Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. 2014 August 15; 24(16): 3841–3844. doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2014.06.066.

Synthesis and receptor binding in *trans*-CD ring-fused A-CD estrogens: Comparison with the *cis*-fused isomers

Cristian Dabrota^a, Muhammad Asim^a, Christine Choueiri^a, Ana Gargaun^a, Ilya Korobkov^a, Ammara Butt^a, Kathryn E. Carlson^b, John A. Katzenellenbogen^b, James S. Wright^c, and Tony Durst^{a,*}

^aDepartment of Chemistry, University of Ottawa, D'Iorio Hall, 10 Marie Curie St., Ottawa, Canada K1N 6N5

^bDepartment of Chemistry, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA

^cDepartment of Chemistry, Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Dr., Ottawa, Canada K1S 5B6

Abstract

Ligands which selectively activate only one of the estrogen receptors, ER α or ER β , are current pharmaceutical targets. Previously, we have reported on substituted *cis* A-CD ligands in which the B-ring of the steroidal structure has been removed and *cis* refers the stereochemistry of the CD ring junction as compared to *trans* in estradiol. These compounds often showed good potency and selectivity for ER β . Here we report the synthesis and binding affinities for a similar series of *trans* A-CD ligands, and compare them to the *cis*-series. Counterintuitively, *trans* A-CD ligands, which are structurally more closely related to the natural ligand estradiol, show weaker binding and less β -selectivity than their *cis*-counterparts.

Current studies of the mechanism of disease initiation in breast cancer and several other cancers have focussed on the pathway starting from the natural estrogen 17 β -estradiol (E2), which by P450 aromatic hydroxylation can form the catechol estrogen and potentially the corresponding *ortho*-quinones [1]. Of various possible metabolites, the 3,4-quinone has been shown to intercalate into DNA and undergo Michael addition with DNA bases, ultimately forming depurinating adducts. DNA repair then leads to a high mutation rate and tumor initiation [2]. Once initiated, activation of the estrogen receptor ER α by endogenous ligands such as E2 has been demonstrated to promote proliferation of the cancer cells [3]. On the other hand, in some experiments activation of the receptor ER β may suppress cancer cell growth [4], hence the current intense interest in developing ER β -selective ligands [5].

We have recently reported the synthesis of a series of estrogen agonists represented by structure **1** shown in Fig. 1 in which the A ring and C rings are connected by a single bond [6–8], which we called A-CD estrogens. These compounds, especially those having electronegative substituents at C5, showed high affinity binding to the estrogen receptors (ERs), which for ER β was in some cases even stronger than the naturally occurring ligand

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. T. Durst: Phone, (613)562-5800, extension 6072; fax, (613)562-5170; tony.durst@uottawa.ca.

E2, which has the highest affinity of the natural ligands. We also observed some, and at times considerable, enhancement of ER β -receptor binding selectivity. In general, the compounds which showed this type of binding selectivity also acted as strong β -selective agonists; such compounds are denoted “super-agonists” when they exceed the maximum level of transcription activation by E2 [9]. In our initial report [6], we presented these compounds as having the general structure **2** (see Fig. 1), where the CD ring junction is *trans* in E2. Subsequently [7,8], we corrected the structure assignment and showed that the compounds we had prepared actually had the *cis*-CD ring structure, as shown below in the parent A-CD compound for series **1**.

We now present our work on the preparation of a series of compounds of structural type **2** which have the *trans*-CD ring junction. We compare their binding affinity to both estrogen receptors with the corresponding *cis*-compounds in series **1**. One might expect that retaining the geometry of the natural ligand at the CD interface would lead to optimum binding of the A-CD system. However, we will show that the unintended synthesis of compounds with structure **1** rather than **2** turns out to have been quite fortuitous, since the A-CD compounds that most closely resemble E2 generally bind less strongly and with lower selectivity to ER β than those in the *cis*-series **1**. As before, for convenience we have chosen the numbering in these compounds to correspond to the same numbering scheme as in E2 (see Fig. 1)

The *trans*-CD ring junction in the structures for series **2** was installed in one of two ways [10]. In the first approach (Scheme 2), the CD ring ketone **4** having the *trans*-ring junction was prepared following the method of Hajos and Parrish [11]. This ketone was then reacted with the lithio-derivative of a suitably protected ring A (moiety **5**) to give the alcohol **6**. Dehydration, with concomitant removal of the 3-phenol and 17-alcohol protecting groups, generally MEM-ethers, gave exclusively the alkene **7**. The typical overall yield over these two steps was in the 80–90% range. Simple hydrogenation with Pd/C as catalyst afforded quantitatively a mixture of isomers at C9 from which the major desired isomer **2** was isolated by preparative HPLC. The structure of the parent compound in the *trans*-series was verified by an X-Ray structure determination, shown in Fig. 2 for **2a**, the *trans*-CD parent compound.

The ^1H NMR spectrum of **2a** showed the C13 methyl group at 0.83 ppm; this compared with 1.05 ppm for the *cis*-CD-fused derivative **1**. This difference was consistent for all other pairs of compounds described herein. ^{13}C NMR also showed significant differences for the C17, which helped subsequently to verify whether either the *trans*- or the *cis*-CD ring juncture was present in derivatives of **1** and **2**.

Alternatively, reaction of **5** with the MEM-protected enone **8** yielded the allylic alcohol **9**. Acid-catalyzed dehydration with concomitant deprotection afforded the diene **9** (Scheme 2) in excellent yield. Hydrogenation with a variety of common catalysts, including Pd/C, gave mainly the compound **2**, as shown by ^1H NMR examination of the crude reaction product. Small amounts of the three other possible stereoisomers were also formed. The formation of **2** as the major product in the hydrogenation of **10** indicates that the C14–C15 double bond is hydrogenated first, with preferential delivery of hydrogen from the less hindered side, to give the C8–C11 alkene **11** having the *trans*-CD ring junction. Subsequent hydrogenation

gives, as expected, mainly the isomer **2** with the (S) configuration at C9. In contrast, hydrogenation of the *cis* CD-junctioned alkene **12** gives a close to a 1:1 mixture of stereoisomers at C9.

Either of the above sequences or slight variations thereof were used to prepare a series of 10 derivatives carrying a variety of substituents in the A-ring [10]. [For example, the 5-hydroxy derivative **2i** was obtained in three steps by first converting 1,3-dibenzyloxy-4-bromobenzene into its lithio-derivative and reaction of this species with the enone **8**. Purification of the reaction mixture via silica gel chromatography (Scheme 3) resulted in formation of the diene **1**, which was hydrogenated to give a mixture of compounds from which **2i** was obtained after reverse phase HPLC purification.

As pointed out above, the isomeric compounds **1** and **2** were most readily distinguished by focusing on the quaternary methyl group. In all of the compounds described these methyl hydrogens absorbed in the 0.83–0.85 ppm range for the *trans*-compounds but more downfield at 1.09 to 1.11 ppm for the *cis*-isomers. In the ^{13}C spectrum this carbon was found near 12 ppm in the *trans*-compounds but again considerably more downfield near 20 ppm for the corresponding *cis*-isomers [10,11].

Binding affinities to the estrogen receptors ER α and ER β are given as relative binding affinities (RBAs), where the RBA for estradiol on both ERs is 100. The RBA value and selectivity ratio RBA(ER β)/RBA(ER α) for a series of 10 *cis* A-CD (series **1**) and 10 *trans* A-CD compounds (series **2**) containing saturated C-rings are given in Table 1. The binding affinity ratios RBA(*trans*)/RBA(*cis*) for both receptors are given in Table 2.

The values of the RBAs shown in Table 1 are correlated via a sigmoidal dependence with the transcription activation, or “potency”, of each ligand in its receptor [8], so the RBAs are already useful predictors of potential drug activity. With four distinct data sets (*cis*- and *trans*-ligands in two receptors, ER α and ER β) there are a number of interesting comparisons that can be made. First, consider the selectivity of *trans* vs. *cis* ligands binding to ER α and ER β . The β -selectivity of the parent *trans* compound **2a**, for example, is given by the β/α ratio = $10/2.38 = 4.2$ (see Table 1), whereas for the *cis* compound **1a** it is $21.5/1.47 = 14.6$, over three times larger. Looking at the selectivity ratios β/α for each series, the average value for the ligands in the *trans*-series is 3.7, whereas for the *cis*-series it is 9.1. Thus, the *cis*-series is much more β -selective than the *trans*-series.

It is also of interest to compare the magnitude of the RBAs of the *trans* vs. the *cis* compounds in Table 1. For example, comparing the *trans/cis* RBA ratio for compound **c** (**2c/1c**) in ER α , the ratio is $4.22/27.3 = 0.15$ (see Table 2); the *cis*-structure is much more strongly bound. Continuing in this way, the average ratio for *trans/cis* binding into ER α for the 10 ligands is 0.48, showing that the binding of the *cis*-compounds into ER α is, generally speaking, over twice as strong as that of the *trans*-compounds. Performing the same operations on binding to the ER β receptor, the *trans/cis* ratio for compound **a** (**2a/1a**) is $10/21.5 = 0.47$. The average for the whole series is only 0.20, so binding to the ER β receptor favors the *cis*-structures by a factor of five.

It should also be pointed out that in the *cis* series **1**, the compounds such as **1c** (5-F) and **1e** (5-CF₃), which showed the highest binding affinities, also had the lowest β/α selectivity, 5.0 and 2.3, respectively. In contrast, some ligands with more modest binding affinities to both receptors **1a** (parent) and **1i** (5-OH) showed the maximum selectivity for the ER β to ER α ratio of ca. 15. The very low binding affinity of the 5-OCH₃ derivatives **1j** relative to those carrying CF₃, CH₃ and OH groups at this position was unexpected. For comparison, the binding affinity to the ER β of **1e** (5-CF₃) is about 1700 times greater than that of **1j**. A similar comparison for **2e** vs **2j** gives a value of close to 130. It should be possible to explain these large differences by examining the interaction of these substituents with receptor residues, work that we have already begun.

Since the results presented above were so unexpected, we looked at two more series of compounds with the *trans*-, *cis*-CD ring fusion (**Series 7** and **Series 14**, Table 3). These were prepared during the course of our studies and are C9–C11 alkenes having the *trans* CD ring fusion (**Series 7**) and the *cis* fusion (**Series 14**). The compounds in **Series 7** were obtained as intermediates in the synthesis via Scheme 2; those in **Series 14** were formed in the preparation of the *cis* A-CD compounds [10]. As shown in Table 3, even though relatively few pairs are currently available, the trends discussed above are also seen for these sets of isomers. Thus, the average β/α selectivity ratio for the *cis*-series **7** (6.6) is higher than that for the *trans*-series **14** (2.7) by a factor of 2.4; this is identical to the ratio for the *cis*-series **1** and *trans*-series **2** (factor of 2.4). Since the alkene series show no special advantages over the alkanes and is more likely to be reactive *in vivo*, and since the *cis*-series **1** shows improved β -selectivity and binding affinity compared to the *trans*-series **2**, future drug development using these compounds will be focussed on the *cis*-series **1**.

We have begun a series of modeling studies aimed at understanding the trends in reactivity described above [8,14]. In future work we will focus on understanding the origins of the ER β -selectivity described in this paper, as well as the preference for the *cis*- rather than the *trans*-geometry for the binding affinity in the receptors ER α and ER β .

Acknowledgments

We thank the Canadian Breast Cancer Foundation (Ontario Region) for grants to J. S. W. and T. D. which supported this research. Support from the National Institutes of Health (PHS 5R01 DK015556 to J. A. K.) is also gratefully acknowledged.

Abbreviations

RBA	relative binding affinity
ER	estrogen receptor
E2	17 β -estradiol

References and notes

1. Cavalieri EL, Rogan EG, Chakravarti D. Cell. Mol. Life Sci. 2002; 59:665. [PubMed: 12022473]
2. Li KM, Todorovic R, Devanesan P, Higginbotham S, Kofeler H, Ramanathan R, Gross ML, Rogan EG, Cavalieri EL. Carcinogenesis. 2004; 25:289. [PubMed: 14578156]

3. Zahid M, Kohli E, Saeed M, Rogan E, Cavalieri E. *Chem. Res. Toxicol.* 2006; 19:164. [PubMed: 16411670]
4. Strom A, Hartman J, Foster JS, Kietz S, Wimalasena J, Gustafsson J-A. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 2004; 101:1566. [PubMed: 14745018]
5. Minutolo F, Macchia M, Katzenellenbogen BS, Katzenellenbogen JA. *Medicinal Res. Rev.* 2011; 31:364.
6. Asim M, El-Salfiti M, Qian Y, Choueiri C, Salari S, Cheng J, Shadnia H, Bal M, Pratt MAC, Carlson KE, Katzenellenbogen JA, Wright JS, Durst T. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* 2009; 19:1250. [PubMed: 19167882]
7. Erratum to ref. 6 in *Bioorg. Med. Chem Lett.* 2010; 20:6861.
8. Wright JS, Shadnia H, Anderson JM, Durst T, Asim M, El-Salfiti M, Choueiri C, Pratt MAC, Ruddy SC, Lau R, Carlson KE, Katzenellenbogen JA, O'Brien PJ, Wan L. *J. Med. Chem.* 2011; 54:433. [PubMed: 21190382]
9. Min J, Wang P, Srinivasan S, Nwachukwu JC, Guo P, Huang M, Carlson KE, Katzenellenbogen JA, Nettles KW, Zhou H-B. *J. Med. Chem.* 2013; 56:3346. [PubMed: 23586645]
10. Choueiri, C. Ph.D Thesis. University of Ottawa; 2013.
11. Micheli RA, Hajos ZG, Cohen N, Parrish DR, Portland LA, Sciamanna W, Scott MA, Wehrli PA. *J. Org. Chem.* 1975; 40:675. [PubMed: 1133631]
12. The preparation of the A ring precursor bromides is described in ref. 8.
13. All new compounds were characterized by high field ^1H and ^{13}C NMR and HREIMs. For example, for the 5-OH derivative, **2i**: ^1H NMR (400 MHz, acetone- d_6) δ 8.11 (s, 1H, OH) 8.00 (s, 1H, OH), 6.97 (d, J = 8.3Hz, 1H), 6.36 (d, J = 2.4Hz, 1H), 6.20 (dd, J = 8.3, 2.4Hz, 1H) 3.69-3.61 (m, 2H, H17 and O-H), 2.88-2.74 (m, 1H), 2.05-1.89 (m, 1H), 1.84 (dt, J = 12.5, 3.2Hz, 1H), 1.74-1.27 (m, 8H), 1.17(dt, 12.7, 4.7 Hz, 1H), 0.84 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (100 MHz, acetone- d_6) δ 157.7, 157.1, 129.3, 126.3, 108.3, 104.4, 82.8, 47.5, 44.4, 39.4, 39.1, 34.0, 31.9, 30.2, 27.3, 11.9. HRMS calc'd for $\text{C}_{16}\text{H}_{22}\text{O}_3$: 262.1569. Found: 262.1570.
14. Wright JS, Anderson JM, Shadnia H, Durst T, Katzenellenbogen JA. *J. Comput. Aided Mol. Des.* 2013; 27:707. [PubMed: 23975271]

Figure 1.

Stereochemical relationship between the natural estrogen **E2**, the A-CD estrogens, *cis*-series **1** and the *trans*-series **2**. The *cis* and *trans* designations refer to the stereochemistry at the CD ring junction.

Figure 2.
X-ray structure determination of compound **2a**, the *trans* A-CD parent compound.

Scheme 1.

Scheme 2.

Scheme 3.

Table 1

Relative binding affinities for *cis*-series **1** and *trans*-series **2** to estrogen receptors ER α and ER β , selectivity ratio for ER β /ER α . Error bars in parentheses.

Compound	<i>cis</i> A-CD structures (1)			<i>trans</i> A-CD structures (2)		
	RBA(α)	RBA(β)	β/α	RBA(α)	RBA(β)	β/α
a (H)	1.47(0.26)	21.5(4.6)	14.6	2.38(0.19)	10(1.3)	4.2
b (4-F)	1.04(0.09)	8.7(1.5)	8.4	1.68(0.15)	6.84(0.41)	4.1
c (5-F)	27.3(0.70)	135.5(7.3)	5.0	4.22(0.06)	13.6(0.35)	3.2
d (5-Me)	2.82(0.45)	33.6(6.2)	11.9	0.47(0.1)	1.3(0.3)	2.8
e (5-CF ₃)	89.7(13.8)	205(23)	2.3	4.8(1.1)	4.9(0.1)	1.0
f (4,5-diF)	4.62(0.93)	42.8(5.5)	9.3	0.92(0.15)	7.3(1.8)	7.9
g (2,4,5-triF)	0.186(0.01)	1.73(0.02)	9.3	0.029(0.004)	0.097(0.025)	3.3
h (2,4-diF 5-Me)	0.75(0.20)	5.35(0.88)	7.1	0.08(0.007)	0.226(0.04)	2.8
i (5-OH)	0.26(0.07)	3.97(0.08)	15.3	0.037(0.003)	0.15(0.04)	4.1
j (5-OMe)	0.016(0.002)	0.123(0.03)	7.7	0.010(0.001)	0.037(0.008)	3.7
Estradiol (E2)				100.	100.	1.0
Average β/α ratio *			9.1			3.7

* E2 is not included in the averages.

Table 2Ratio of binding to ER α and ER β for the *trans*-compounds **2** vs the *cis*-compounds **1**.

Compound	ER α	ER β
a(Parent, R=H)	1.62	0.47
b(4-F)	1.58	0.79
c(5-F)	0.15	0.10
d(5-Me)	0.17	0.04
e(5-CF ₃)	0.054	0.024
f(4,5-diF)	0.20	0.17
g(2,4,5-triF)	0.16	0.056
h(2,4-diF 5-Me)	0.11	0.042
i(5-OH)	0.14	0.038
j(5-OMe)	0.63	0.30
Average β/α ratio	0.48	0.20

Table 3

Relative binding affinities for *cis*-series **14** and *trans*-series **7** to estrogen receptors ER α and ER β , and selectivity ratio for ER β /ER α .

		<i>trans</i> -series 7		<i>cis</i> -series 14			
		<i>cis</i> A-CD structures (14)		<i>trans</i> A-CD structures (7)			
Compound		RBA(α)	RBA(β)	RBA(α)	RBA(β)	β/α	β/α
a (H)		0.39(0.04)	6.8(0.6)	2.38(0.19)	17.3(2.4)	17	4.7
b (5-F)		4.5 [*] (0.8)	49 [*] (7)	21.7(0.4)	38(11)	11 [*]	1.7
c (5-Cl)		60(8)	118(4)	9.7(2.2)	14.1(3.8)	2.0	1.5
d (5-CF ₃)		122(11)	174(8)	-----	-----	1.4	-----
e (5-OMe)		0.004(0.001)	0.022(0.004)	0.006(0.001)	0.029(0.002)	5.5	4.8
f (2,4,5-triF)		-----	-----	0.099(0.33)	0.076(0.8)	-----	0.8
g (2,5-diF)		0.44(0.02)	2.7(0.5)			6.1	
h (4-F,5-Cl)		50(6)	149(9)			3.0	
i (4,5-diCl)		3.0(0.8)	55(9)			18.3	
j (2,4-diF 5-Cl)		3.35(0.06)	6(2)			1.8	
		Average β/α ratio				6.6	2.7

^{*} Determined for a ~1:1 mixture of 8-9 and 9-11 alkenes