3-pyridyl

23 R = NH(CH₂)₂-1-morpholinyl

Figure 1.
Potential prodrugs of riluzole prepared and evaluated for in vitro stability properties.

Figure 2. Stability results for potential prodrugs 4 – 26 evaluated in SGF, SIF, human plasma (*hPS*), mouse plasma (*mPS*), human liver microsomes (*hLM*) and mouse liver microsomes (*mLM*). Vertical bars represent percent disappearance of prodrug after 60 min incubation times (30 min incubation for microsome assays). See Supplementary Material for actual data in tabular form. [Intended for color reproduction]

Scheme 1.
Riluzole (**1**), and metabolites **2** and **3**

Scheme 2.

Preparation of riluzole prodrugs. Reagents and conditions (i) RCO_2H , EDCI, DCM; or ROCOCl , Et_3N , DCM; or $\text{RCO}_2\text{COR}'$, DMF, then $\text{R}_1\text{R}_2\text{NH}$, HATU, Et_3N , DMF (ii) TFA, DCM, 2hr if deprotection is required.

Scheme 3.

Enzymatic and chemical mechanisms for the release of riluzole from various prodrug classes.

Table 1

Evaluation of compound **9** in various in vitro human stability assays.³² Values are half-lives of prodrug disappearance in the indicated media.

9			
Simulated gastric fluid	Simulated intestinal fluid	Human liver microsomes	Human plasma stability
>60 min	98 min	>60 min	~300 min ^a

^aRiluzole formation occurred during the experiment

Table 2

Human liver microsome stability of riluzole **1** and prodrug **9** in liver microsomes with high and low Cyp 1A2 activity based on phenacetin metabolism to acetaminophen.

Microsomes	NADPH	Time (min)	Riluzole 1 ^a	Compound 9 ^a
High cyp1A2 Activity ^b	(+)	0	100%	100%
	(+)	30	47% ^c	70%
	(-)	30	120%	77%
Low cyp1A2 Activity ^b	(+)	0	100%	100%
	(+)	30	100%	78%
	(-)	30	91%	76%

^aCompounds tested at 1 μ M concentration, n = 3.

^bcyp1A2 activity level was based on microsomes 10 fold kinetic conversion ratio of phenacetin to acetaminophen

^cAccompanied by substantial formation of N-hydroxyriluzole