Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. 2013 July 1; 23(13): 3732–3737. doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2013.05.011.

Synthesis and Biological Evaluation of Sorafenib- and Regorafenib-like sEH Inhibitors

Sung Hee Hwang, Aaron T. Wecksler, Guodong Zhang, Christophe Morisseau, Long V. Nguyen, Samuel H. Fu, and Bruce D. Hammock*

Department of Entomology and UC Davis Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of California, Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616-8584, USA

Abstract

To reduce the pro-angiogenic effects of sEH inhibition, a structure-activity relationship (SAR) study was performed by incorporating structural features of the anti-angiogenic multi-kinase inhibitor sorafenib into soluble epoxide hydrolase (sEH) inhibitors. The structural modifications of this series of molecules enabled the altering of selectivity towards the pro-angiogenic kinases C-RAF and vascular endothelial growth factor receptor-2 (VEGFR-2), while retaining their sEH inhibition. As a result, sEH inhibitors with greater potency against C-RAF and VEGFR-2 were obtained. Compound **4** (*t*-CUPM) possesses inhibition potency higher than sorafenib towards sEH but similar against C-RAF and VEGFR-2. Compound **7** (*t*-CUCB) selectively inhibits sEH, while inhibiting HUVEC cell proliferation, a potential anti-angiogenic property, without liver cancer cell cytotoxicity. The data presented suggest a potential rational approach to control the angiogenic responses stemming from sEH inhibition.

Keywords

soluble epoxide hydrolase (sEH); sorafenib; regorafenib; angiogenesis; C-RAF kinase; VEGFR-2

Soluble epoxide hydrolase (sEH, EC 3.3.2.10) is an enzyme that catalyzes the hydrolysis of epoxy fatty acids (EpFAs), including epoxyeicosatrienoic acids (EETs), to their less bioactive corresponding diols, such as dihydroxyeicosatrienoic acids (DHETs).¹ EETs possess anti-inflammatory² anti-hypertensive³ and analgesic properties.⁴ Therefore, sEH has been a therapeutic target for numerous indications such as inflammation, pain, hypertension, atherosclerosis, pulmonary diseases, renal end-organ damage and diabetes.^{2,5} EETs have also long been known as a pro-angiogenic factor particularly in the presence of vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF).^{6,7,8,9} While this is an attractive property during development and in certain cases such as wound healing,¹⁰ studies suggested that EETs can promote cancer progression.¹¹ For example, Panigrahy et al. recently demonstrated their contribution to tumor growth and metastasis.¹²

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +1-530-752-7519; fax: +1-530-752-1537; bdhammock@ucdavis.edu.

Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at <http://dx.doi.org/xxx>.

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.

Small-molecule kinase inhibitors¹³ such as sorafenib and regorafenib, are generally flat, aromatic molecules which mimic the adenine group of ATP which binds to a highly conserved ATP-binding pocket to inhibit kinase function.¹⁴ Sorafenib is a bi-aryl urea which was originally developed as a therapeutic agent targeting the pro-angiogenic kinase, C-RAF.¹⁵ However, the structural features of sorafenib demonstrated multi-kinase inhibitory activities with potent anti-angiogenic properties via the inhibition of pro-angiogenic receptor tyrosine kinases (RTKs), such as the VEGFR-2.¹⁶ As a result, sorafenib displays multi-inhibitory action in the RAF/MEK/ERK pathway and RTKs to combat tumor angiogenesis. It is currently used for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC)¹⁷ and renal cell carcinoma (RCC).¹⁸

Based on the structural similarity between sorafenib and one class of sEH inhibitors (Fig. 1A), we tested and found that sorafenib (Nexavar®, BAY 43-9006), also displays potent inhibitory activity against sEH (human sEH IC₅₀ = 12 ± 2 nM).¹⁹ As expected, sorafenib exhibits similar anti-inflammatory responses as conventional sEH inhibitors in lipopolysaccharide-induced inflammation murine model.¹⁹ In addition, we recently found that regorafenib (Stivarga™, BAY 73-4506), a second generation derivative of sorafenib for the treatment of colon or rectal cancer, is a more potent sEH inhibitor (human sEH IC₅₀ = 0.5 ± 0.1 nM). Data on clinical blood levels from sorafenib-treated patients suggest that the sEH should be significantly inhibited, which may be beneficial during cancer treatment with sorafenib by reducing renal toxicity, hypertension and pain,² often associated with pan-kinase anti-angiogenic agents.²⁰

On the other hand, urea-based sEH inhibitors {*t*-AUCB (**11**) and *t*-TUCB (**12**)} that are structurally related to sorafenib (Fig. 1A), did not display the cytotoxicity, growth inhibition, or apoptotic effects of sorafenib in RCC cell lines in our previous study.¹⁹ The first question asked was whether lack of antiproliferative effect in RCC cells was reflected in their kinase inhibitory activities. We screened *t*-AUCB and *t*-TUCB against a panel of known sorafenib targets and found that these sEH inhibitors display no significant multi-kinase inhibition at 10 μM concentration (Fig. 1B). This confirmed that there is a distinct structure-activity relationship (SAR) between sorafenib and structurally related urea-based sEH inhibitors against kinase inhibition, and probably explains the lack of antiproliferative effects of *t*-AUCB and *t*-TUCB in RCC cells. Alternatively, it raises the question whether structural modifications of urea-based sEH inhibitors could yield altered kinase inhibition properties towards sorafenib's primary anti-angiogenic targets, C-RAF and VEGFR-2, in order to balance the potential adverse effect stemming from the angiogenic responses of EETs resulting from high doses of sEH inhibitors.¹²

Herein, we report SAR study of hybrid compounds between sorafenib and conventional urea-based sEH inhibitors. To this end, we investigated whether these structural modifications could maintain sEH inhibition while altering kinase inhibitory activities (C-RAF and VEGFR-2, the two primary kinase targets of sorafenib believed to yield its anti-angiogenic properties) and cellular functions. The cellular responses of the compounds in this small library of sorafenib-like sEH inhibitors were determined in both endothelial HUVEC cells as an initial measurement of anti-angiogenesis, and two epithelial liver cell carcinoma cell lines (HepG2 and Huh-7) as an initial measurement of cytotoxicity.

The synthetic routes of urea-based sEH inhibitors containing the cyclohexyl group which are described herein have previously been disclosed.²¹ The preparation of urea compounds **4-15**, **17**, **21** and **22** is depicted in Scheme 1 and 2. Briefly geometric isomers (*trans*- and *cis*-) were made starting from the corresponding alcohols, **1-3** and **16** respectively, using Mitsunobu reaction we published previously.²² Distal rings in compounds **4-15**, and **17** were then installed by nucleophilic aromatic substitution (S_NAr) reaction.²³ The compounds **21**

and **22** were synthesized starting from picolinic acid according to the procedure used for the preparation of sorafenib.²⁴

Our previous SAR study with sEH inhibitors such as *t*-AUCB reveal that replacement of the cyclohexyl group, by rigid groups such as a phenyl or an acetylenyl group, results in equal to or slightly less sEH inhibitory activity.^{22,25} We hypothesized that the cyclohexyl group should be a bioisostere of the phenyl group due to its size and similar lipophilicity. Therefore we first modified the “proximal group” in sorafenib (Fig. 1A). Two geometric isomers *t*-CUPM (**4**, *trans*) and **17** (*cis*), were initially obtained replacing the phenyl ring of sorafenib by the 1,4-cyclohexyl moiety as the proximal ring.

As seen in Table 1, the high potency of *t*-CUPM was surprising because kinase inhibitors utilize a phenyl or planar heterocyclic ring to maximize lipophilic interaction with residues at ATP-binding site conserved throughout the kinome. Although the phenyl group in sorafenib is proposed to interact with three aromatic residues – Trp530 of the hinge region, Phe582 at the end of the catalytic loop, and Phe594 of the DFG-out ATP-binding region found in the protein kinase C-RAF²⁶ – we observed similar activity towards C-RAF inhibition with the *trans*-isomer *t*-CUPM. Both *cis*- and *trans*-isomers improved sEH inhibition by about 20-fold, but the *cis*-isomer **17** had much poorer C-RAF kinase inhibition compared to the *trans*-isomer *t*-CUPM, directing our investigation towards only the *trans*-isomers.

As previously observed in the original SAR study with sorafenib,²⁷ conversion of a methylamide in *t*-CUPM to a dimethylamide **5** on the distal group (Fig. 1A) causes loss in C-RAF inhibition due to the loss of H-bonding. Interchange of a methylaminocarbonyl group and a nitrogen atom in pyridyl group of *t*-CUPM led only to 2.3-fold less activity against C-RAF, suggesting that the methyl amide group in the pyridyl group of the compound **9** still makes contact with residues that interact with sorafenib. Shifting the position of the nitrogen atom in the pyridyl group or its removal has little effect on sEH activity. In contrast to C-RAF inhibition, the terminal carboxylic acid is not critical for potency on the distal ring of sEH inhibitors. When present the carboxylic acid is of similar activity on sEH to its esters and amides.^{22,28} Thus avoiding the methylaminocarbonyl group provides another way to block kinase activity among sEH inhibitors structurally related to sorafenib.²⁹

We then conversely left the proximal phenyl group intact - identical to that in sorafenib - and subsequently tested how replacement of the lipophilic group (R¹, Fig. 1A) in sorafenib by groups found in *t*-AUCB and *t*-TUCB affected C-RAF kinase inhibition. While the adamantyl group (**21**, Table 2) is not compatible for C-RAF inhibition, surprisingly, *p*-trifluoromethoxyphenyl group (**22**) became slightly more potent than sorafenib itself, suggesting that the lipophilic group (R¹, Table 1 and 2) is not restricted to 4-Cl, 3-CF₃-phenyl moiety for C-RAF inhibition. This indicates that the lack of inhibition of C-RAF in *t*-TUCB is more likely due to the lack of the amide group and the pyridine ring as the distal group than to the presence of the lipophilic group (R¹).

With these data in hand, we then converted the free carboxylic acid of sEH inhibitors *t*-CUCB (**7**), **10**, *t*-AUCB and *t*-TUCB to the corresponding methylamide group as in compounds **8**, and **13-15**, respectively. Except for compounds **8** and **13** which have the same lipophilic group (R¹) as seen in sorafenib, other compounds **14** and **15** lost C-RAF inhibitory activity.

However replacement of 4-chloro-3-trifluoromethoxy-phenyl group (R¹) in *t*-CUPM by 4-trifluoromethoxyphenyl group (R¹) with a *trans*-cyclohexyl proximal ring causes complete

loss of C-RAF inhibition in compound **6**, suggesting the importance of the 3,4-substituents of the R¹ group when the proximal phenyl group is replaced by the cyclohexyl group. Most sEH inhibitors do not need large 3,4-substituted aryl group at the lipophilic group (R¹) for potent sEH inhibitory activity,⁵ so lacking a single large 3, or 4-aryl substituent provides a simple way to reduce the potential of sEH inhibitors with a 1,4-cyclohexyl proximal ring to have inhibitory activity on the kinases studied here. Therefore we can conclude that unless the proximal ring is a complete planar group like the phenyl group as in sorafenib or compounds **21** and **22**, the lipophilic group (R¹) appears to require the 4-chloro,3-trifluoromethoxyphenyl moiety to inhibit C-RAF. Otherwise no C-RAF inhibition was observed in this series. Structurally diverse sEH inhibitors such as the ones with a piperidyl proximal ring¹⁹ (TPPU and TUPS, Table 1) are not known to be kinase inhibitors.

We then evaluated all of our compounds against VEGFR-2 to determine which of these compounds have potentially anti-angiogenic property. As seen in Figure 2, only four compounds (*t*-CUPM, **9**, **21** and **22**) displayed potency towards VEGFR-2 at 10 μ M concentration. These data yielded crucial evidence on the structural features which appear to be most important for VEGFR-2 inhibition. 1) There is some flexibility in the lipophilic group (R¹) and the proximal ring, and 2) compound **8** which is structurally similar to compound *t*-CUPM, shows little inhibitory activity suggesting the pyridine ring in R² is critical for VEGFR-2 inhibition.

To determine if potency against VEGFR-2 correlated with anti-angiogenic properties, we tested the ability of these compounds to halt the growth of HUVEC cells, which is used as preliminary model for angiogenesis.³⁰ We observed that compounds *t*-CUPM and **9** displayed similar effects on HUVEC cells compared to sorafenib, whereas **21** and **22** displayed over 2-fold loss in growth inhibition (Table 3). Interestingly, the compounds *t*-CUCB, **8**, and **17** also inhibited HUVEC growth with similar to the compound *t*-CUPM and **9** despite their lack of VEGFR-2 inhibition. This suggested that some of these compounds may be cytotoxic rather than anti-angiogenic.

Finally, since C-RAF is overexpressed in a high number of HCC tumors,³¹ and sEH is highly expressed in the liver,³² we treated two epithelial liver carcinoma cells, HepG2 and Huh-7, to correlate sEH, C-RAF and VEGFR-2 inhibition to cytotoxicity and potential anti-tumorigenic properties. Consistent with our previous observations in RCC cell lines,¹⁹ sEH inhibitors (TUPS and TPPU) that are structurally dissimilar to sorafenib displayed no observable effects on cell viability up to 100 μ M (data only shown for 25 μ M) (Table 3). Initial observation with compounds *t*-CUPM, **8**, **9**, and **13** suggested there may be a direct correlation between C-RAF inhibition and cytotoxicity; however, compounds **8** and **17** display similar ability to halt cellular proliferation despite significant differences in C-RAF inhibition. Moreover, among these compounds only *t*-CUPM and **9** inhibit both C-RAF and VEGFR-2. Lastly, **22** displayed similar cytotoxicity as *t*-CUPM, **9** and **22**, yet possessed significant differences in C-RAF inhibition. These data are consistent with previous work with sorafenib derivatives,³³ suggesting that C-RAF kinase inhibition may not be critical for the cytotoxic responses of sorafenib in HCC cells.

This study reveals that structural modification of sorafenib slightly alters sEH inhibitory activity, but affects C-RAF kinase and VEGFR-2 inhibition dramatically. Compounds possessing both a left side lipophilic group (R¹) and a right side distal group with a methylamide, or the identical right side groups as in sorafenib, retain C-RAF inhibition and/or VEGF receptor kinase inhibition. Such kinase inhibition is easy to remove from potent selective sEH inhibitors by altering the distal ring and thus avoid adverse effects associated with kinase inhibition. In addition, current study also demonstrated that a 1,4-cyclohexyl group, especially, as a *trans*-form as in the compound *t*-CUPM could be act as a bioisostere

for the phenyl ring in sorafenib, which give an advantage over sorafenib by having narrower spectrum of kinase inhibition. This is illustrated by the selective inhibition of C-RAF over B-RAF^{V600E} (Table 4). This selectivity should reduce B-RAF driven side effects for example when treating tumors initiated by oncogenic Kras where B-RAF is not required but C-RAF is critical for downstream MEK signaling.³⁴ In addition, reducing the aromatic character of the sorafenib improved its physical characteristics.³⁵ Therefore the compound *t*-CUPM might have reduced side effects compared to sorafenib.

Lastly, while conventional sEH inhibitors *t*-AUCB and *t*-TUCB display little cytotoxicity, the corresponding methylamide derivatives (**14** and **15**, respectively) significantly affected HCC cell viabilities. These data reinforce the notion that inhibition of sEH does not contribute to cytotoxicity and suggest that the carboxylic acid derivative confers selectivity towards sEH. In addition, compound *t*-CUCB displays an ability to inhibit the growth of HUVEC stimulated by growth factors such as VEGF, but does not suppress cancer cell growth, suggesting that general cytotoxicity is not the mechanism for inhibition of HUVEC growth. Therefore, such compounds might possess a potential to reduce adverse effect associated with angiogenesis related to sEH inhibition.

In summary, we have performed a SAR study against sEH and kinases, such as C-RAF and VEGFR-2, with a series of compounds that resemble both sorafenib and conventional urea-based sEH inhibitors. Sorafenib is such a potent inhibitor of the sEH that this activity is thought to stabilize endogenous EpFAs including anti-hypertensive, anti-inflammatory, and analgesic EETs. Surprisingly regorafenib is 24-fold more potent than sorafenib as a sEH inhibitor. A recent study showed that epoxides of the ω -3 fatty acid DHA, when stabilized against hydrolysis, inhibit angiogenesis, tumor growth and metastasis by a non-VEGF dependent pathway.³⁶

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by NIEHS grant ES02710, NIEHS Superfund grant P42 ES04699, NIH grant HL059699 and the CounterACT Program, National Institutes of Health Office of the Director, and the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, Grant Number U54 NS079202. Aaron T. Weckslar was supported by Award Number T32CA108459 from the National Institutes of Health. Bruce D. Hammock is a George and Judy Senior Fellow of the American Asthma Society.

References and notes

1. Spector AA, Fang X, Snyder GD, Weintraub NL. *Prog Lipid Res.* 2004; 43:55–90. [PubMed: 14636671]
2. Morisseau C, Hammock BD. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol.* 2013; 53:37. [PubMed: 23020295]
3. Spector AA, Norris AW. Action of epoxyeicosatrienoic acids on cellular function. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol.* 2007; 292:C996–C1012. [PubMed: 16987999]
4. Inceoglu B, Jinks SL, Ulu A, Hegedus CM, Georgi K, Schmelzer KR, Wagner K, Jones PD, Morisseau C, Hammock BD. Soluble epoxide hydrolase and epoxyeicosatrienoic acids modulate two distinct analgesic pathways. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2008; 105:18901–18906. [PubMed: 19028872]
5. Shen HC, Hammock BD. Discovery of inhibitors of soluble epoxide hydrolase: a target with multiple potential therapeutic indications. *J Med Chem.* 2012; 55:1789–1808. [PubMed: 22168898]
6. (a) Webler AC, Michaelis UR, Popp R, Barbosa-Sicard E, Murugan A, Falck JR, Fisslthaler B, Fleming I. Epoxyeicosatrienoic acids are part of the VEGF-activated signaling cascade leading to angiogenesis. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol.* 2008; 295:C1292–C1301. [PubMed: 18787075] (b) Oguro

- A, Sakamoto K, Suzuki S, Imaoka S. Contribution of hydrolase and phosphatase domains in soluble epoxide hydrolase to vascular endothelial growth factor expression and cell growth. *Biol Pharm Bull.* 2009; 32:1962–1967. [PubMed: 19952412]
7. Munzenmaier DH, Harder DR. Cerebral microvascular endothelial cell tube formation: role of astrocytic epoxyeicosatrienoic acid release. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol.* 2000; 278:H1163–H1167. [PubMed: 10749710]
8. Pozzi A, Macias-Perez I, Abair T, Wei S, Su Y, Zent R, Falck JR, Capdevila JH. Characterization of 5,6- and 8,9-epoxyeicosatrienoic acids (5,6- and 8,9-EET) as potent in vivo angiogenic lipids. *J Biol Chem.* 2005; 280:27138–27146. [PubMed: 15917237]
9. Wang Y, Wei X, Xiao X, Hui R, Card JW, Carey MA, Wang DW, Zeldin DC. Arachidonic acid epoxigenase metabolites stimulate endothelial cell growth and angiogenesis via mitogen-activated protein kinase and phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase/Akt signal pathways. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther.* 2005; 314:522–532. [PubMed: 15840765]
10. Sander AL, Sommer K, Neumayer T, Fleming I, Marzi I, Barker JH, Frank J, Jakob H. Soluble epoxide hydrolase disruption as therapeutic target for wound healing. *J Surg Res.* 2012 Epub ahead of print. 10.1016/j.jss.2012.10.034
11. (a) Zhang C, Harder DR. Cerebral capillary endothelial cell mitogenesis and morphogenesis induced by astrocytic epoxyeicosatrienoic acid. *Stroke.* 2002; 33:2957–2964. [PubMed: 12468797] (b) Michaelis UR, Fisslthaler B, Medhora M, Harder D, Fleming I, Busse R. Cytochrome P450 2C9-derived epoxyeicosatrienoic acids induce angiogenesis via cross-talk with the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR). *FASEB J.* 2003; 17:770–772. [PubMed: 12586744] (c) Fleming I. Epoxyeicosatrienoic acids, cell signaling and angiogenesis. *Prostag Oth Lipid M.* 2007; 82:60–67.
12. Panigrahy D, et al. Epoxyeicosanoids stimulate multiorgan metastasis and tumor dormancy escape in mice. *J Clin Invest.* 2012; 122:178–191. [PubMed: 22182838]
13. Cohen P. Protein kinases - the major drug targets of the twenty-first century? *Nature Rev Drug Discov.* 2002; 1:309–315. [PubMed: 12120282]
14. Zhang J, Yang PL, Gray NS. Targeting cancer with small molecule kinase inhibitors. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2009; 9:28–39. [PubMed: 19104514]
15. Loweinger TB, Riedl B, Dumas J, Smith RA. Design and Discovery of Small Molecules Targeting Raf-1 Kinase. *Curr Pharm Design.* 2002; 8:2269–2278.
16. Strumberg D. Preclinical and clinical development of the oral multikinase inhibitor sorafenib in cancer. *Drugs Today (Barc).* 2005; 41:773–784. [PubMed: 16474853]
17. Llovet JM, Ricci S, Mazzaferro V, Hilgard P, Gane E, Blanc JF, de Oliveira AC, Santoro A, Raoul JL, Forner A, Schwartz M, Porta C, Zeuzem S, Bolondi L, Greten TF, Galle PR, Seitz JF, Borbath I, Häussinger D, Giannaris T, Shan M, Moscovici M, Voliotis D, Bruix J. SHARP Investigators Study Group. Sorafenib in advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. *N Engl J Med.* 2008; 359:378–390. [PubMed: 18650514] (b) Rimassa L, Santoro A. Sorafenib therapy in advanced hepatocellular carcinoma: the SHARP trial. *Expert Rev Anticancer Ther.* 2009; 9:739–745. [PubMed: 19496710]
18. Wilhelm S, Carter C, Lynch M, Lowinger T, Dumas J, Smith RA, Schwartz B, Simantov R, Kelley S. Discovery and development of sorafenib: a multikinase inhibitor for treating cancer. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2006; 5:835–844. [PubMed: 17016424]
19. Liu J-Y, Park S-H, Morisseau C, Hwang SH, Hammock BD, Weiss RH. Sorafenib has soluble epoxide hydrolase inhibitory activity, which contributes to its effect profile in vivo. *Mol Cancer Ther.* 2009; 8:2193–2203. [PubMed: 19671760]
20. Strumberg D, Voliotis D, Moeller JG, Hilger RA, Richly H, Kredtke S, Beling C, Scheulen ME, Seeber S. Results of phase I pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic studies of the Raf kinase inhibitor BAY 43-9006 in patients with solid tumors. *Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2002; 40:580–581. [PubMed: 12503822]
21. Hammock BD, Hwang SH, Weckler AT, Morisseau C. Sorafenib derivatives as soluble epoxide hydrolase inhibitors. *Aug 23.2012 WO2012112570 A1.*
22. Hwang SH, Tsai H-J, Liu J-Y, Morisseau C, Hammock BD. Orally Bioavailable Potent Soluble Epoxide Hydrolase Inhibitors. *J Med Chem.* 2007; 50:3825–3840. [PubMed: 17616115]

23. Ramurthy S, Subramanian S, Aikawa M, Amiri P, Costales A, Dove J, Fong S, Jansen JM, Levine B, Ma S, McBride CM, Michaelian J, Pick T, Poon DJ, Girish S, Shafer CM, Stuart D, Sung L, Renhowe PA. Design and Synthesis of Orally Bioavailable Benzimidazoles as Raf Kinase Inhibitors. *J Med Chem.* 2008; 51:7049–7052. [PubMed: 18942827]
24. Bankston D, Dumas J, Natero R, Riedl B, Monahan M-K, Sibley RA. Scaleable Synthesis of BAY 43-9006: A Potent Raf Kinase Inhibitor for the Treatment of Cancer. *Org Process Res Dev.* 2002; 6:777–781.
25. Kasagami T, Kim I-H, Tsai H-J, Nishi K, Hammock BD, Morisseau C. Salicylate-urea based soluble epoxide hydrolase inhibitors with high metabolic and chemical stabilities. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett.* 2009; 19:1784–1789. [PubMed: 19216074]
26. Wan PT, Garnett MJ, Roe SM, Lee S, Niculescu-Duvaz D, Good VM, Jones CM, Marshall CJ, Springer CJ, Barford D, Marais R. Mechanism of activation of the RAF-ERK signaling pathway by oncogenic mutations of B-RAF. *Cell.* 2004; 116:855–867. [PubMed: 15035987]
27. Lowinger TB, Riedl B, Dumas J, Smith RA. Design and Discovery of Small Molecules Targeting Raf-1 Kinase. *Curr Pharm Design.* 2002; 8:2269–2278.
28. Kim IH, Morisseau C, Watanabe T, Hammock BD. *J Med Chem.* 2004; 47:2110–2122. [PubMed: 15056008]
29. Kim I-H, Tsai H-J, Nishi K, Kasagami T, Morisseau C, Hammock BD. 1,3-Disubstituted Ureas Functionalized with Ether Groups are Potent Inhibitors of the Soluble Epoxide Hydrolase with Improved Pharmacokinetic Properties. *J Med Chem.* 2007; 50:5217–5226. [PubMed: 17894481]
30. Esser S, Lampugnani MG, Corada M, Dejana E, Risau W. Vascular endothelial growth factor induces VE-cadherin tyrosine phosphorylation in endothelial cells. *J Cell Sci.* 1998; 111:1853–1865. [PubMed: 9625748]
31. Wilhelm SM, Adnane L, Newell P, Villanueva A, Llovet JM, Lynch M. Preclinical overview of sorafenib, a multikinase inhibitor that targets both Raf and VEGF and PDGF receptor tyrosine kinase signaling. *Mol Cancer Ther.* 2008; 7:3129–3140. [PubMed: 18852116]
32. Enayetallah AE, French RA, Thibodeau MS, Grant DF. Distribution of soluble epoxide hydrolase and of cytochrome P450 2C8, 2C9, and 2J2 in human tissues. *J Histochem Cytochem.* 2004; 52:447–454. [PubMed: 15033996]
33. Chen KF, Tai WT, Huang JW, Hsu CY, Chen WL, Cheng AL, Chen PJ, Shiau CW. Sorafenib derivatives induce apoptosis through inhibition of STAT3 independent of Raf. *Eur J Med Chem.* 2011; 46:2845–2851. [PubMed: 21531053]
34. Rebocho AP, Marais R. New insight puts CRAF in sight as a therapeutic target. *Cancer Discov.* 2011; 1:98–99. [PubMed: 22318779]
35. Lovering F, Bikker J, Humblet C. Escape from Flatland: Increasing Saturation as an Approach to Improving Clinical Success. *J Med Chem.* 2009; 52:6752–6756. [PubMed: 19827778]
36. Zhang G, et al. Epoxy metabolites of docosahexaenoic acid (DHA) inhibit angiogenesis, tumor growth and metastasis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* Apr 3.2013 10.1073/pnas.1304321110
37. Zambon A, Niculescu-Duvaz I, Niculescu-Duvaz D, Marais R, Springer CJ. Small molecule inhibitors of BRAF in clinical trials. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett.* 2012; 22:789–792. [PubMed: 22222036]

Abbreviations

HCC	hepatocellular carcinoma
RCC	renal cell carcinoma
GI₅₀	concentration required to inhibit cell growth by 50%
EpFAs	epoxygenated fatty acids
<i>t</i>-CUPM	<i>trans</i> -4-{4-[3-(4-chloro-3-trifluoromethyl-phenyl)-ureido]-cyclohexyloxy}-pyridine-2-carboxylic acid methylamide

<i>t</i>-CUCB	<i>trans</i> -3-{4-[3-(4-chloro-3-trifluoromethyl-phenyl)-ureido]-cyclohexyloxy}-benzoic acid
<i>t</i>-AUCB	<i>trans</i> -4-[4-(3-adamantan-1-yl-ureido)-cyclohexyloxy]-benzoic acid
<i>t</i>-TUCB	<i>trans</i> -4-{4-[3-(4-trifluoromethoxy-phenyl)-ureido]-cyclohexyloxy}-benzoic acid

Figure. 1.
(A) Structures of sorafenib and common sEH inhibitors. (B) Selectivity of sorafenib, *t*-AUCB (**11**) and *t*-TUCB (**12**) at 10 μ M concentration against 10 recombinant kinases.

Figure 2.
Percent inhibition against VEGFR-2 at 10 μ M concentration of test compounds.

Scheme. 1.

Reagents and conditions: (a) *trans*-4-aminocyclohexanol, DMF, rt, 12h; (b) i) KO^tBu, **18**, THF, 0 °C to rt, overnight, ii) a. 30% TFA in DCM, 6h, b. PyBOP, R₂R₃NH, DMF, rt, overnight; (c) i) NaH, 3-fluorobenzonitrile, DMF, rt, 1d, ii) 6N NaOH, EtOH, 90 °C, 1d; (d) PyBOP, MeNH₂, DMF, rt, 12h; (e) i) KO^tBu, **19**, THF, 0 °C to rt, overnight, ii) a. 30% TFA in DCM, 6h, b. PyBOP, MeNH₂, DMF, rt, 12h; (f) i) NaH, 4-fluorobenzonitrile, DMF, rt, 12h, ii) 6N NaOH, EtOH, 90 °C, 1d; (g) PyBOP, MeNH₂, DMF, rt, 12h; (h) i) *cis*-4-nitrobenzoic acid 4-aminocyclohexyl ester, ²² 4-chloro-3-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl isocyanate, Et₃N, DMF, rt, 12h, ii) 1N NaOH, THF, rt, 12h; (i) a. KO^tBu, **18**, THF, 0 °C to rt, overnight, b. 50% TFA in DCM, 6h, and c. PyBOP, MeNH₂, DMF, rt, 12h.

Scheme. 2.

Reagents and conditions: (a)²⁴ i) SOCl₂, DMF, 80 °C, 16h, ii) MeNH₂, MeOH, THF, 0 °C, 4h, iii) *p*-hydroxyaniline, KO*t*-Bu, K₂CO₃, DMF, 80 °C, 6h; (b) R₁-NCO, DMF, rt, 12h.

Table 1

IC₅₀ values of *N*-aryl, *N'*-cyclohexyl ureas **4-15**, and **17** for sEH and C-Raf.

	R ¹	R ²	A	B	sEH	C-Raf
sorafenib ^a					12±2	45±5
regorafenib ^a					0.5 ± 0.1	ND ^b
sunitinib ¹⁹					>10000 ¹⁹	>10000
<i>l</i> -CUPM (4)	4-Cl, 3-CF ₃ -Ph	3-C(=O)NHMe	<i>trans</i>	C	0.5 ± 0.1	75±5
5	4-Cl, 3-CF ₃ -Ph	3-C(=O)NMe ₂	<i>trans</i>	C	0.5±0.1	>10000
6	4-OCF ₃ -Ph	3-C(=O)NHMe	<i>trans</i>	C	0.5 ± 0.1	>10000
<i>l</i> -CUCB (7)	4-Cl, 3-CF ₃ -Ph	3-CO ₂ H	<i>trans</i>	C	8.6 ± 1.0	>10000
8	4-Cl, 3-CF ₃ -Ph	3-C(=O)NHMe	<i>trans</i>	C	1.0 ± 0.1	293±10
9	4-Cl, 3-CF ₃ -Ph	4-C(=O)NHMe	<i>trans</i>	N	0.5 ± 0.1	175±20
10	4-Cl, 3-CF ₃ -Ph	4-CO ₂ H	<i>trans</i>	C	0.5 ± 0.1	4300±400
<i>l</i> -AUCB (11)	adamantyl	4-CO ₂ H	<i>trans</i>	C	1.5 ± 0.5	>10000
<i>l</i> -TUCB (12)	4-OCF ₃ -Ph	4-CO ₂ H	<i>trans</i>	C	0.9 ± 0.1	>10000
13	4-Cl, 3-CF ₃ -Ph	4-C(=O)NHMe	<i>trans</i>	C	0.5 ± 0.1	340±40
14	adamantyl	4-C(=O)NHMe	<i>trans</i>	C	0.5 ± 0.1	>10000
15	4-OCF ₃ -Ph	4-C(=O)NHMe	<i>trans</i>	C	0.5 ± 0.1	>10000
17	4-Cl, 3-CF ₃ -Ph	3-C(=O)NHMe	<i>cis</i>	C	0.5 ± 0.1	1500±200
TPPU (1770) ¹⁹					3.7 ± 1.0 ¹⁹	>10000
TUPS (1709) ¹⁹					2.9 ± 1.0 ¹⁹	>10000

^a see the supplementary data,

^b ND = not determined.

Table 2

IC₅₀ values of ureas **21** and **22** for sEH and C-RAF.

	R ¹	sEH	C-RAF
		IC ₅₀ (nM)	
sorafenib	4-Cl, 3-CF ₃ -Ph	12±2	45±5
21	adamantyl	0.5±0.1	1000±100
22	4-OCF ₃ -Ph	0.5±0.1	30±5

Table 3GI₅₀ concentrations of test compounds for HCC cells (HepG2 and Huh-7) and HUVEC.

	GI ₅₀ (μM)		
	HepG2	Huh-7	HUVEC
sorafenib	4.5	4.0	6
4	7.0	8.0	11
5	10	8	ND
6	7.0	7.0	>25
7	>25	>25	10.5
8	6.5	7.5	11
9	7.0	8.0	10.5
10	>25	>25	25
11	>25	>25	>25
12	15	20	>25
13	>25	16	>25
14	7.0	5.5	>25
15	7.0	5.5	>25
17	7.5	8.5	10
21	10	7.0	25
22	7.0	7.0	>25
TUPS	>25	>25	>25
TPPU	>25	>25	>25

Table 4IC₅₀ values of compounds *t*-CUPM, **17**, **21**, and **22** for B-RAF^{V600E}.

B-RAF^{V600E}	
IC₅₀ (nM)	
sorafenib	13±2 (38 ¹⁸)
regorafenib	19 ³⁷
<i>t</i> -CUPM	570 ± 30
17	>5000
21	>5000
22	>5000