Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. 2016 April 1; 26(7): 1827–1830. doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2016.02.030.

Design, synthesis, and analysis of antagonists of GPR55: Piperidine-substituted 1,3,4-oxadiazol-2-ones

Maria Elena Meza-Aviña^{#a}, Mary A. Lingerfelt^{#a}, Linda M. Console-Bram^b, Thomas F. Gamage^b, Haleli Sharir^b, Kristen E. Gettys^a, Dow P. Hurst^a, Evangelia Kotsikorou^c, Derek M. Shore^a, Marc G. Caron^d, Narasinga Rao^a, Larry S. Barak^d, Mary E. Abood^{b,*}, Patricia H. Reggio^{a,*}, and Mitchell P. Croatt^{a,*}

^a Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Natural Products and Drug Discovery Center, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, North Carolina 27402, United States

^b Center for Substance Abuse Research, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19140, United States

^c Department of Chemistry, University of Texas – Pan American, Edinburg, Texas 78539, United States

^d Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina 27709, United States

[#] These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

A series of 1,3,4-oxadiazol-2-ones was synthesized and tested for activity as antagonists at GPR55 in cellular beta-arrestin redistribution assays. The synthesis was designed to be modular in nature so that a sufficient number of analogues could be rapidly accessed to explore initial structure-activity relationships. The design of analogues was guided by the docking of potential compounds into a model of the inactive form of GPR55. The results of the assays were used to learn more about the binding pocket of GPR55. With this oxadiazolone scaffold, it was determined that modification of the aryl group adjacent to the oxadiazolone ring was often detrimental and that the distal cyclopropane was beneficial for activity. These results will guide further exploration of this receptor.

Graphical Abstract

* Corresponding authors. mabood@temple.edu (M.E.A.), phreggio@uncg.edu (P.H.R.), mpcroatt@uncg.edu (M.P.C.).

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Supplementary data

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

GPR55; neuropathic pain; GPCR; antagonist; cancer

Our synthetic approach to GPR55 antagonists was designed so that many different structures could be accessed to rapidly explore initial SAR, along with validating or modifying our current model (Figure 2).¹¹ The synthesis begins with the coupling of a carboxylic acid to 4-piperidone by first forming the acid chloride (Scheme 1). The different acids chosen, based on the initial hit, modify the electronics and sterics of this section of the molecule. Relative to ML191, compound **2a** reduces the steric impact, **2b** increases the electron-density in the aromatic ring, and compounds **2c** and **2d** decrease the electron-density. Compounds **2e** and **2f** were selected to examine the influence of steric bulk at the position of the cyclopropane ring. The largest change in overall structure relates to the 1-naphthoic acid derivative (**2f**). Although the naphthalene ring is structurally different, this analogue can position the distal aromatic ring in a similar position as the phenyl rings of the other analogues since the bond angle for the C α will be similar to that of the cyclopropane analogues, however, this structure is much flatter.

With a handful of acylated piperidones prepared, the final two steps first involved a reductive coupling of aryl hydrazides (**3t-z**) with the previously synthesized piperidones (**2a-f**) to yield hydrazides **4** (Scheme 2).¹⁴ These compounds were then cyclocarbonylated using triphosgene to yield oxadiazolones **5**.¹⁵ The reductive coupling reactions proceeded smoothly but the products of that step were often unstable to silica gel chromatography. Therefore, the unpurified products were treated with triphosgene without further purification. This modification of the synthesis typically improved the yields of the final compounds (see supplementary data for individual yields).

Similar to the cyclopropane starting materials (**1a-f**), the hydrazides (**3t-z**) were selected to probe the electronic and steric opportunities in the binding site. Based on the current model (Figure 2), the aromatic ring adjacent to the oxadiazolone is involved in an interaction with M3.36(105) and F6.48(239). Additionally, the oxadiazolone contributes as the key interaction between the basic carbonyl oxygen with the ammonium of K2.60(80). Thus, electron rich aromatic rings adjacent to the oxadiazolone should make the carbonyl oxygen more basic and strengthen this interaction.

A targeted exploration of the SAR of all six acids (**1a-f**) with hydrazide **3t** and all seven hydrazides (**3t-z**) with acid **1a** (Figure 3 and Table 1) was performed instead of synthesizing and exploring the biological activity of all 42 permutations of the six acids and seven hydrazides. Acid **1a** and hydrazide **3t** were chosen as the constants since these were the most simplified pieces consisting of an unsubstituted phenyl ring. Unfortunately, there were solubility issues with some of the compounds (e.g. **5bt** and **5bv**), so additional combinations were required to elucidate the effect of the different areas of the scaffold.

Compounds were initially screened via an image-based cell assay to identify antagonist activity. The rationale for using the β -arrestin recruitment assay was to provide a fair comparison of IC₅₀ values since our initial report employed this assay.¹¹⁻¹² Briefly, U2OS cells overexpressing GPR55 and β arr2-GFP were exposed to LPI (6 μ M; EC₈₀) resulting in the recruitment of β -arrestin. Antagonist activity was evaluated by ligand-mediated inhibition of LPI-induced receptor activation. This strategy quickly identified the

compounds that had IC₅₀ values higher than 15 μ M which were excluded from further analysis (Figure 3).

Concentration response curves were generated for compounds that were active at concentrations below 15 μ M employing both the image-based β -arrestin recruitment assay and the DiscoverX PathHunter® chemiluminescent β -arrestin complementation assay. In the DiscoverX PathHunter® system, CHO-K1 cells stably expressing GPR55 (fused with a β -galactosidase enzyme fragment), and β -arrestin (fused to an N-terminal deletion mutant of β -galactosidase) were used to quantitate the inhibition of LPI-induced β -arrestin activity. (Figure 4, Table 1). Hence, antagonist activity was evaluated through the use of two differential means of β -arrestin quantitation, in two different cellular backgrounds (see Supplemental Information, Biological Assay). IC₅₀ values were similar in both methodologies.

Screening of the compounds allowed for a number of interesting SAR observations. First of all, pyridyl analogue **5au** demonstrated that a pyridine ring would be beneficial for both clogP as well as increasing the potency (entry 2 versus entry 1). Electron-poor aryl groups next to the oxadiazolone were detrimental (Figure 3), but electron-rich groups were also not beneficial (entry 3). As discussed earlier, it was anticipated that the more electron-rich aryl groups next to the oxadiazolone would be beneficial electronically, but the results obtained could be validated by the electron-donating groups being larger and creating some detrimental steric interactions.

It was found that electron-rich cyclopropylaryl groups had relatively good activities (entry 7), but also typically had solubility problems (entries 5 and 6). Fortunately, analogue **5bw** was soluble, but the moderate activity illustrates that the *p*-methoxy group is detrimental since the most closely related analogue (ML191, Figure 1) was more active and the electron-withdrawing *p*-chloro analogue (**5dt**) was even more active. Dichlorophenyl analogue **5ct** had good activity, but was not as potent as compared to the monochloroaryl compound (entries 8 and 9) which could be justified based on the larger steric bulk of the second chlorine atom. Structure **5et** with the dimethylcyclopropyl group was similarly active (entry 10) as compared to the parent compound, ML191 (Figure 1) which is interesting since this compound adds more steric bulk to the cyclopropyl aryl section of the molecule, albeit in a slightly different location than analogue **5ct**. It should be noted that analogue **5et** is the only structure analyzed that is chiral. The synthesis of **5et** was racemic and the model indicates that there are no major anticipated differences in activities between the two enantiomers.

In conclusion, this letter presents initial SAR for piperidine-substituted oxadiazolone antagonists at GPR55, a recently deorphanized G protein-coupled receptor that lacks a potent and selective ligand of nanomolar potency. These data help to better define areas for improvement of this family of GPR55 antagonists since both halves of the molecule were independently modified. The activities spanned about two orders of magnitude and will be used as a guide for future efforts which will be published in due time.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by National Institutes of Health Grants R21NS077347 and R01DA023204, T32DA007237, P30DA013429. The authors thank Dr. Franklin J. Moy (UNCG) for assisting with analysis of NMR data and Dr. Brandie M. Ehrmann (UNCG) for acquisition of the high resolution mass spectrometry data at the Triad Mass Spectrometry Laboratory at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

References and notes

1. Henstridge CM, Balenga NAB, Kargl J, Andradas C, Brown AJ, Irving A, Sanchez C, Waldhoer M. *Mol. Endocrinol.* 2011; 25:1835. [PubMed: 21964594]
2. Staton PC, Hatcher JP, Walker DJ, Morrison AD, Shapland EM, Hughes JP, Chong E, Mander PK, Green PJ, Billinton A, Fulleylove M, Lancaster HC, Smith JC, Bailey LT, Wise A, Brown AJ, Richardson JC, Chessell IP. *PAIN.* 2008; 139:225. [PubMed: 18502582]
3. Whyte LS, Ryberg E, Sims NA, Ridge SA, Mackie K, Greasley PJ, Ross RA, Rogers MJ. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA.* 2009; 106:16511. [PubMed: 19805329]
4. Ford LA, Roelofs AJ, Anavi-Goffer S, Mowat L, Simpson DG, Irving AJ, Rogers MJ, Rajnicek AM, Ross RA. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2010; 160:762. [PubMed: 20590578]
5. Andradas C, Caffarel MM, Pérez-Gómez E, Salazar M, Lorente M, Velasco G, Guzmán M, Sánchez C. *Oncogene.* 2011; 30:245. [PubMed: 20818416]
6. Pineiro R, Maffucci T, Falasca M. *Oncogene.* 2011; 30:142. [PubMed: 20838378]
7. Pérez-Gómez E, Andradas C, Flores JM, Quintanilla M, Paramio JM, Guzmán M, Sánchez C. *Oncogene.* 2013; 32:2534. [PubMed: 22751111]
8. Sharir H, Abood ME. *Pharmacol. Ther.* 2010; 126:301. [PubMed: 20298715]
9. Brown AJ, Daniels DA, Kassim M, Brown S, Haslam CP, Terrell VR, Brown J, Nichols PL, Staton PC, Wise A, Dowell SJ. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2011; 337:236. [PubMed: 21233197]
10. Yin H, Chu A, Li W, Wang B, Shelton F, Otero F, Nguyen DG, Caldwell JS, Chen YA. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2009; 284:12328. [PubMed: 19286662]
11. Heynen-Genel, S.; Dahl, R.; Shi, S.; Milan, L.; Hariharan, S.; Sergienko, E.; Hendrick, M.; Dad, S.; Stonich, D.; Su, Y.; Vicchiarelli, M.; Mangravita-Novo, A.; Smith, LH.; Chung, TDY.; Sharir, H.; Caron, MG.; Barak, LS.; Abood, ME. Screening for Selective Ligands for GPR55: Antagonists. National Institutes of Health; Bethesda, MD: 2010.
12. Kotsikorou E, Sharir H, Shore DM, Hurst DP, Lynch DL, Madrigal KE, Heynen-Genel S, Milan LB, Chung TDY, Seltzman HH, Bai Y, Caron MG, Barak LS, Croatt MP, Abood ME, Reggio PH. *Biochem.* 2013; 52:9456. [PubMed: 24274581]
13. Kapur A, Zhao P, Sharir H, Bai Y, Caron MG, Barak LS, Abood ME. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2009; 284:29817. [PubMed: 19723626]
14. Verheijen JC, Richard DJ, Curran K, Kaplan J, Lefever M, Nowak P, Malwitz DJ, Brooijmans N, Toral-Barza L, Zhang W-G, Lucas J, Hollander I, Ayrat-Kaloustian S, Mansour TS, Yu K, Zask A. *J. Med. Chem.* 2009; 52:8010. [PubMed: 19894727]
15. Jiang L-L, Tan Y, Zhu X-L, Wang Z-F, Zuo Y, Chen Q, Xi Z, Yang G-F. *J. Ag. Food Chem.* 2009; 58:2643.

Figure 1.
LPI and Lead Antagonists of GPR55¹²

Figure 2.

A. Docking and Key Interactions Between ML191 and GPR55. ML191 (green) has a key H-bond interaction with K2.60 (pink). ML191 also has π -stacking or other van der Waals interactions with F169, F3.33, F6.55, M7.39, and Y3.32 (all mustard). The interactions with M7.39 and F6.55 appear to hinder the rotation of M3.36 and F6.48 (both purple) which are considered the toggle switch for GPR55. **B.** Electrostatic potential map of ML191. [This figure is adapted from previously published work, see ref. 12].

Scheme 1.
Synthesis of Acylated Piperidones

Scheme 2.
Synthesis of GPR55 Antagonists

Figure 3.
Analogues with Poor Activity (>15 μM)

Figure 4. Representative Images of Antagonist Screening. A) 0.1 μM **5dt** + LPI; B) 1.0 μM **5dt** + LPI; C) 10 μM **5dt** + LPI; D) 3 μM LPI; E) 10 μM **5dt**; F) DMSO.

Table 1

GPR55 Antagonist Activity of Compounds.

Entry, Compound	R	Ar	IC ₅₀ ^a (95% CI)
1, 5at			12 μM (3.9 - 36)
2, 5au			0.42 μM (0.075 - 2.4)
3, 5av			7.0 μM (0.47 - 100)
4, 5aw			insol. ^b
5, 5bt			insol. ^b
6, 5bv			insol. ^b
7, 5bw			1.8 μM (0.74 - 4.3)
8, 5ct			2.5 μM (1.3 - 5.0)

Entry, Compound	R	Ar	IC ₅₀ ^a (95% CI)
9, 5dt			0.64 μM (0.33 - 1.2)
10, 5et			0.77 μM (0.39 - 1.5)

^aIC₅₀ values and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were determined by running the sample in triplicate versus a 6 μM concentration of LPI

^bcompound was not completely soluble at the concentrations of the assay.