Published in final edited form as:

Chembiochem. 2015 July 27; 16(11): 1565–1570. doi:10.1002/cbic.201500256.

Tobramycin variants with enhanced ribosome-targeting activity

Dr. Marina Y. Fosso[#],

Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, College of Pharmacy, University of Kentucky, 789 S. Limestone, Lexington, KY 40536-0596, USA

Hongkun Zhu[#],

Department of Microbiology, Center for RNA biology, Ohio State University, 484 W. 12th Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210-1292, USA

Dr. Keith D. Green,

Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, College of Pharmacy, University of Kentucky, 789 S. Limestone, Lexington, KY 40536-0596, USA

Dr. Sylvie Garneau-Tsodikova, and

Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, College of Pharmacy, University of Kentucky, 789 S. Limestone, Lexington, KY 40536-0596, USA

Dr. Kurt Fredrick

Department of Microbiology, Center for RNA biology, Ohio State University, 484 W. 12th Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210-1292, USA

Sylvie Garneau-Tsodikova: sylviegttsodikova@uky.edu; Kurt Fredrick: Fredrick.5@osu.edu

Abstract

With the increased evolution of aminoglycoside (AG)-resistant bacterial strains, the need to develop AGs with (i) enhanced antimicrobial activity, (ii) the ability to evade resistance mechanisms, and (iii) the capability of targeting the ribosome with higher efficiency, is more and more pressing. The chemical derivatization of the naturally occurring tobramycin (TOB) by attachment of 37 different thioethers groups at the 6''-position led to the identification of generally poorer substrates of TOB-targeting AG-modifying enzymes (AMEs). Thirteen of these displayed better antibacterial activity than the parental TOB while retaining ribosome-targeting specificity. Analysis of these compounds *in vitro* shed light on the mechanism by which they act and revealed three with clearly enhanced ribosome-targeting activity.

Keywords

aminoglycoside; antibacterial; bacterial resistance; drug-modifying enzymes; translocation

Aminoglycosides (AGs) represent one of the major groups of antibiotics that target the bacterial ribosome. They interfere with translation,^[1] promote errors during decoding,^[2] and

Correspondence to: Sylvie Garneau-Tsodikova, sylviegttsodikova@uky.edu; Kurt Fredrick, Fredrick.5@osu.edu.

[#]These authors contributed equally to this work.

Supporting information for this article is given *via* a link at the end of the document.

inhibit translocation^[3] and ribosome recycling.^[4] AGs have been shown to target the decoding site of the 30S subunit, interacting at the internal loop of helix h44 in which A1408 lies across from A1492-A1493.^[5] The structurally most-conserved portion of the AGs (rings I and II) forms most of the contacts to h44. Ring I intercalates into h44, stacking on G1491 and forming hydrogen bonds with A1408. This occludes A1492 and A1493 from within h44 and hence stabilizes a “flipped out” conformation of these nucleotides. An analogous rearrangement occurs upon codon recognition during decoding: A1492 and A1493 flip out of h44 and dock into the minor groove of the codon-anticodon helix.^[6] The ability of AGs to stabilize this conformation of h44 thus appears to disturb translational fidelity during protein synthesis. AG binding pays the energetic cost of the rearrangement and thereby stabilizes tRNA in the A site. This leads to miscoding, because near-cognate aa-tRNA is also stabilized.^[2] This also inhibits translocation, because A-tRNA cannot readily move from the A- to the P-site.^[3, 7]

The clinical usefulness of AGs has been seriously compromised by the growing prevalence of various resistance mechanisms among pathogenic bacteria. These mechanisms include the decrease in AG uptake into the bacteria, the alteration of the bacterial ribosome, and the acquisition of AMEs, which represent the major cause of resistance to AGs.^[8] With more than 100 AMEs identified, these enzymes pose a serious health threat as they chemically alter the structures of AGs by *N*-acetylation (AACs), *O*-phosphorylation (APHs), or *O*-nucleotidylation (ANTs). To overcome this issue, AGs that could evade the action of AMEs, while still targeting bacterial ribosomal RNA, have been investigated. This has led to the development of structurally constrained AGs that would mimic the ribosome-bound AG conformation,^[9] guanidynylated AGs,^[10] and AG dimers,^[11] which have been shown to also bind viral and human RNAs.^[12]

We have previously synthesized a number of 6''-thioether TOB variants and assayed their antimicrobial activities.^[13] Many of these compounds exhibited bacteriolytic activity, raising the possibility that the mode of action in these cases involves membrane disruption rather than translation inhibition. Herein, we present the synthesis of 18 additional TOB variants (Scheme 1), establish their antibacterial activity profile, and investigate the mechanism by which the 18 novel and the 19 previously reported 6''-thioether TOB variants inhibit bacterial growth, using AG-resistant ribosomes with mutations in the primary helix h44 site.

TOB was modified at the 6''-position with various thioether groups (Scheme 1). While compounds **3a–j**, **l**, **m**, **p–t**, **jj**, and **kk** have been described previously,^[13–14] compounds **3k**, **n**, **o**, and **u–ii** are new. Our collection encompasses a diverse set of 6''-substituents, including linear, branched, and cyclic alkyl groups, and substituted aromatic rings.

Compounds **3a–f**, **k–p**, and **u–jj** were screened for their antibacterial activity against 19 diverse bacterial strains and their minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) were determined (Table S1). Among the variants with aliphatic substituents, compound **3f** (with a C₁₄ chain) is the most potent against several of the TOB-resistant bacterial strains, including the newly tested *E. faecium* (**C**) and *S. pyogenes* (**L**). Compounds bearing aromatic substituents generally exhibited promising antibacterial activity (MIC 9.4 µg/mL) against *B.*

anthracis (**A**), *B. subtilis* (**B**), *L. monocytogenes* (**E**), *M. smegmatis* (**I**), *S. aureus* NorA (**J**), *S. epidermidis* (**K**), *E. coli* (**N**), *H. influenzae* (**H**), and *S. flexneri* (**S**). Several of these, including compounds **3m–n**, **p**, **x–z**, **aa**, **cc–dd**, **ff**, **gg**, and **ii** were even capable of inhibiting the growth of various bacterial strains at an MIC 2.4 µg/mL. Furthermore, additional substitution at the *ortho*- or *para*-positions on the aryl ring appeared to improve antibacterial activity. It is worth mentioning that compounds **3m** (MIC 2.4 µg/mL), **3p** (MIC 1.2 µg/mL), and **3jj** (MIC 9.4 µg/mL) displayed a 16- to 128-fold drop in MIC value compare to TOB (MIC >150 µg/mL) against *E. coli* TolC (**O**), while compound **3z** (MIC 18.8 µg/mL) was 8 times more active than TOB (MIC 150 µg/mL) against *M. intracellulare* (**G**).

Since these compounds demonstrated comparable or better potency against *E. coli* strains, we further investigated their mechanisms of action. We compared their abilities to inhibit growth of *E. coli* 7 prn containing wild-type (WT), A1408G, or G1491U ribosomes. Strain 7 prn lacks all seven chromosomal rRNA operons and instead contains a single plasmid-borne rRNA operon.^[15] Hence, each of these strains contains a homogeneous population of WT or mutant ribosomes. Mutations A1408G and G1491U target the primary AG binding site of helix h44 of the 30S subunit, and each mutation confers resistance to a number of AGs.^[16]

TOB inhibited *E. coli* 7 prn WT (MIC 18.8 µg/mL) and failed to inhibit either 7 prn A1408G or G1491U (MIC >150 µg/mL) (Table S2), indicating that TOB inhibits growth by binding its h44 site, consistent with previous results.^[16a, 16c] Many of the TOB variants showed a similar activity profile against these strains, inhibiting growth in an A1408- and G1491-dependent manner. Several of these (**3m–n**, **p**, **x–z**, **aa–dd**, **ff–hh**), all carrying an aryl ring substituent, are more potent than TOB and retain target specificity.

Two compounds (**3f** and **3g**) were found to have indistinguishably strong antibacterial activity against 7 prn WT, A1408G, and G1491U, showing that these compounds act through a distinct mechanism, independent of h44. These compounds, substituted with linear alkyl chains (C₁₄ and C₁₆, respectively) were previously found to have cellulolytic activity,^[13] which may be their primary mechanism of action. Compounds **3d** and **3e**, with slightly shorter alkyl chains (C₁₀ and C₁₂, respectively), have lower activity with little-to-no h44-dependence.

Finally, a number of compounds were found to be virtually inactive against all the tested strains. These include compounds **3b**, **c**, **h**, and **i**; substituted respectively with C₆, C₈, C₁₈, or C₂₂ linear alkyl chains; compound **3s**, modified with 4-*t*-butyl thiophenyl group; and compound **3kk**, carrying a 4-methylcoumarin-7-yl group.

Some AGs are potent inhibitors of EF-G-dependent translocation.^[3, 7, 17] This is believed to be due to the stabilization of A-site tRNA that occurs when these antibiotics bind their primary site in h44. We suspected that TOB too would inhibit translocation, allowing effects of the 6''-substituents to be compared *in vitro*. To test this, we purified WT and A1408G ribosomes from the corresponding 7 prn strains and used toeprinting to measure the extent of translocation in the presence of various concentrations of TOB, and the data obtained were fit to the Hill equation. TOB strongly inhibited translocation of WT ribosomes (IC₅₀

16 μM) (Fig. 1, Table 1). Interestingly, the Hill coefficient derived from the curve-fitting was consistently less than 1 (0.5–0.7), raising the possibility that TOB binds its primary (h44) and secondary (H69)^[5a] sites in a negative cooperative manner. With A1408G ribosomes, TOB had substantially reduced potency (IC_{50} 700 μM), and the data could be well fit with a Hill coefficient of either 1 or >1 , depending on the particular experiment. These data show that inhibition of translocation by TOB normally depends on the primary h44 site, and mutation of that site qualitatively changes the concentration dependence of inhibition.

Next, the effects of several TOB variants on translocation were analyzed (Fig. 1, Table 1). Many behaved similarly to the parental compound, although differences correlating with the structure of the substituent were observed. Four compounds inhibited translocation more strongly than TOB in both WT and A1408G ribosomes. Three of these (**3n**, **aa**, **dd**) have *ortho*-substituted thioaryl groups, whereas the fourth carries a naphthyl moiety (**3jj**). For the former compounds, IC_{50} values were similarly decreased for WT and mutant ribosomes. Compound **3jj**, on the other hand, exhibited some loss of specificity, as the ratio of IC_{50} values (WT vs A1408G) dropped from 44 to 9. Compounds **3u** and **3x** (with *o*-methoxythiophenyl or *o*-fluorothiophenyl groups) were notably poorer inhibitors of translocation.

Compounds with *meta*-substituted thioaryl groups (**3o**, **v**, **y**, **bb**, **ee**) were generally less potent translocation inhibitors than their *ortho*-substituted counterparts and had reduced specificity for WT ribosomes (Fig. 1, Table 1). As with *ortho*-substituted set, the methoxythiophenyl and fluorothiophenyl modified compounds (**3v** and **y**) were the weakest inhibitors of the group.

Many of the compounds with *para*-substituted aryl rings (**3w**, **z**, **cc**, **ff**) gave complex inhibition curves that failed to fit the standard Hill equation (Fig. 1). In these cases, the lowest concentration of drug tested (10 μM) resulted in a substantial degree of inhibition, and further inhibition occurred only gradually over the higher range of drug concentrations. While the basis of this complexity remains unclear, although highly speculative, it may arise from two distinct populations of ribosomal complexes, one being considerably more sensitive to AG inhibition than the other. Accordingly, the data were fit to the sum of two Hill functions, yielding inflection points (*i.e.*, IC_{50} values) for the two putative distinct populations (Table 1). In the context of the cell, potent inhibition of even a small subset of translating ribosomes would have deleterious consequences, consistent with the enhanced biological activity of these variants (Table S2). Compound **3x**, which carries an *ortho*-fluorothiophenyl substituent, showed a similarly complex inhibition curve (Fig. 1). Finally, compounds **3d**, **e**, and **h**, with linear alkyl chains, failed to inhibit translocation *in vitro* (Fig. 1, Table 1).

Compounds **3n**, **aa**, and **dd**, with *ortho*-substituted aryl groups, thus appear to be more potent inhibitors of both bacterial growth and ribosomal translocation than TOB in *E. coli* strains. In these cases, inhibition of ribosomes *in vivo* and *in vitro* remains strictly dependent on A1408, showing that higher potency comes without loss of target specificity. These TOB variants thus bind the primary h44 site with increased affinity. How these 6''-aryl

substituents promote TOB binding remains to be determined. Co-crystal structures of ribosomes bound to related AGs provide some clues to the basis of enhanced binding.^[5a] Rings I and II of these TOB variants make similar sets of contacts to nucleotides 1407–1409 and 1491–1495 of helix h44. Ring III of gentamicin contacts nucleotides 1405–1407, forming hydrogen bonds with G1405 and C1407. Presumably, the analogous ring III of TOB occupies a similar position. The 6''-aryl groups of the TOB variants may form a favourable stacking interaction with a nearby rRNA nucleotide, such as C1404, and thereby stabilize binding.

For the linear alkyl substituted compounds, potency and mechanism of action change as a function of chain length. Compound **3a**, with the shortest chain (C₄) of the series, has biological activity indistinguishable from TOB, inhibiting cell growth in an A1408- and G1491-dependent manner. When the length of the chain is increased to C₆ (**3b**), antibacterial activity is completely lost (Table S2), presumably due to a steric clash with the ribosome, shedding light on the spatial constraints of the h44 site. Further lengthening of the alkyl chain to C₁₀ through C₁₆ (**3d–g**) restores antibacterial activity, although this activity is h44-independent. Indeed, these compounds do not appear to target the ribosome, as **3f** fails to inhibit *in vitro* translation^[13] and **3e** fails to inhibit translocation (Fig. 1). Rather, these compounds target the cell membrane and probably act *via* bacteriolysis.^[13] Compounds with even longer chains (**3h**, C₁₈; **3i**, C₂₂) lose potency, likely due to diminished bacteriolytic activity.

As quite a number of our TOB variants demonstrated good antibacterial activity, we evaluated their susceptibility to AMEs, which greatly contribute to bacterial resistance to AGs. We measured the relative activities of four AMEs with our TOB variants and compared them to that of TOB itself (Fig. 2). While an increase in catalytic activity of AAC(3)-IV^[1a] and ANT(4')-Ia^[18] was noticeable in the majority of TOB variants with aliphatic substituents (**3a–c**, **f**, **k**, **l**), in general, TOB variants bearing an aromatic ring appeared to be poorer substrates of these AMEs. This implies that TOB variants with aliphatic substituents were more susceptible to modifications by AAC(3)-IV and ANT(4')-Ia than TOB variants bearing an aromatic ring. In light of the information gathered from the crystal structures of various AMEs with our parent drug TOB (*e.g.*, AAC(2')-Ic (PDB: IM4D),^[19] APH(2'')-IVa (PDB 3SG8),^[20] Eis (PDB: 4JD6),^[21] along with that of AMEs with other AGs (*e.g.*, AAC(2')-Ic (PDB: IM4I),^[19] AAC(6')-Ib (PDB: 1V0C),^[22] APH(2'')-IVa (PDB: 3SG9),^[20] APH(2'')-Id/APH(2'')-IVa (PDB: 4DFB),^[23] and APH(3')-IIIa (PDB: 1L8T)^[24] with kanamycin A; AAC(2')-Ic (PDB: IM4G),^[19] AAC(6')-Iy (PDB: 1S3Z),^[25] and AAC(6')-Ib (PDB: 2BUE)^[22] with ribostamycin; AAC(6')-Ib (PDB: 2VQY),^[22] and Eis (PDB: 4QB9)^[26] with paromomycin; APH(3')-IIIa (PDB: 2B0Q)^[24] with neomycin B), it appears that the AG binding pocket of AACs is very hydrophilic, lined with several water molecules and amino acid residues with acidic side chains. Replacement of the hydroxyl group at the 6''-position with a hydrophobic moiety might thus weaken the interactions of the resulting AGs in the binding pocket, reducing their susceptibility to AMEs. Taking all of our combined data into consideration (Figs. 2 and 3, Tables 1 and S1), compounds **3n**, **aa**, and **dd**, which all contain an *ortho*-substituted thioaryl group, exhibited the most potent inhibitory activity against bacterial growth and ribosomal translation, and were also among

the poorest substrates for all the tested AMEs. These variants could therefore evade the action of TOB-targeting AMEs AAC(6')-Ie/APH(2'')-Ia,^[1a] AAC(6')-Ib',^[27] and ANT(4')-Ia better than TOB. It is important to note that the most common AAC(6') enzymes were the least active against all variants tested, a highly encouraging result.

In conclusion, 18 novel 6''-thioether TOB variants were synthesized and, together with the 19 previously reported, their antibacterial activity were evaluated. Compound **3f** (with a C₁₄ chain) exhibited the most potent antibacterial activity; meanwhile compounds bearing aromatic substituents were more active against *E. coli* strains. Importantly, we identified several TOB variants with enhanced ribosome-targeting activity. Compounds **3n**, **aa**, and **dd** inhibited bacterial growth and ribosomal translation better than TOB in *E. coli*. These compounds also served as poor substrates for many AMEs, including those known to target parental TOB, suggesting that AMEs will have little-to-no effect on these AG variants. As the addition of aromatic moieties to the 6''-position of TOB appears to be a promising avenue for enhancing ribosome-targeting activity, studies aimed at adding aromatic substituents to AGs at various positions are currently underway in our laboratories.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by startup funds from the University of Kentucky (S.G.-T.), and by NIH grants AI090048 (S.G.-T.) and GM072528 (K.F.). We thank A. Devaraj for help with toeprinting experiments.

References

1. a) Green KD, Chen W, Houghton JL, Fridman M, Garneau-Tsodikova S. ChemBioChem. 2010; 11:119–126. [PubMed: 19899089] b) Fosso MY, Li Y, Garneau-Tsodikova S. MedChemComm. 2014; 5:1075–1091. [PubMed: 25071928] c) Magnet S, Blanchard JS. Chem Rev. 2005; 105:477–498. [PubMed: 15700953]
2. Pape T, Wintermeyer W, Rodnina MV. Nat Struct Biol. 2000; 7:104–107. [PubMed: 10655610]
3. Peske F, Savelsbergh A, Katunin VI, Rodnina MV, Wintermeyer W. J Mol Biol. 2004; 343:1183–1194. [PubMed: 15491605]
4. Hirokawa G, Kiel MC, Muto A, Selmer M, Raj VS, Liljas A, Igarashi K, Kaji H, Kaji A. EMBO J. 2002; 21:2272–2281. [PubMed: 11980724]
5. a) Borovinskaya MA, Pai RD, Zhang W, Schuwirth BS, Holton JM, Hirokawa G, Kaji H, Kaji A, Cate JH. Nat Struct Mol Biol. 2007; 14:727–732. [PubMed: 17660832] b) Carter AP, Clemons WM, Brodersen DE, Morgan-Warren RJ, Wimberly BT, Ramakrishnan V. Nature. 2000; 407:340–348. [PubMed: 11014183] c) Ogle JM, Brodersen DE, Clemons WM Jr, Tarry MJ, Carter AP, Ramakrishnan V. Science. 2001; 292:897–902. [PubMed: 11340196] d) Perez-Fernandez D, Shcherbakov D, Matt T, Leong NC, Kudyba I, Duscha S, Boukari H, Patak R, Dubbaka SR, Lang K, Meyer M, Akbergenov R, Freihofer P, Vaddi S, Thommes P, Ramakrishnan V, Vasella A, Bottger EC. Nat Commun. 2014; 5:3112. [PubMed: 24473108]
6. Ogle JM, Carter AP, Ramakrishnan V. Trends Biochem Sci. 2003; 28:259–266. [PubMed: 12765838]
7. Shoji S, Walker SE, Fredrick K. Mol Cell. 2006; 24:931–942. [PubMed: 17189194]
8. a) Ramirez MS, Tolmasky ME. Drug Resist Updates. 2010; 13:151–171. b) Labby KJ, Garneau-Tsodikova S. Future Med Chem. 2013; 5:1285–1309. [PubMed: 23859208]

9. a) Zhao F, Zhao Q, Blount KF, Han Q, Tor Y, Hermann T. *Angew Chem.* 2005; 44:5329–5334. [PubMed: 16037995] b) Batisda A, Hidalgo A, Chiara JL, Torrado M, Corzana F, Perez-Canadillas JM, Groves P, Garcia-Junceda E, Gonzalez C, Jimenez-Barbero J, Asensio JL. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2006; 128:100–116. [PubMed: 16390137] c) Kling D, Heseck D, Shi Q, Mobashery S. *J Org Chem.* 2007; 72:5450–5453. [PubMed: 17579461] d) Zhang W, Chen Y, Liang Q, Li H, Jin H, Zhang L, Meng X, Li Z. *J Org Chem.* 2013; 78:400–409. [PubMed: 23228010]
10. Fair RJ, Hensler ME, Thienphrapa W, Dam QN, Nizet V, Tor Y. *ChemMedChem.* 2012; 7:1237–1244. [PubMed: 22639134]
11. a) Watkins D, Kumar S, Green KD, Arya DP, Garneau-Tsodikova S. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2015b) Michael K, Wang H, Tor Y. *Bioorg Med Chem.* 1999; 7:1361–1371. [PubMed: 10465410] c) Sucheck SJ, Wong AL, Koeller KM, Boehr DD, Draker KA, Sears P, Wright GD, Wong CH. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2000; 122:5230–5231. d) Agnelli F, Sucheck SJ, Marby KA, Rabuka D, Yao SL, Sears PS, Liang FS, Wong CH. *Angew Chem.* 2004; 43:1562–1566. [PubMed: 15022234] e) Kumar S, Xue L, Arya DP. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:7361–7375. [PubMed: 21524066] f) Berkov-Zrihen Y, Green KD, Labby KJ, Feldman M, Garneau-Tsodikova S, Fridman M. *J Med Chem.* 2013; 56:5613–5625. [PubMed: 23786357] g) Santana AG, Bastida A, del Campo TM, Asensio JL, Revuelta J, Synlett. 2011; 2:219–222.
12. Liang FS, Wang SK, Nakatani T, Wong CH. *Angew Chem.* 2004; 43:6496–6500. [PubMed: 15578772]
13. Herzog IM, Green KD, Berkov-Zrihen Y, Feldman M, Vidavski RR, Eldar-Boock A, Satchi-Fainaro R, Eldar A, Garneau-Tsodikova S, Fridman M. *Angew Chem.* 2012; 51:5652–5656. [PubMed: 22499286]
14. Shrestha SK, Fosso MY, Green KD, Garneau-Tsodikova S. 2015
15. a) Asai T, Zaporozhets D, Squires C, Squires CL. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 1999; 96:1971–1976. [PubMed: 10051579] b) Qin D, Fredrick K. *Mol Microbiol.* 2009; 71:1239–1249. [PubMed: 19154330]
16. a) Salian S, Matt T, Akbergenov R, Harish S, Meyer M, Duscha S, Shcherbakov D, Bernet BB, Vasella A, Westhof E, Bottger EC. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2012; 56:6104–6108. [PubMed: 22948879] b) Hobbie SN, Pfister P, Bruell C, Sander P, Francois B, Westhof E, Bottger EC. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2006; 50:1489–1496. [PubMed: 16569869] c) Hobbie SN, Pfister P, Brull C, Westhof E, Bottger EC. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2005; 49:5112–5118. [PubMed: 16304180]
17. Studer SM, Feinberg JS, Joseph S. *J Mol Biol.* 2003; 327:369–381. [PubMed: 12628244]
18. a) Porter VR, Green KD, Zolova OE, Houghton JL, Garneau-Tsodikova S. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun.* 2010; 403:85–90. [PubMed: 21040710] b) McQuade TJ, Shalloo AD, Sheoran A, Delproposto JE, Tsodikov OV, Garneau-Tsodikova S. *Anal Biochem.* 2009; 386:244–250. [PubMed: 19135023]
19. Vetting MW, Hegde SS, Javid-Majd F, Blanchard JS, Roderick SL. *Nat Struct Biol.* 2002; 9:653–658. [PubMed: 12161746]
20. Shi K, Houston DR, Berghuis AM. *Biochemistry.* 2011; 50:6237–6244. [PubMed: 21678960]
21. Houghton JL, Biswas T, Chen W, Tsodikov OV, Garneau-Tsodikova S. *ChemBioChem.* 2013; 14:2127–2135. [PubMed: 24106131]
22. Vetting MW, Park CH, Hegde SS, Jacoby GA, Hooper DC, Blanchard JS. *Biochemistry.* 2008; 47:9825–9835. [PubMed: 18710261]
23. Shakya T, Stogios PJ, Waglechner N, Evdokimova E, Ejim L, Blanchard JE, McArthur AG, Savchenko A, Wright GD. *Chem Biol.* 2011; 18:1591–1601. [PubMed: 22195561]
24. Fong DH, Berghuis AM. *EMBO J.* 2002; 21:2323–2331. [PubMed: 12006485]
25. Vetting MW, Magnet S, Nieves E, Roderick SL, Blanchard JS. *Chem Biol.* 2004; 11:565–573. [PubMed: 15123251]
26. Kim KH, An DR, Yoon HJ, Yang JK, Suh SW. *Acta Crystallogr F.* 2014; 70:1173–1179.
27. Green KD, Chen W, Garneau-Tsodikova S. *Antimicrob Agents Chemotherapy.* 2011; 55:3207–3213.

Figure 1.

Effects of TOB variants on ribosomal translocation. The extent of EF-G-dependent translocation was measured in control (WT; circles) and mutant (A1408G; squares) *E. coli* ribosomes with various concentrations of TOB variants.

Figure 2.

Bar graph showing the relative initial rates of reactions of the listed AMEs with variants **3a–jj**. Rates are normalized to TOB. * indicates that **3f** with AAC(6')-Ib' had activity >200% and is not shown here.

Scheme 1.
Synthesis of 6''-thioether TOB variants.

Table 1

Translocation inhibition (IC₅₀ values in μM) activities of TOB variants in WT or mutant A1408G *E. coli* ribosomes.

AG	Control (WT)	A1408G
TOB	16	700
3d	>1000	ND
3e	>1000	ND
3h	>1000	ND
3k	330	660
3l	230	>1000
3m	44	>1000
3n	5	250
3o	47	430
3p	36	>1000
3u	100	620
3v	100	990
3w	<1; 360 ^a	650
3x	<1; 210 ^a	310
3y	72	210
3z	<1; 280 ^a	350
3aa	7.7	370
3bb	19	140
3cc	<5; 290 ^a	240
3dd	1.2	230
3ee	33	180
3ff	<1; 250 ^a	320
3gg	39	130
3hh	66	270
3ii	350	410
3jj	11	100

^aCurves in these cases exhibited complex concentration dependence. Data were fit to the sum of two Hill functions, and the reported values correspond to the two deduced inflection points (IC₅₀ values).

ND = not determined.