Published in final edited form as:

J Med Chem. 2015 May 28; 58(10): 4194–4203. doi:10.1021/jm501831g.

Synthesis and Evaluation of 1,2,4-Triazolo[1,5-*a*]pyrimidines as Antibacterial Agents Against *Enterococcus faecium*

Huan Wang, Mijoon Lee, Zhihong Peng, Blas Blázquez, Elena Lastochkin, Malika Kumarasiri, Renee Bouley, Mayland Chang*, and Shahriar Mobashery*

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and Eck Institute for Global Health, University of Notre Dame, 423 Nieuwland Hall, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, United States

Abstract

Rapid emergence of antibiotic resistance is one of the most challenging global public health concerns. In particular, vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium* infections have been increasing in frequency, representing 25% of enterococci infections in intensive care units. A novel class of 1,2,4-triazolo[1,5-*a*]pyrimidines active against *E. faecium* is reported herein. We used a three-component Biginelli-like heterocyclization reaction for the synthesis of a series of these derivatives based on reactions of aldehydes, β -dicarbonyl compounds, and 3-alkylthio-5-amino-1,2,4-triazoles. The resulting compounds were assayed for antimicrobial activity against the ESKAPE panel of bacteria, followed by investigation of their *in vitro* activities. These analyses identified a subset of 1,2,4-triazolo[1,5-*a*]pyrimidines that had good narrow-spectrum antibacterial activity against *E. faecium* and exhibited metabolic stability with low intrinsic clearance. Macromolecular synthesis assays revealed cell-wall biosynthesis as the target of these antibiotics.

*Corresponding Authors: For M.C.: mchang@nd.edu. For S.M.: mobashery@nd.edu.

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

Supporting Information

Additional experimental information and ^1H and ^{13}C NMR spectra of all the other compounds. The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/jm501831g.

INTRODUCTION

Antibacterial resistance is on the increase, becoming one of the most serious public health challenges.^{1–3} The ESKAPE bacteria (*Enterococcus faecium*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Acinetobacter baumannii*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and *Enterobacter* species) are important pathogens, not only because they account for nearly one-third of all nosocomial infections in the United States^{4,5} but also because they are broadly resistant to existing antibiotics.^{4,6} Enterococci have been important clinically for some time. They are either intrinsically resistant to antibiotics or have acquired resistant mechanisms to many commonly used antibiotics.^{7–9} This is especially true for bloodstream infections, for which they are the third most common bacterial pathogen.¹⁰ *E. faecalis* and *E. faecium* are the major enterococcal species.¹¹ Although *E. faecium* is known to be a harmless commensal inhabitant of the gastrointestinal tract, it causes invasive diseases such as neonatal meningitis,¹² endocarditis,¹³ urinary tract infections,¹⁴ surgical wound infections,¹⁵ and bloodstream infections,¹⁶ accounting for 20% of enterococcal infections in the United States.¹¹ It shows high resistance to many commonly used antibacterial reagents.¹⁷ Vancomycin-resistant *E. faecium* (VRE) emerged in the 1980s in the United Kingdom and France.^{18,19} The VRE strains disseminated globally rapidly.¹⁹ Infections by VRE represent 25% of enterococci infections in intensive-care units,²⁰ and in some medical centers more than 70% of *E. faecium* isolates are vancomycin-resistant.^{11,21} There is a genuine need for new antibacterial agents against this organism, and agents selective for this organism are especially sought. The draw of selective agents is that they would be useful in treatment of infections by *E. faecium*, yet they would spare other organisms in the microbiota, mitigating the opportunity for rapid emergence of resistance clinically.

We report herein the discovery of a novel class of antibacterial agents, the triazolopyrimidines, which emerged from an in silico screening against a penicillin-binding protein (PBP), which is an essential enzyme for peptidoglycan biosynthesis.²² The in silico screening was performed against 1.2 million compounds. Of the top 2500 hits, we purchased 118 compounds, which were then evaluated against the living bacteria of the ESKAPE panel. The triazolopyrimidine emerged as a template with antibacterial activity, of which we synthesized 68 analogues. These derivatives, along with 18 additional compounds that could be purchased commercially, were evaluated for antibacterial activity. We disclose herein the structural template and describe the structure–activity relationship (SAR) for antibacterial activity for this set of molecules.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Discovery of the Lead Template

We used in silico docking and scoring of 1.2 million drug-like compounds from the ChemDiv subset of the ZINC database²³ against the X-ray structure of PBP2a (PDB ID: 1VQQ),²⁴ in discovery of antibiotics. We reasoned that identification of the leads from the in silico screening should result in discovery of compounds that would have the ability to cross-inhibit more than one PBP, as the active sites of these enzymes are very similar. Whereas these in silico methodologies have come a long way in sophistication in the past few years, there still exists a degree of uncertainty in identifying molecules that indeed bind

to the target site for which they were screened. As such, as will be described, experimental verification is critical. We analyzed the top 2500 best scoring compounds and clustered them in groups according to structural similarity using hierarchical clustering. From these, we selected 118 compounds for purchase from ChemDiv and screened them for antibacterial activity against the ESKAPE panel of organisms. Therefore, the bar was set high from the outset, as demonstration of antibacterial activity with living bacteria was selected as the minimal criterion for a molecule to move forward. This is in contrast to the possibility that the compound inhibiting avidly the recombinant target in vitro, which might turn out to be devoid of any activity with living bacteria. Compound **1** (Scheme 1) emerged from this screening, with an MIC of 8 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ against *E. faecium*. No antibacterial activity was observed against the other bacteria in the ESKAPE panel. Hence, this compound fits the narrow-spectrum antibiotic definition for enterococci, which is desirable, as described earlier. However, as will be elaborated below, and as a cautionary note on in silico drug discovery, compound **1** did not inhibit PBP2a, which was the basis of the screening. Hence, notwithstanding the prediction by computation that this compound should inhibit PBP2a, it does not. Yet, it possesses antibacterial activity, as activity against living bacteria was set as the minimal criterion for moving forward. Optimization of the antibacterial activity became the goal of the diversification of structure that we undertook.

Chemistry

The general procedure for the syntheses of triazolopyrimidine derivatives is outlined in Scheme 1. We made 68 analogues of compound **1** by this method. Compounds **III**, as key intermediates in these syntheses, were prepared by the reaction of 3-amino-5-thiol-1,2,4-triazole with alkyl bromides in the presence of triethyl amine as the base. Subsequently, equal amounts of derivatives **I**, **II**, and **III** were heated in DMF for roughly 15–20 min (with a temperature of 130–160 °C), which yielded the desired compounds after the work up. This three-component Biginelli-like heterocyclization method^{25,26} afforded the rapid and efficient synthesis of a focused library of these compounds, using commercially available reagents. In light of the essentially single-pot reactions that led to these molecules, only the final compounds have been characterized in this report.

Antibacterial Activity and SAR Analysis

The SAR of the compound class was investigated by synthesizing structural variations at each of the three sites designated as SAR1, SAR2, and SAR3 (Figure 1) and by determination of their minimal-inhibitory concentration (MIC) values against *E. faecium*. Initial studies of the scaffold focused on modifications of the aromatic ring in the pyrimidine segment (SAR1). The antibacterial activities (as MICs) for these compounds are shown in Table 1. In the SAR1 study, the synthesis was driven by preserving the original functionalities for the SAR2 and SAR3 regions in the lead compound, while the SAR1 position was varied. Various functional groups, such as substituted phenyl and heterocycles, were introduced in SAR1. Substitution of the 4-*i*-propyl group with a hydrogen atom resulted in loss of antibacterial activity (**2**), which indicates addition of a substituent on the phenyl ring is necessary. An evaluation of derivatives with lipophilic steric bulk showed that the anti-*E. faecium* activity is linked with the size of the lipophilic group (–Ph-4-*i*-Bu (**5**)/–Ph-4-*i*-Pr (**1**)/–Ph-4-Et (**4**) > –Ph-4-Me (**3**)/–Ph-4-H (**2**)). Assessment of compounds with

bulky oxygen and sulfur substituents at the *para*-position also indicates a similar trend. Introduction of 4-*O*-*i*-Pr (**10**) and 4-SEt (**13**) into the scaffold showed 32-fold improvement of the anti-*E. faecium* activity, compared to the 4-OCH₃ (**7**) and 4-SMe (**12**) derivatives, which were devoid of activity. A series of analogues with nitrogen (or alkylated nitrogen) at this position, –Ph-4-NH₂ (**15**), –Ph-4-NMe₂ (**16**), –Ph-4-NEt₂ (**17**), –Ph-4-(1-pyrrolidinyl) (**18**), and –Ph-4-NHCOCH₃ (**19**), were prepared. Compound **16** with –Ph-4-NMe₂ was the best in this series. It showed 32-fold improved potency over compounds **15** (–Ph-4-NH₂) and **19** (–Ph-4-NHCOCH₃), 4-fold better antimicrobial activity than compound **18** (–Ph-4-(1-pyrrolidinyl)), and slightly better activity than compound **17** (–Ph-4-NEt₂); also 2-fold improved antibacterial activity over the lead compound **1**. Introduction of small electron-donating groups at the *para*-position of the phenyl ring resulted in loss of antimicrobial activity, as observed for compounds **6**, **7**, **8**, and **9**. On the other hand, introduction of electron-withdrawing groups at the *para*-position of the phenyl ring retained activity (**11**, **21**, and **24**) but not in all cases (**14**, **25**, and **26**), as compared to compound **1**. Analogues with halogen substituents did not show any activity (**22** and **23**). The variant **20** had no activity. From all the above findings, compounds with –Ph-4-*i*-Pr (**1**), –Ph-4-Et (**4**), –Ph-4-*O*-*i*-Pr (**10**), –Ph-4-OCF₃ (**11**), –Ph-4-NMe₂ (**16**), –Ph-4-NEt₂ (**17**), and –Ph-4-CF₃ (**21**) groups showed good activity (MIC of 8 µg/mL).

In general, the substituents that gave good activity at the *para*-position of the ring gave poorer or no activity when placed at the *meta*- or *ortho*-positions. Compounds with –Ph-3-CF₃, –Ph-3-*i*-Pr, –Ph-3-Et, –Ph-3-*O*-*i*-Pr, and –Ph-3-OCF₃ substitutions (**28**, **29**, **30**, **31**, and **32**) were examples of these analogues. Also, compound **27**, with CF₃ at the *ortho*-position of the phenyl group, was inactive. Substitutions of the phenyl group with heterocyclic rings were also tried, including thiophene, furan, pyrrole, imidazole, indole, and pyridine rings (compounds **33–41**); however, these changes were generally not tolerated, resulting in loss of activity. The nonaromatic cyclohexyl moiety in the SAR1 position (**42**) was devoid of activity. On the basis of the SAR1 findings, the phenyl ring was necessary for activity. Furthermore, substituents at the *para*-position improved the activity. Introduction of bulky electron-donating groups proved useful in improving activity against *E. faecium*. We selected –Ph-4-NMe₂ (**16**) from SAR1 for its favorable log *P* value and for its MIC of 4 µg/mL.

Next, our exploration shifted to modifications at the amide position within the bicyclic system SAR2 (Figure 1 and Table 1). Considering that the antibacterial activity favors the presence of the –Ph-4-NMe₂ (of the SAR1), the subsequent analogues were investigated with this moiety retained. Replacing the carboxamide with an ester, *N*-methylcarbox-amide, and *N*-phenylcarboxamide generated analogues **43**, **45**, and **51**, respectively. While the substituted amides (**45** and **51**) led to slight reduction of activity compared to compound **16**, the ester derivative (**43**) lost antimicrobial activity. Introduction of cyclohexenone next to the 1,6-dihydropyridine (**46**) abolished activity. This series of molecules shows that replacement of the carboxamide with an ester or cyclic ketone led to loss of activity. We also evaluated the commercially available derivatives **44**, **47–50**, and **52–63**. Unfortunately, all were devoid of antibacterial activity. These analyses indicated that the carboxamide segment of the molecular scaffolding was desirable for activity.

Our attention turned to the SAR3 series bearing the –Ph-4-NMe₂ (SAR1) and –CONH₂ (SAR2) moieties on the structural template (Figure 1 and Table 1). Replacement of the *S*-benzyl moiety with smaller groups (**64–71**) resulted in loss of activity. Introduction of longer R₃ functionalities (than *S*-benzyl) in compounds **72**, **73**, and **74** were not tolerated. Further exploration focused on the necessity of the phenyl ring and methylene of the *S*-benzyl group on the SAR3 region. Compound **75** was generated by replacing the phenyl ring with a pyridine ring; compound **76** was generated by removing the methylene from **75**. These changes resulted in loss of activity, which indicated the need for the phenyl ring and the methylene group. These results indicate the requirement for the *S*-benzyl group, which was retained in the next group of compounds that was prepared. A subset of analogues was made to investigate whether the antibacterial activity could be improved via substituents on the *S*-benzyl ring at the SAR3 position. A total of 10 *para*-substituted analogues (**77–86**) were made. While the ones with electron-donating groups at the *para*-position did not show good activity (**77–79**), compounds with electron-withdrawing groups at the *para*-position, such as the trifluoromethylmercaptan (**82**) and the cyano (**84**), were as active as compound **1** and slightly less active than compound **16**. The nitro (**83**) analogue was as good as compound **16**. Compounds **80** and **81** had no activity. The SAR3 revealed that the *S*-benzyl group and electron-withdrawing groups at the *para*-position are favored.

The most active compounds (**1**, **10**, **13**, **16**, **83**, and **84**) were further evaluated for their MICs with several additional enterococci strains, both from commercial as well as the clinical sources (Table 2). These included strains that were resistant to erythromycin, tetracycline, vancomycin, and teicoplanin.

In Vitro Metabolic Stability, Plasma-Protein Binding, and Cytotoxicity

The most active compounds (**1**, **10**, **13**, **16**, **83**, and **84**) were evaluated for metabolic stability using human liver S9, which contains microsomal and cytosolic fractions capable of phase I and II metabolism. In general, the compounds were metabolically stable, with half-lives of around 1 h or longer (Table 3). Replacement of the –Ph-4-*i*-Pr (**1**) with –Ph-4-O-*i*-Pr (**10**) did not change the half-life, however –Ph-4-SEt (**13**) and –Ph-4-NMe₂ (**16**) resulted in increased metabolic stability and lower intrinsic clearance. Retention of –Ph-4-NMe₂ at R₁ and –SCH₂Ph-4-NO₂ at R₃ (**83**) and –SCH₂Ph-4-CN at R₃ (**84**) also increased the half-lives and consequently resulted in the lowest intrinsic clearances. We also ascertained plasma–protein binding for these compounds in human plasma using equilibrium dialysis (Table 3). Compound **1** showed 98.7 ± 0.7% plasma–protein binding. Plasma–protein binding of compounds **10**, **13**, and **83** was high. Compound **16** had 97.6 ± 0.1% plasma–protein binding, while compound **84** had the lowest protein binding at 96.8 ± 0.4%. Forty three percent of the 1500 frequently prescribed drugs on the market show protein binding greater than 90%, and 27% of anti-inflammatory drugs have protein binding above 99%.²⁷ Moreover, many marketed antibiotics, including daptomycin,²⁸ oxacillin,²⁹ teicoplanin,³⁰ rifampicin,³¹ and clindamycin,³¹ have plasma protein binding of >91%. Compounds **1**, **10**, **13**, **16**, **83**, and **84** were evaluated for in vitro toxicity in the hemolysis assay (Table 3). The most active of these compounds (e.g., compounds **16** and **84**) showed 1–2% hemolysis of red blood cells at a fixed concentration of 64 µg/mL for the antibiotic.

The minimal-bactericidal concentrations (MBCs) of compounds **1**, **10**, **13**, **16**, **83**, and **84** were determined using *E. faecium* NCTC7171. The MBC values were 32, 16, 16, 32, 16, and 16 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ for the given antibiotics, respectively. This reveals that cidal effects are seen at 2–4-fold above the MIC values.

Mechanism of Action

Compound **16** was selected to investigate the mode of action by using macromolecular synthesis assays with *E. faecium* NCTC7171. Incorporation of radiolabeled precursors [methyl- ^3H]-thymidine, [5,6- ^3H]-uridine, L-[4,5- ^3H]-leucine, or D-[2,3- ^3H]-alanine into DNA, RNA, protein, or peptidoglycan, respectively, was monitored in the logarithmic phase of growth of this bacterium. Ciprofloxacin, rifampicin, tetracycline, and meropenem, which are known inhibitors of each corresponding pathway, were used as positive controls. Compound **16** showed notable inhibition of peptidoglycan biosynthesis. It did not inhibit replication, transcription, or translation appreciably by these assays (Figure 2). These experiments with living bacteria were followed up by additional in vitro transcription and translation assays. A transcriptAid T7 high-yield transcription kit was used for in vitro transcription assay; an *Escherichia coli* S30 extract for circular DNA kit plus a β -galactosidase assay were used for a tandem in vitro transcription and translation assay. Compound **16** did not show any effect on transcription and/or translation (Figure 3) in these assays.

Binding Assays for PBP2a of *S. aureus* and PBP5fm of *E. faecium*

Compound **1** was conceived from in silico screening of PBP2a of *S. aureus*. We explored if recombinant purified PBP2a was actually inhibited by this compound. At concentrations of up to 100 $\mu\text{g/mL}$, we observed no inhibition. We then turned to PBP5fm, an important PBP of *E. faecium*, as these compounds had activity against this organism. Similarly, at up to 100 $\mu\text{g/mL}$, we saw no inhibition of this enzyme. We also investigated compound **84**, an active compound that emerged from the SAR analyses. This compound also lacked the ability to inhibit both the recombinant proteins. As a last experiment, we also investigated if other PBPs in the *E. faecium* membrane fractions were inhibited in the presence of these compounds. The data from the membrane fractions were less clear due to the low copy numbers of PBPs in this organism. Regardless, no inhibition was apparent in membranes exposed to these antibiotics. It would appear that triazolopyrimidines are not inhibitors of PBPs.

CONCLUSION

In summary, we synthesized 68 compounds and investigated the SAR of these and 18 additional compounds that were purchased. The most active compounds were evaluated in several *E. faecium* strains, including clinical VRE isolates, as well as assessed for metabolic stability, plasma–protein binding, and cytotoxicity. Compound **16** has promising activity against *E. faecium*, is metabolically stable, has low intrinsic clearance, and lower plasma–protein binding.

Notwithstanding the fact that the in silico segment of screening was done against the PBP2a structure, compounds **1** and **84** did not inhibit this enzyme in vitro, nor the PBP5fm of *E. faecium* or likely the PBPs in the *E. faecium* membranes. This exercise reveals the limitations of in silico search. Experimental verification is critical. We state that by setting the bar high at the outset for the experimental verification, we went directly for documentation of the antibacterial activity with living bacteria rather than the in vitro exploration of inhibition of recombinant PBP2a. If the bar had not been set high, by mere inhibition assays for PBPs the triazolopyrimidine class of antibacterials would not have been discovered.

An important aspect of the work with the triazolopyrimidine template is that a large set of molecules of this class can be prepared essentially in single-pot three-component reactions, using the Biginelli-like heterocyclization reaction. This ease in preparation should lend itself to further exploration of the SAR. Notwithstanding our observation that cell-wall biosynthesis is inhibited by this class of antibiotics, the identification of the actual target in the pathway is open for elucidation.

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

General Chemistry

All chemicals, reagents, and solvents were used directly as purchased without further purification. Chemical shifts in ^1H NMR and ^{13}C NMR spectra are reported in parts per million (ppm) relative to tetramethylsilane (TMS). ^1H and ^{13}C NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker AVANCE III HD 400 or Bruker AVANCE III HD 500 spectrometers (Bruker Daltonik, Bremen, Germany) equipped with BBFO probes and operating at ^1H resonance frequencies of 400.13 and 500.13 MHz, respectively, or using Varian UnityPlus 300 spectrometer (Varian Inc., Palo Alto, CA, USA). High-resolution mass spectra were measured using a Bruker micrOTOF/Q2 mass spectrometer in ESI ionization. Compounds **1**, **44**, **47–50**, and **52–63** were purchased from ChemDiv with >95% purity. All synthetic compounds had >95% purity as determined by high-performance liquid chromatography.

General Procedure for Syntheses of the 1,2,4-Triazolo[1,5-*a*]pyrimidine Analogues

The 1,2,4-triazolo[1,5-*a*]pyrimidine analogues were synthesized by using a modification of a known method.²⁶ Equimolar mixtures of compounds **I**, **II**, and **III** (0.80–2.0 mmol) were heated in 0.30–0.50 mL of DMF within the temperature range of 130–160 °C for 15–20 min. After cooling, acetone (10–25 mL) was added to the solution. The mixture was allowed to stand for a minimum of 2 h or overnight (depending on the nature of the derivative), at which time the product precipitates. The precipitate was filtered to obtain the desired product in the range of 6.0–82% of yield. Spectral data for the six active compounds (**1**, **10**, **13**, **16**, **83**, and **84**) are given below. The spectral data of the remaining 63 compounds are given in the Supporting Information.

Compounds **III** were synthesized by a modification of a known method.³² 3-Amino-5-thiol-1,2,4-triazole (6.0 mmol) was stirred in anhydrous DMF (10 mL) for 5 min. Triethylamine (7.0 mmol) was added dropwise to this solution, and the mixture was stirred under a nitrogen atmosphere at room temperature for 15 min. Alkyl bromide (7.0 mmol) was

added to the solution, followed by stirring under a nitrogen atmosphere at room temperature for 3 h. The solvent was evaporated to dryness, and the resulting residue was partitioned between ethyl acetate (30 mL) and water (20 mL). The organic layer was washed with brine (10 mL), dried over anhydrous MgSO_4 , and it was concentrated under reduced pressure. The crude product was typically purified by column chromatography with hexane/ethyl acetate.

2-(Benzylthio)-7-(4-isopropylphenyl)-5-methyl-4,7-dihydro-[1,2,4]triazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine-6-carboxamide (1)—Compound **1** was prepared from 4-isopropyl-

benzaldehyde (0.30 g, 2.0 mmol), acetoacetamide (0.20 g, 2.0 mmol), and 3-amino-5-(benzylthio)-1,2,4-triazole (0.41 g, 2.0 mmol) in 44% yield as a white solid (0.37 g). ^1H NMR ($\text{DMSO}-d_6$, 400 MHz): δ 10.09 (s, 1H, NH), 7.29–7.12 (m, 10H, 9ArH + NH), 6.96 (s, 1H, NH), 6.31 (s, 1H, CHN), 4.24 (A of AB, 1H, $J = 13.4$ Hz, one of SCH_2), 4.16 (B of AB, 1H, $J = 13.4$ Hz, one of SCH_2), 2.86 (m, 1H, $\text{CH}(\text{CH}_3)_2$), 2.17 (s, 1H, $=\text{C}-\text{CH}_3$), 1.18 (d, $J = 7.1$ Hz, 6H, $\text{CH}(\text{CH}_3)_2$). ^{13}C NMR ($\text{DMSO}-d_6$, 75 MHz): δ 167.8, 157.2, 148.5, 148.1, 138.2, 138.1, 136.0, 128.8, 128.3, 127.2, 127.0, 126.4, 103.4, 59.7, 34.8, 33.2, 23.9, 17.4. HRMS (ESI) m/z : 442.1672 calcd for $\text{C}_{23}\text{H}_{25}\text{N}_5\text{NaOS}$ [$\text{M} + \text{Na}$] $^+$; 442.1697 obsd

2-(Benzylthio)-7-(4-isopropoxyphenyl)-5-methyl-4,7-dihydro-[1,2,4]triazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine-6-carboxamide (10)—Compound **10** was prepared from 4-isopropoxy-

benzaldehyde (0.16 g, 1.0 mmol), acetoacetamide (0.10 g, 1.0 mmol), and 3-amino-5-(benzylthio)-1,2,4-triazole (0.21 g, 1.0 mmol) in 80% yield as a white solid (0.35 g). ^1H NMR ($\text{DMSO}-d_6$, 400 MHz): δ 10.08 (s, 1H, NH), 7.41–7.18 (m, 6H, 5ArH + NH), 7.13 (d, 2H, $J = 8.7$ Hz, ArH), 6.97 (s, 1H, NH), 6.85 (d, 2H, $J = 8.7$ Hz, ArH), 6.28 (s, 1H, CHN), 4.56 (m, 1H, $\text{OCH}(\text{CH}_3)_2$), 4.23 (A of AB, 1H, $J = 13.2$ Hz, one of SCH_2), 4.15 (B of AB, 1H, $J = 13.2$ Hz, one of SCH_2), 2.17 (s, 3H, $=\text{C}-\text{CH}_3$), 1.25 (d, 6H, $J = 5.9$ Hz, $\text{OCH}(\text{CH}_3)_2$). ^{13}C NMR ($\text{DMSO}-d_6$, 125 MHz): δ 167.7, 157.3, 157.0, 148.3, 138.1, 135.8, 132.5, 128.7, 128.5, 128.2, 127.0, 115.1, 103.4, 69.1, 59.4, 34.8, 21.8, 17.3. HRMS (ESI) m/z : 458.1621 calcd for $\text{C}_{23}\text{H}_{25}\text{N}_5\text{NaO}_2\text{S}$ [$\text{M} + \text{Na}$] $^+$; 458.1644 obsd.

2-(Benzylthio)-7-(4-ethylthiophenyl)-5-methyl-4,7-dihydro[1,2,4]-triazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine-6-carboxamide (13)—Compound **13** was prepared from 4-methylthio-

benzaldehyde (0.20 g, 1.2 mmol), acetoacetamide (0.12 g, 1.2 mmol), and 3-amino-5-(benzylthio)-1,2,4-triazole (0.25 g, 1.2 mmol) in 79% yield as a light-yellow solid (0.42 g). ^1H NMR ($\text{DMSO}-d_6$, 400 MHz): δ 10.13 (s, 1H, NH), 7.27–7.15 (m, 10H, 9ArH + NH), 6.99 (s, 1H, NH), 6.31 (s, 1H, CHN), 4.24 (A of AB, 1H, $J = 13.4$ Hz, one of SCH_2Ph), 4.16 (B of AB, 1H, $J = 13.4$ Hz, one of SCH_2Ph), 2.97 (q, 2H, $J = 7.3$ Hz, SCH_2CH_3), 2.17 (s, 3H, $=\text{C}-\text{CH}_3$), 1.23 (t, 3H, $J = 7.3$ Hz, SCH_2CH_3). ^{13}C NMR ($\text{DMSO}-d_6$, 100 MHz): δ 167.5, 157.2, 148.4, 138.0, 137.8, 136.3, 136.0, 128.6, 128.1, 127.8, 127.4, 126.9, 103.1, 59.5, 34.7, 25.8, 17.3, 14.1. HRMS (ESI) m/z : 460.1236 calcd for $\text{C}_{22}\text{H}_{23}\text{N}_5\text{NaOS}_2$ [$\text{M} + \text{Na}$] $^+$; 460.1260 obsd.

2-(Benzylthio)-7-(4-dimethylaminophenyl)-5-methyl-4,7-

dihydro[1,2,4]triazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine-6-carboxamide (16)—Compound **16** was prepared from 4-dimethylamino-benzaldehyde (0.22 g, 1.5 mmol), acetoacetamide (0.15 g, 1.5 mmol), and 3-amino-5-(benzylthio)-1,2,4-triazole (0.31 g, 1.5 mmol) in 33% yield as an

off-white solid (0.21 g). ^1H NMR (DMSO- d_6 , 300 MHz): δ 10.02 (s, 1H, NH), 7.30–7.17 (m, 6H, 5ArH + NH), 7.05 (d, 2H, J = 8.6 Hz, ArH), 6.94 (s, 1H, NH), 6.65 (d, 2H, J = 8.6 Hz, ArH), 6.21 (s, 1H, CHN), 4.23 (A of AB, 1H, J = 13.2 Hz, one of SCH₂), 4.15 (B of AB, 1H, J = 13.2 Hz, one of SCH₂), 2.87 (s, 6H, N(CH₃)₂), 2.16 (s, 3H, =C-CH₃). ^{13}C NMR (DMSO- d_6 , 75 MHz): δ 167.8, 156.8, 150.2, 148.3, 138.1, 135.6, 128.7, 128.2, 128.0, 127.0, 112.0, 103.6, 59.5, 40.1, 34.8, 17.3. HRMS (ESI) m/z : 421.1805 calcd for C₂₂H₂₅N₆OS [M + H]⁺; 421.1808 obsd.

2-(4-Nitrobenzylthio)-7-(4-dimethylaminophenyl)-5-methyl-4,7-dihydro[1,2,4]triazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine-6-carboxamide (83)—

Compound **83** was prepared from 4-dimethylamino-benzaldehyde (0.22 g, 1.5 mmol), acetoacetamide (0.15 g, 1.5 mmol), and 3-amino-5-[4-nitro(benzylthio)]-1,2,4-triazole (0.38 g, 1.5 mmol) in 20% yield as a light-yellow solid (0.14 g). ^1H NMR (DMSO- d_6 , 400 MHz): δ 10.00 (s, 1H, NH), 7.99 (d, 2H, J = 8.7 Hz, ArH), 7.47 (d, 2H, J = 8.7 Hz, ArH), 7.16 (s, 1H, NH), 7.04 (d, 2H, J = 8.7 Hz, ArH), 6.93 (s, 1H, NH), 6.64 (d, 2H, J = 8.7 Hz, ArH), 6.20 (s, 1H, CHN), 4.34 (A of AB, 1H, J = 14.0 Hz, one of SCH₂), 4.23 (B of AB, 1H, J = 14.0 Hz, one of SCH₂), 2.89 (s, 6H, N(CH₃)₂), 2.16 (s, 3H, =C-CH₃). ^{13}C NMR (DMSO- d_6 , 100 MHz): δ 167.7, 155.9, 150.1, 148.4, 146.7, 146.2, 135.5, 129.9, 128.0, 123.1, 111.8, 103.5, 59.5, 39.9, 33.7, 17.2. HRMS (ESI) m/z : 466.1656 calcd for C₂₂H₂₄N₇O₃S [M + H]⁺; 466.1631 obsd.

2-(4-Cyanobenzylthio)-7-(4-dimethylaminophenyl)-5-methyl-4,7-dihydro[1,2,4]triazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine-6-carboxamide (84)—

Compound **84** was prepared from 4-dimethylamino-benzaldehyde (0.12 g, 0.80 mmol), acetoacetamide (0.08 g, 0.80 mmol), and 3-amino-5-(4-cyanobenzylthio)-1,2,4-triazole (0.19 g, 0.80 mmol) in 15% yield as a yellow solid (53 mg). ^1H NMR (DMSO- d_6 , 400 MHz): δ 9.99 (s, 1H, NH), 7.62 (d, 2H, J = 8.7 Hz, ArH), 7.43 (d, 2H, J = 8.7 Hz, ArH), 7.15 (s, 1H, J = 8.7 Hz, NH), 7.03 (d, 2H, J = 8.7 Hz, ArH), 6.92 (s, 1H, NH), 6.65 (d, 2H, J = 8.7 Hz, ArH), 6.19 (s, 1H, CHN), 4.28 (A of AB, 1H, J = 13.8 Hz, one of SCH₂), 4.20 (B of AB, 1H, J = 13.8 Hz, one of SCH₂), 2.89 (s, 6H, N(CH₃)₂), 2.16 (s, 3H, =C-CH₃). ^{13}C NMR (DMSO- d_6 , 75 MHz): δ 167.8, 156.1, 150.2, 148.4, 144.5, 135.6, 132.0, 129.8, 128.14, 128.07, 118.8, 112.0, 109.6, 103.6, 59.6, 40.1, 34.2, 17.3. HRMS (ESI) m/z : 446.1758 calcd for C₂₃H₂₄N₇OS [M + H]⁺; 446.1752 obsd.

Bacterial Strains

S. aureus ATCC 29213, *K. pneumonia* ATCC 700603, *A. baumannii* ATCC 17961, *P. aeruginosa* ATCC 27853, *E. aerogenes* ATCC 35029, *E. coli* ATCC 25922, *E. faecium* NCTC 7171 (ATCC 19734), *E. faecium* ATCC 700221, and *E. faecium* ATCC BAA 2127 were used for the initial screen and were purchased from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC, Manassas, VA, U.S.A.). Strain *E. faecium* 119-39A was collected from Wayne State University School of Medicine. The strains *E. faecium* C9, C38, and C68 were generously supplied by Dr. Robert A. Bonomo.

Determination of Minimal-Inhibitory Concentrations (MICs) and Minimal-Bactericidal Concentrations (MBCs)

The MIC assays of each compound were conducted in triplicate in 96-well plates with cation-adjusted Mueller Hinton II broth (MH) according to broth microdilution method described by the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.³³ Bacteria were grown to OD₆₀₀ of approximately 0.60–0.80, then the suspension was diluted 100-fold with fresh MH medium. The final bacterial inoculum was 5×10^5 CFU/mL. Each compound was prepared from a 5 mg/mL DMSO stock solution. The stock solution was diluted with MH medium to give various concentrations of antibiotics in a manner that the final concentration of DMSO was kept to 2% (v/v) with a supplement of 0.25% (v/v) glacial acetic acid. After the plates were incubated at 35 °C for 16–20 h, MICs were read. All MIC determinations were performed in triplicate. Determination of MBCs was performed by a reported method.³⁴ *E. faecium* NCTC 7171 was used for the determination of MBCs.

In Vitro Metabolic Stability

Pooled human liver S9 (1 mg/mL, BD Biosciences, Woburn, MA) and NADPH (1 mM), and a given synthetic compound (10 μ M) in sodium phosphate buffer (PBS, 0.20 M sodium phosphate, 0.15 M NaCl, pH 7.4) were incubated at 37 °C for 60 min. Aliquots were taken at each of six time points, and the reaction was terminated by addition of two volumes of acetonitrile containing the internal standard (5 μ M of **24**). The mixture was centrifuged (20 min, 20000g), and the supernatant was analyzed by ultraperformance liquid chromatography (UPLC) with multiple reaction monitoring (MRM). Half-lives of the compounds in human liver S9 were calculated based on the first-order rate constants that were measured. Intrinsic clearance was calculated by the following equation:³⁵

$$CL_{int} = (0.693 / \ln \text{in vitro } t_{1/2}) \times (\text{mL incubation} / \text{mg microsomal protein}) \times (45 \text{ mg microsomal protein} / \text{g liver}) \times (20 \text{ g liver} / \text{kg body weight})$$

The metabolic stability for each compound was determined in duplicate.

Determination of Plasma–Protein Binding

The plasma–protein binding of compounds **1**, **10**, **13**, **16**, **83**, and **84** was determined in a rapid equilibrium dialysis device (Pierce Biotechnology, ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA). Human plasma was thawed and centrifuged at 1200g for 10 min to remove any particulates. The compounds were dissolved in DMSO and incubated in human plasma at a final concentration of 10 μ M and 0.1% DMSO. A 200 μ L aliquot was added into the sample chamber, and 350 μ L of 0.1 M sodium phosphate buffer, pH 7.4, containing 0.15 mM NaCl was added into the adjacent chamber. The compounds were dialyzed at 37 °C in an orbital shaker overnight. A 150 μ L aliquot from the buffer side was mixed with 300 μ L of internal standard solution (**24** with final concentration of 1 μ M in acetonitrile), and an equivalent sample volume from the plasma side was also mixed with 300 μ L of internal standard solution. The solutions were vortexed and centrifuged (20 min, 20000g). A 400 μ L aliquot of the supernatant was concentrated to dryness and then dissolved in 120 μ L of acetonitrile,

followed by centrifugation. A 100 μL aliquot of the supernatant was analyzed by UPLC-MRM. The plasma-protein binding (B%) was calculated according to the following equation:

$$B\% = (C_p - C_f) / C_p \times 100$$

where C_p and C_f are the total plasma concentration and the free concentration of the compound.

Macromolecular Synthesis Assays

Macromolecular synthesis assays were performed according to a previously reported method.³⁶ *E. faecium* NCTC 7171 was grown in brain-heart infusion culture at 37 °C until early log phase was reached. Radiolabeled precursor (15 μL , 1 $\mu\text{Ci/mL}$ of [methyl-³H]-thymidine, [5,6-³H]-uridine, L-[4,5-³H]-leucine, or D-[2,3-³H]-alanine) was added into each Falcon tube of cell culture, followed by incubation at 37 °C for 5 min. The radiolabeled precursors were purchased from PerkinElmer (Waltham, MA, USA). Negative control (DMSO) and positive controls (ciprofloxacin, rifampicin, tetracycline, and meropenem), as well as compound **16** (8 $\mu\text{g/mL}$), were added into each tube and allowed to grow for an additional 2 h. The positive controls were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Sigma-Aldrich, MO, USA). Samples (650 μL) were collected every 20 min and were mixed with 650 μL of 20% ice-cold trichloroacetic acid (TCA) and allowed to sit on ice for 1 h. The sample (1.3 mL) in each case was transferred to a glass microfiber filter (GF/A grade, whatman), which was washed with 5% TCA (2 $\times$) and with 95% ethanol (2 $\times$) before letting it dry. The microfiber filter was placed in 20 mL scintillation vials with 5 mL of scintillation cocktail for radioactive measurement. Scintillation vials were counted using a Beckman LS-100 liquid scintillation counter (Beckman Coulter, Inc., Brea, CA, USA). Duplicate aliquots were taken at each time point for measurements.

In Vitro Transcription Assay

In vitro transcription and the tandem transcription/translation assays were performed using a previous reported method.³⁶

High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC)

The HPLC instrument consisted of a PerkinElmer series 200 autosampler, series 200 UV/vis detector, series 200 pump, using TotalChrom Navigator software (PerkinElmer, Shelton, CT USA). The HPLC conditions consisted of isocratic elution on a ZORBAX Rx-C8 5 μm , 4.6 mm $\times$ 250 mm column (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA), at a flow rate of 1 mL/min with 50% A/50% B or 60% A/40% B for 15 min (A = 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid/water; B = 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid/acetonitrile). Effluent was detected at 254 nm. All synthetic compounds were 95% pure.

Mass Spectrometry and Sample Analysis

Mass spectra were acquired on a Waters Acquity UPLC binary solvent manager (Waters Corporation, Milford, Massachusetts, USA), using MASSLYNX V4.1 software. The

instrument consists of a sample manager, PDA detector, and triple quadrupole detector. The experiments were performed in the ESI positive mode with MRM. The parameters of capillary voltage, cone voltage, extractor voltage, and RF lens voltage were set at 3.6 kV, 30 V, 3 V, 0.3 V, respectively. The source temperature was 150 °C, desolvation temperature was 350 °C. Desolvation gas flow rate (N₂) was 650 L/h, and the cone gas (Xe) flow rate was 10 L/h. The dwell time was 0.1 s, and collision energy was 20 V. Samples were analyzed by UPLC-MRM on a Waters Acquity UltraPerformance Thermo Scientific Acclaim RSLC 120 C18 2.2 μ m, 120 Å, 2.1 mm $\times$ 100 mm column at 40 °C. Compounds **1**, **10**, and **13** were eluted at 0.4 mL/min with 80% A/20% B for 2 min, followed by a 8 min linear gradient to 10% A/90% B (A = 0.1% formic acid/water; B = 0.1% formic acid/acetonitrile). For compounds **16**, **83**, and **84**, the flow was changed to 0.5 mL/min; the other conditions were same. The transitions monitored for each compound were: 420 $\rightarrow$ 403 for **1**, 437 $\rightarrow$ 378 for **10**, 439 $\rightarrow$ 422 for **13**, 421 $\rightarrow$ 404 for **16**, 466 $\rightarrow$ 122 for **83**, 446 $\rightarrow$ 122 for **84**, and 403 $\rightarrow$ 91 for the internal standard **24**.

Purification of PBP5fm

The *pbp5* gene corresponding to amino acids 34 to 678 for PBP5 from *E. faecium* D63r was custom synthesized (GenScript) for optimal expression in *E. coli*. This synthetic gene was cloned into plasmid pET-28a(+) with a His-tag in the N-terminal position to give the recombinant plasmid pET28-PBP5fm. This construct lacks the signal peptide for delivery to the periplasm, hence the recombinant protein is expressed in the cytoplasm. For the enzyme purification, *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) harboring the pET28-PBP5fm plasmid was grown at 37 °C in Luria-Bertani (LB) supplemented with kanamycin (50 μ g/mL) to OD₆₀₀ of 0.6. Protein expression was then induced using 0.4 mM IPTG and the culture incubated at 25 °C for an additional 6 h. The protein was purified using a Macro-Prep High Q anion exchange column (BioRad) equilibrated with 50 mM Tris pH 7.5 and eluted using a gradient from 0 to 0.5 M NaCl in 50 mM Tris pH 7.5. The fractions containing PBP5fm were loaded onto a HiTrap Chelating column (GE Healthcare) and eluted in a 0.5 M imidazole gradient. After removing the imidazole, protein concentration was determined spectrophotometrically using the predicted extinction coefficient ($\epsilon_{280} = 57760 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$) and purity was assessed by resolution on 12% SDS-PAGE. The enzyme was stored at 4 °C in 50 mM Tris pH 7.5, 0.5 M NaCl.

Binding Assays for PBP2a and PBP5fm

Purification of PBP2a was reported earlier and was followed in the present study.³⁷ The assay is identical for PBP5fm, so we only explain the procedure for PBP2a here.

BOCILLIN FL, a fluorescent penicillin (Molecular Probes, Inc., CA), is used in this assay as a labeling reagent for the active sites of PBP2a.³⁸ A 19 μ L reaction solution was prepared on ice by adding 1 μ L of PBP2a (final concentration 2 μ M) into 18 μ L of the inhibitor (**1** and **83**) in 25 mM Hepes, 1 M NaCl (pH 7.0). The mixture was incubated at 37 °C for 10 min. A 1 μ L BOCILLIN FL solution was added into the reaction mixture to give the final concentration of 20 μ M, and the mixture was allowed to incubate for an additional 10 min at 37 °C. A total of 15 μ L of a SDS sample buffer was added to the reaction mixture, and it was boiled for 5 min. The samples at different antibiotic concentrations were loaded onto

12% SDS-PAGE, and the gel was developed at 125 V for 120 min. The gels were scanned using Storm840 Fluorimager, and the bands were quantified with IMAGE-QUANT 5.2 software. A control sample without inhibitor was also prepared at the same time.

The assay for PBP5fm is similar to that for PBP2a. The differences were the final concentration of PBP5fm (40 μ M) and BOCILLIN FL (30 μ M), and the incubation time was extended from 10 to 20 min.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by grant AI90818 from the NIH. H.W. was supported by a Predoctoral Fellowship from the Eck Institute for Global Health, University of Notre Dame. R.B. was supported by training grant T32GM075762 and by an individual Ruth L. Kirschstein National Research Service Award F31 AI115851 from the National Institutes of Health. We thank Dr. Robert Bonomo for generously supplying us with several additional stains of *E. faecium*.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

DMSO	dimethyl sulfoxide
ESI	electrospray ionization
MRM	multiple-reaction monitoring
MS	mass spectrometry
UPLC	ultraperformance liquid chromatography

References

1. Fisher JF, Meroueh SO, Mobashery S. Bacterial resistance to beta-lactam antibiotics: compelling opportunism, compelling opportunity. *Chem Rev.* 2005; 105:395–424. [PubMed: 15700950]
2. Walsh C, Wright G. Introduction: antibiotic resistance. *Chem Rev.* 2005; 105:391–394. [PubMed: 15700949]
3. Yong D, Shin HB, Kim YK, Cho J, Lee WG, Ha GY, Choi TY, Jeong SH, Lee K, Chong Y. Increase in the prevalence of carbapenem-resistant acinetobacter isolates and ampicillin-resistant non-typhoidal salmonella species in Korea: A KONSAR study conducted in 2011. *J Infect Chemother.* 2014; 46:84–93.
4. Bales PM, Renke EM, May SL, Shen Y, Nelson DC. Purification and characterization of biofilm-associated EPS exopoly-saccharides from ESKAPE organisms and other pathogens. *PLoS One.* 2013; 8:e67950. [PubMed: 23805330]
5. Cei M, Pardelli R, Sani S, Mumoli N. Local resistance patterns to antimicrobials in internal medicine: a focused report from the REGIMEN (REGistro Infezioni in Medicina Interna) study. *Clin Exp Med.* 2014; 14:77–82. [PubMed: 23184125]
6. Rice LB. Federal funding for the study of antimicrobial resistance in nosocomial pathogens: no ESKAPE. *J Infect Dis.* 2008; 197:1079–1081. [PubMed: 18419525]
7. Perri MB, Hershberger E, Ionescu M, Lauter C, Zervos MJ. In vitro susceptibility of vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE) to fosfomycin. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2002; 42:269–271. [PubMed: 12007445]

8. Landman D, Mobarakai NK, Quale JM. Novel antibiotic regimens against *Enterococcus faecium* resistant to ampicillin, vancomycin, and gentamicin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 1993; 37:1904–1908. [PubMed: 8239604]
9. Revati S, Chitra P. Prevalence of various Enterococcal infections and its antibiotic susceptibility with special reference to Vancomycin and high level Gentamicin resistance in a Tertiary care center in Navi Mumbai. *Int J Pharm Sci Rev Res*. 2013; 23:122–125.
10. Nannini EC, Pai SR, Singh KV, Murray BE. Activity of tigecycline (GAR-936), a novel glycylcycline, against Enterococci in the mouse peritonitis model. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2003; 47:529–532. [PubMed: 12543654]
11. Treitman AN, Yarnold PR, Warren J, Noskin GA. Emerging incidence of *Enterococcus faecium* among hospital isolates (1993 to 2002). *J Clin Microbiol*. 2005; 43:462–463. [PubMed: 15635016]
12. Chang D, Zhu Y, An L, Liu J, Su L, Guo Y, Chen Z, Wang Y, Wang L, Wang J, Li T, Fang X, Fang C, Yang R, Liu C. A multi-omic analysis of an *Enterococcus faecium* mutant reveals specific genetic mutations and dramatic changes in mRNA and protein expression. *BMC Microbiol*. 2013; 13:304–326. [PubMed: 24373636]
13. Nallapareddy SR, Singh KV, Murray BE. Contribution of the collagen adhesin Acm to pathogenesis of *Enterococcus faecium* in experimental endocarditis. *Infect Immun*. 2008; 76:4120–4128. [PubMed: 18591236]
14. Leendertse M, Heikens E, Wijnands LM, van Luit-Asbroek M, Teske GJ, Roelofs JJ, Bonten MJ, van der Poll T, Willems RJ. Enterococcal surface protein transiently aggravates *Enterococcus faecium*-induced urinary tract infection in mice. *J Infect Dis*. 2009; 200:1162–1165. [PubMed: 19702507]
15. Boerlin P, Eugster S, Gaschen F, Straub R, Schawalder P. Transmission of opportunistic pathogens in a veterinary teaching hospital. *Vet Microbiol*. 2001; 82:347–359. [PubMed: 11506928]
16. Kubota H, Tsuji H, Matsuda K, Kurakawa T, Asahara T, Nomoto K. Detection of human intestinal catalase-negative, Gram-positive cocci by rRNA-targeted reverse transcription-PCR. *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 2010; 76:5440–5451. [PubMed: 20581195]
17. Theuretzbacher U. Accelerating resistance, inadequate antibacterial drug pipelines and international responses. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2012; 39:295–299. [PubMed: 22341298]
18. Rice LB. Emergence of vancomycin-resistant enterococci. *Emerging Infect Dis*. 2001; 7:183–187. [PubMed: 11294702]
19. Szakacs TA, Kalan L, McConnell MJ, Eshaghi A, Shahinas D, McGeer A, Wright GD, Low DE, Patel SN. Outbreak of vancomycin-susceptible *Enterococcus faecium* containing the wild-type vanA gene. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2014; 52:1682–1686. [PubMed: 24523464]
20. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) System Report, data summary from January 1992 through June 2003; issued August 2003. *Am J Infect Control*. 2003; 31:481–498. [PubMed: 14647111]
21. Antibiotic Resistance Threats in the United States. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Atlanta, GA: 2013.
22. Lebar MD, May JM, Meeske AJ, Leiman SA, Lupoli TJ, Tsukamoto H, Losick R, Rudner DZ, Walker S, Kahne D. Reconstitution of peptidoglycan cross-linking leads to improved fluorescent probes of cell wall synthesis. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2014; 136:10874–10877. [PubMed: 25036369]
23. Irwin JJ, Shoichet BK. ZINC-a free database of commercially available compounds for virtual screening. *J Chem Inf Model*. 2005; 45:177–182. [PubMed: 15667143]
24. Lim D, Strynadka NC. Structural basis for the beta lactam resistance of PBP2a from methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Nature Struct Mol Biol*. 2002; 9:870–876.
25. Kappe CO. Recent advances in the Biginelli dihydropyrimidine synthesis. New tricks from an old dog. *Acc Chem Res*. 2000; 33:879–888. [PubMed: 11123887]
26. Chebanov VA, Muravyova EA, Desenko SM, Musatov VI, Knyazeva IV, Shishkina SV, Shishkin OV, Kappe CO. Microwave-assisted three-component synthesis of 7-aryl-2-alkylthio-4,7-dihydro-1,2,4-triazolo[1,5-a]-pyrimidine-6-carboxamides and their selective reduction. *J Comb Chem*. 2006; 8:427–434. [PubMed: 16677013]
27. Kratochwil NA, Huber W, Muller F, Kansy M, Gerber PR. Predicting plasma protein binding of drugs: a new approach. *Biochem Pharmacol*. 2002; 64:1355–1374. [PubMed: 12392818]

28. Lee BL, Sachdeva M, Chambers HF. Effect of protein binding of daptomycin on MIC and antibacterial activity. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 1991; 35:2505–2508. [PubMed: 1667253]
29. Oxacillin for Injection, USP. Sagent Pharmaceuticals; 2013. Oxacillin package insert
30. Dykhuizen RS, Harvey G, Stephenson N, Nathwani D, Gould IM. Protein binding and serum bactericidal activities of vancomycin and teicoplanin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 1995; 39:1842–1847. [PubMed: 7486929]
31. Kochansky CJ, McMasters DR, Lu P, Koeplinger KA, Kerr HH, Shou M, Korzekwa KR. Impact of pH on plasma protein binding in equilibrium dialysis. *Mol Pharmaceutics*. 2008; 5:438–448.
32. Heras M, Font D, Linden A, Villalgordo JM. Synthesis of triazolo[1,5-*a*]triazin-7-one derivatives and highly functionalized [1,2,4]triazoles. *Helv Chim Acta*. 2003; 86:3204–3214.
33. Methods for Dilution Antimicrobial Susceptibility Tests for Bacteria That Grow Aerobically: Approved Standard. 7. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI); Wayne, PA: 2006. Document M7-A7
34. Lorian, V. *Antibiotics in Laboratory Medicine*. 4. Williams & Wilkins; Baltimore: 1996.
35. Obach RS. Nonspecific binding to microsomes: impact on scale-up of in vitro intrinsic clearance to hepatic clearance as assessed through examination of warfarin, imipramine, and propranolol. *Drug Metab Dispos*. 1997; 25:1359–1369. [PubMed: 9394025]
36. O'Daniel PI, Peng Z, Pi H, Testero SA, Ding D, Spink E, Leemans E, Boudreau MA, Yamaguchi T, Schroeder VA, Wolter WR, Llarrull LI, Song W, Lastochkin E, Kumarasiri M, Antunes NT, Espahbodi M, Lichtenwalter K, Suckow MA, Vakulenko S, Mobashery S, Chang M. Discovery of a new class of non-beta-lactam inhibitors of penicillin-binding proteins with Gram-positive antibacterial activity. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2014; 136:3664–3672. [PubMed: 24517363]
37. Otero LH, Rojas-Altuve A, Llarrull LI, Carrasco-Lopez C, Kumarasiri M, Lastochkin E, Fishovitz J, Dawley M, Hesek D, Lee M, Johnson JW, Fisher JF, Chang M, Mobashery S, Hermoso JA. How allosteric control of *Staphylococcus aureus* penicillin binding protein 2a enables methicillin resistance and physiological function. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2013; 110:16808–16813. [PubMed: 24085846]
38. Zhao G, Meier TI, Kahl SD, Gee KR, Blaszcak LC. BOCILLIN FL, a sensitive and commercially available reagent for detection of penicillin-binding proteins. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 1999; 43:1124–1128. [PubMed: 10223924]

SAR1

1: R ₁ = -Ph-4- <i>i</i> -Pr	15: R ₁ = -Ph-4-NH ₂	29: R ₁ = -Ph-3- <i>i</i> -Pr
2: R ₁ = -Ph	16: R ₁ = -Ph-4-NMe ₂	30: R ₁ = -Ph-3-Et
3: R ₁ = -Ph-4-Me	17: R ₁ = -Ph-4-NEt ₂	31: R ₁ = -Ph-3-O- <i>i</i> -Pr
4: R ₁ = -Ph-4-Et	18: R ₁ = -Ph-4-(1-pyrrolidinyl)	32: R ₁ = -Ph-3-OCF ₃
5: R ₁ = -Ph-4- <i>i</i> -Bu	19: R ₁ = -Ph-4-NHCOCH ₃	33: R ₁ = -2-thienyl
6: R ₁ = -Ph-4-OH	20: R ₁ = -Ph-4-OCH ₂ CH ₂ NEt ₂	34: R ₁ = -3-thienyl
7: R ₁ = -Ph-4-OCH ₃	21: R ₁ = -Ph-4-CF ₃	35: R ₁ = -2-furyl
8: R ₁ = -Ph-3-OH-4-OCH ₃	22: R ₁ = -Ph-4-F	36: R ₁ = -2-pyrrolyl
9: R ₁ = -Ph-3,4-(OCH ₃) ₂	23: R ₁ = -Ph-4-Cl	37: R ₁ = -2-imidazolyl
10: R ₁ = -Ph-4-O- <i>i</i> -Pr	24: R ₁ = -Ph-4-CN	38: R ₁ = -3-indolyl
11: R ₁ = -Ph-4-OCF ₃	25: R ₁ = -Ph-4-NO ₂	39: R ₁ = -3-pyridyl
12: R ₁ = -Ph-4-SMe	26: R ₁ = -Ph-4-COOH	40: R ₁ = -3-pyridyl-(2-OCH ₃)
13: R ₁ = -Ph-4-SEt	27: R ₁ = -Ph-2-CF ₃	41: R ₁ = -4-pyridyl
14: R ₁ = -Ph-4-SCF ₃	28: R ₁ = -Ph-3-CF ₃	42: R ₁ = -cyclohexyl

SAR2

43: R ₁ = -Ph-4-NMe ₂ , R ₂ = -OC ₂ H ₅ , R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph	51: R ₁ = -Ph-4-NMe ₂ , R ₂ = -H, R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph
44: R ₁ = -2-thienyl, R ₂ = -OC ₂ H ₅ , R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-CO ₂ H	52: R ₁ = -Ph-4-Me, R ₂ = -H, R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-2-Me
45: R ₁ = -Ph-4-NMe ₂ , R ₂ = -NHCH ₃ , R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph	53: R ₁ = -Ph-4-Me, R ₂ = -2-Me, R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-3-Me
	54: R ₁ = -Ph-4-Me, R ₂ = -2,4-Me ₂ , R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-3-Me
	55: R ₁ = -Ph-4-Et, R ₂ = -H, R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-3-OMe
	56: R ₁ = -Ph-4-Et, R ₂ = -2-Me, R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-3-OMe
	57: R ₁ = -Ph-4-Et, R ₂ = -2-OMe, R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph
	58: R ₁ = -Ph-4-OMe, R ₂ = -2-Me, R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-2,5-Me ₂
	59: R ₁ = -Ph-4-OMe, R ₂ = -2,4-Me ₂ , R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-3-Me
	60: R ₁ = -Ph-3-OMe-4-OH, R ₂ = -2,4-Me ₂ , R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph
	61: R ₁ = -Ph-4-F, R ₂ = -2,4-Me ₂ , R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-3-Me
	62: R ₁ = -Ph-4-Cl, R ₂ = -2,4-Me ₂ , R ₃ = -CO ₂ - <i>i</i> -Pr
	63: R ₁ = -2-thienyl, R ₂ = -2,4-Me ₂ , R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-3-Cl

SAR3

64: R ₃ = -H	77: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-Me
66: R ₃ = -NH ₂	78: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-OCH ₃
67: R ₃ = -CO ₂ CH ₃	79: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-SCH ₃
68: R ₃ = -CO ₂ CH ₂ CH ₃	80: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-CF ₃
69: R ₃ = -SCH ₃	81: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-OCF ₃
70: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ CONH ₂	82: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-SCF ₃
71: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ CO ₂ Et	83: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-NO ₂
72: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ CH ₂ NHCO ₂ CH ₂ Ph	84: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-CN
75: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ -(4-pyridyl)	85: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-COOH
76: R ₃ = -S-2-pyridyl	86: R ₃ = -SCH ₂ Ph-4-COOCH ₃

Compound: 65, 73, 74

65: R ₁ = 2-thienyl, R ₃ = -H
73: R ₁ = Ph-4- <i>i</i> -Pr, R ₃ = -SCH ₂ CH ₂ NHCO ₂ CH ₂ Ph
74: R ₁ = Ph-4-CO ₂ H, R ₃ = -SCH ₂ CH ₂ NHCO ₂ CH ₂ Ph

Figure 1.
SAR of 1,2,4-triazolo[1,5-*a*]pyrimidine derivatives.

Figure 2. Macromolecular synthesis assays. Compound **16** at $2 \times \text{MIC}$. Positive controls for DNA, RNA, protein, and peptidoglycan syntheses are ciprofloxacin ($4 \mu\text{g/mL}$), rifampicin ($4 \mu\text{g/mL}$), tetracycline (248 ng/mL), and meropenem ($4 \mu\text{g/mL}$), respectively. The inhibition reported for compound **16** is at 120 min of the incubation; other time points of incubation are provided in the Supporting Information.

Figure 3.

(A) In vitro transcription assay of compound **16**. (B) In vitro transcription and translation assay of compound **16** to evaluate β -galactosidase expression levels.

Scheme 1.
Syntheses of the 1,2,4-Triazolo[1,5-a]pyrimidine Derivatives

Table 1

Minimal-Inhibitory Concentrations (MICs, $\mu\text{g/mL}$) of SAR1, SAR2, and SAR3 Compounds against *E. faecium* NCTC 7171^a

MICs of SAR1 compounds against <i>E. faecium</i> NCTC 7171

Compd	R ₁	MIC
1	-Ph-4- <i>i</i> -Pr	8
2	-Ph	>128
3	-Ph-4-Me	>128
4	-Ph-4-Et	8
5	-Ph-4- <i>i</i> -Bu	8
6	-Ph-4-OH	>128
7	-Ph-4-OCH ₃	>128
8	-Ph-3-OH-4-OCH ₃	>128
9	-Ph-3,4-(OCH ₃) ₂	>128
10	-Ph-4-O- <i>i</i> -Pr	4
11	-Ph-4-OCF ₃	8
12	-Ph-4-SMe	>128
13	-Ph-4-SEt	4
14	-Ph-4-SCF ₃	>128
15	-Ph-4-NH ₂	>128
16	-Ph-4-NMe ₂	4
17	-Ph-4-NEt ₂	8
18	-Ph-4-(1-pyrrolidinyl)	16
19	-Ph-4-NHCOCH ₃	128
20	-Ph-4-OCH ₂ CH ₂ NEt ₂	>128
21	-Ph-4-CF ₃	8
22	-Ph-4-F	128
23	-Ph-4-Cl	>128
24	-Ph-4-CN	16
25	-Ph-4-NO ₂	64
26	-Ph-4-COOH	>128
27	-Ph-2-CF ₃	>128
28	-Ph-3-CF ₃	16

MICs of SAR1 compounds against *E. faecium* NCTC 7171

Compd	R ₁	MIC
29	-Ph-3- <i>i</i> -Pr	16
30	-Ph-3-Et	16
31	-Ph-3-O- <i>i</i> -Pr	>128
32	-Ph-3-OCF ₃	16
33	-2-thienyl	>128
34	-3-thienyl	>128
35	-2-furyl	>128
36	-2-pyrrolyl	>128
37	-2-imidazolyl	32
38	-3-indolyl	>128
39	-3-pyridyl	>128
40	-3-pyridyl-(2-OCH ₃)	128
41	-4-pyridyl	>128
42	-cyclohexyl	>128

MICs of SAR2 compounds against *E. faecium* NCTC 7171

Compd	R ₁	R ₂	R ₃	MIC
43	-Ph-4-NMe ₂	-OC ₂ H ₅	-SCH ₂ Ph	>128
44	-2-thienyl	-OC ₂ H ₅	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-CO ₂ H	>128
45	-Ph-4-NMe ₂	-NHCH ₂	-SCH ₂ Ph	8

Compd	R ₁	R ₃	MIC
46	-Ph-4-NMe ₂	-SCH ₂ Ph	>128

Compd	R ₁	R ₃	MIC
47	-Ph-4-OMe	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-CO ₂ H	>128
48	-Ph-2-OEt	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-CO ₂ H	>128
49	-Ph-3,4-(OMe) ₂	-SCH ₂ -Ph-4-F	>128
50	-Ph-4-Cl	-SCH ₂ -naphthalenyl	>128

Compd	R ₁	R ₂	R ₃	MIC
51	-Ph-4-NMe ₂	-H	-SCH ₂ Ph	8
52	-Ph-4-Me	-H	-SCH ₂ Ph-2-Me	>128
53	-Ph-4-Me	-2-Me	-SCH ₂ Ph-3-Me	>128
54	-Ph-4-Me	-2,4-Me ₂	-SCH ₂ Ph-3-Me	>128
55	-Ph-4-Et	-H	-SCH ₂ Ph-3-OMe	>128
56	-Ph-4-Et	-2-Me	-SCH ₂ Ph-3-OMe	>128
57	-Ph-4-Et	-2-OMe	-SCH ₂ Ph	>128
58	-Ph-4-OMe	-2-Me	-SCH ₂ Ph-2,5-Me ₂	>128
59	-Ph-4-OMe	-2,4-Me ₂	-SCH ₂ Ph-3-Me	>128
60	-Ph-3-OMe-4-OH	-2,4-Me ₂	-SCH ₂ Ph	16
61	-Ph-4-F	-2,4-Me ₂	-SCH ₂ Ph-3-Me	>128
62	-Ph-4-Cl	-2,4-Me ₂	-CO ₂ - <i>i</i> -Pr	16
63	-2-thienyl	-2,4-Me ₂	-SCH ₂ Ph-3-Cl	>128

MICs of SAR3 compounds against *E. faecium* NCTC 7171

Compd	R ₃	MIC
64	-H	>128
66	-NH ₂	>128
67	-CO ₂ CH ₃	>128
68	-CO ₂ CH ₂ CH ₃	>128
69	-SCH ₃	>128
70	-SCH ₂ CONH ₂	>128
71	-SCH ₂ CO ₂ Et	>128
72	-SCH ₂ CH ₂ NHCO ₂ CH ₂ Ph	>128
75	-SCH ₂ -(4-pyridyl)	128
76	-S-2-pyridyl	>128
77	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-CH ₃	>128
78	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-OCH ₃	>128
79	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-SCH ₃	>128
80	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-CF ₃	>128
81	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-OCF ₃	>128
82	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-SCF ₃	8
83	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-NO ₂	4
84	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-CN	8
85	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-COOH	>128
86	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-COOCH ₃	>128

Compd	R ₁	R ₃	MIC
65	-2-thienyl	H	>128
73	-Ph-4- <i>i</i> -Pr	-SCH ₂ CH ₂ NHCO ₂ CH ₂ Ph	>128
74	-Ph-4-CO ₂ H	-SCH ₂ CH ₂ NHCO ₂ CH ₂ Ph	>128

^a Compounds with MIC $\geq 16 \mu\text{g/mL}$ are highlighted in gray background.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 2

Minimal-Inhibitory Concentrations (MICs, $\mu\text{g/mL}$) of Compounds 1, 10, 13, 16, 83, 84, and Vancomycin with Additional *E. faecium* Strains

	MIC ($\mu\text{g/mL}$)						
	1	10	13	16	83	84	vancomycin
<i>E. faecium</i> ATCC BAA 2127 ^a	4	16	16	4	32	8	1
<i>E. faecium</i> 119-39A (Van S) ^b	4	4	8	4	16	8	0.5
<i>E. faecium</i> ATCC 700221 (Van R) ^c	4	8	8	4	8	8	16
<i>E. faecium</i> C9 ^d	16	4	8	4	8	4	2
<i>E. faecium</i> C38 ^d	16	32	16	16	32	16	64
<i>E. faecium</i> C68 ^{d,e}	16	16	16	4	32	4	64

^aResistant to copper, erythromycin, and tetracycline, and sensitive to vancomycin and teicoplanin.

^bVancomycin-susceptible clinical isolate.

^cIsolated from human feces, *vanA* positive, resistant to vancomycin and teicoplanin.

^dClinical strains isolated in Cleveland hospitals, gifts from Dr. Robert A. Bonomo.

^eMost prevalent VRE clinical strain from Cleveland hospitals.

Table 3

Metabolic Stability, Apparent Intrinsic Clearance, Plasma–Protein Binding, and Hemolysis of Red Blood Cells of Selected Antibiotics

MIC of <i>E. faecium</i> C68 (µg/mL)	Half-life in human liver S9 (min)	Apparent intrinsic clearance (mLmin ⁻¹ kg ⁻¹)	Plasma-protein binding (%)	Hemolysis at 64 µg/mL (%)
Compd	R ₁	R ₂					
1	-Ph-4- <i>i</i> -Pr	-SCH ₂ Ph	16	56 ± 1	11.1	98.7 ± 0.7	22%
10	-Ph-4-O- <i>i</i> -Pr	-SCH ₂ Ph	16	57 ± 8	10.9	99.9 ± 0.2	<1%
13	-Ph-4-SEt	-SCH ₂ Ph	16	>60	<10.4	99.9 ± 0.4	46%
16	-Ph-4-NMe ₂	-SCH ₂ Ph	4	>60	<10.4	97.6 ± 0.1	2%
83	-Ph-4-NMe ₂	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-NO ₂	32	>60	<10.4	99.9 ± 0.5	23%
84	-Ph-4-NMe ₂	-SCH ₂ Ph-4-CN	4	>60	<10.4	96.8 ± 0.4	1%