

Published in final edited form as:

ACS Med Chem Lett. 2010 April 12; 1(5): 194–198. doi:10.1021/ml100041f.

Selection, Preparation, and Evaluation of Small- Molecule Inhibitors of Toll-Like Receptor 4

Douglas E. Bevan¹, Alexander J. Martinko¹, Lisa C. Loram^{2,3}, Joshua A. Stahl¹, Frederick R. Taylor², Sampada Joshee¹, Linda R. Watkins^{2,3}, and Hang Yin^{1,3}


Hang Yin: Hang.Yin@colorado.edu

¹Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309

²Department of Psychology & Neuroscience, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309

³The Center for Neuroscience, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309

Abstract



Toll-like receptor 4 (TLR4), a membrane spanning receptor protein that functions in complex with its accessory protein MD-2, is an intriguing target for therapeutic development. Herein we report the identification of a series of novel TLR4 inhibitors and the development of a robust, enantioselective synthesis using an unprecedented Mannich-type reaction to functionalize a pyrazole ring. *In silico* and cellular assay results demonstrated that compound 1 and its analogues selectively block TLR4 activation in live cells. Animal model tests showed that 1 and its derivatives could potentiate morphine-induced analgesia *in vivo*, presumably by attenuating the opioid-induced TLR4 activation.

Keywords

toll-like receptor; glial cells; signal transduction; protein-protein interactions; synthesis

The regulation of protein-protein interactions using small-molecule agents is a fast-evolving field in medicinal chemistry and chemical biology¹. One of the mechanisms by which the innate immune system senses the invasion of pathogenic microorganisms is through the toll-like receptors (TLRs). TLRs are type I integral membrane glycoproteins² that recognize specific molecular patterns present in microbial components³. Stimulation of different TLRs induces distinct patterns of gene expression, which not only leads to the activation of innate immunity but also instructs the development of antigen-specific acquired immunity. TLR4 detects lipopolysaccharide (LPS, a component of gram-negative bacterial cell walls)⁴. Most

Correspondence to: Hang Yin, Hang.Yin@colorado.edu.

Supporting Information: Experimental procedures and characterization of novel compounds, biological testing procedure and results. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

recently, Watkins *et al.* found that TLR4 plays an essential role in microglial activation that contributes to the development of morphine tolerance and thereby compromises the analgesic effects of morphine⁵. This exciting discovery provides a novel avenue for therapeutic development to attenuate morphine tolerance by blocking TLR4 signal transduction in glial cells⁶.

The structure of TLR4 has recently been solved⁷, rendering opportunities for the use of structure-based drug design technology to develop potential inhibitors. TLR4 forms a heterodimer with MD-2, regulating a number of critical cell signaling pathways⁸. The protein-protein interactions between TLR4 and MD-2 are essential for TLR4 signaling, and therefore an intriguing target for therapeutic development specifically for TLR4 over other TLRs since MD-2 interacts primarily with TLR4 among TLR family proteins⁹.

In order to identify novel, drug-like small molecule inhibitors for TLR4, we employed a recently developed high throughput *in silico* screening method¹⁰. A low-molecular-weight, drug-like lead structure, T5342126 (**1**) has been identified from the *in silico* screening that targets the MD-2 binding region on the TLR4 surface. The next step was to develop a synthesis which would be conducive to structure activity relationship (SAR) studies.

When considering a retrosynthesis for **1** (Figure 1), the most logical disconnection was that of the β -amino alcohol, giving epoxide **2** and tetra substituted pyrazole **3**. Epoxide **2** could be traced back to epichlorohydrin (**4**) and phenol **5**. The pyrazole portion **3** can be dismantled via a Mannich type reaction and S_N2 displacement of benzylchloride **7** by pyrazole **6**. This retrosynthesis gave us the ability to easily alter four parts of the molecule independently to aid in SAR studies.

In the forward direction (Scheme 1), the construction of the top piece commenced with the treatment of 3,5-dimethylpyrazole (**6**) with KOH and the 2-chloro benzyl chloride (**7**) to give *N*-aryl pyrazole **8** in a quantitative yield. The next reaction to append the methylene methylamine was unprecedented in the literature to the best of our knowledge. With guidance from a number of sources¹¹, we were able to develop a robust and high yielding Mannich-type reaction for the synthesis. By treating pyrazole **8** with a 1:2 mixture of methyl amine and paraformaldehyde in refluxing ethanol¹², we were able to obtain the desired amine **3** in a 93% yield.

Synthesis of the bottom half of the molecule involved stirring 4-ethoxy phenol (**5**) with epichlorohydrin (**4**) and potassium carbonate in refluxing acetone¹³ to yield 83% of desired product **2**. Coupling of the two pieces was best accomplished by stirring amine **3** and epoxide **2** in a 1.2:1 ratio in refluxing 2 M ethanol, to give the target compound **1** in an 89% yield, with an 82% overall yield from commercially available 3,5-dimethylpyrazole.

To test the stereospecificity of the binding of **1** to TLR4, we made the enantiopure forms of both enantiomers at the single alcohol stereocenter of the molecule. To accomplish this, racemic epoxide **2** was treated with Jacobsen's hydrolytic kinetic conditions¹⁴ (Scheme 2) to access either the pure (+) or the (-) enantiomers. Since both the (*R,R*)- and the (*S,S*)-Jacobsen pre-catalysts are commercially available, either enantiomer of **2** could be readily produced. This material could then be used in the final coupling reaction with **3** to give access to both enantiomers of **1**. Using this method, both enantiopure isomers of **1** were synthesized with 99% enantiomeric excess (*ee*).

Using this robust, modular synthesis, we also prepared a focused-library of analogues of lead compound **1**. (Table 1). All these analogues were made racemically using the same sequence as the parent compound, and in comparable yields. This first round of analogues was meant to apply changes only to the periphery of the parent compound.

With these analogues in hand, we tested the *in vitro* inhibitory effects for TLR4 signaling in the HEK 293 cells using a previously described SEAP assay¹⁵. Compound **15** with 2-Cl and 4-Cl substitutes on the top and bottom aromatic rings has been identified with the highest potency to block TLR4 signaling in live cells. At a concentration of 50 μ M, racemic **15** showed a complete inhibition of LPS-induced TLR4 activation in HEK 293 cells. By contrast, analogue **12** with no substitution on the aromatic rings showed negligible inhibition, indicating the critical importance of the functional groups. Both enantiomers of **1** showed comparable inhibitory potency, suggesting that its stereocenter does not involve in the recognition of TLR4. These SAR results also demonstrated that the derivatives of **1** inhibit TLR4 activation in a specific manner, ruling out the possibility of non-specific artifacts by the backbone scaffold. Further, none of these compounds showed any detectable cytotoxicity at concentrations up to 300 μ M in various cell lines (*e.g.* RAW264.7, HEK 293, HeLa).

Next, we carried out dose-dependence studies for the representative inhibitors. Using the SEAP assay, the EC₅₀ values for racemic compounds **15** and **1** were determined to be 18.7 ± 3.2 μ M and 48.1 ± 2.1 μ M, respectively (Supplementary Figure). Unfortunately, complete inhibition plots for other less potent analogues were not achieved due to the limitation of the cellular assay. TLR4 is an innate immune receptor and can recognize an array of exogenous ligands¹⁶. Addition of higher dose of inhibitors activates TLR4's signal transduction, which in turn compromises the inhibitory effect analyses. Nonetheless, these results have demonstrated that the inhibitory effects of these analogues are dose-dependent and that the functional groups on the benzene rings are crucial

In an effort to understand the specificity of our small molecule inhibitors between different TLRs, we investigated the selectivity of **15** by measuring nitric oxide (NO) production in RAW cells. RAW cells express all TLRs and each specific TLR can be individually activated by treatment with a receptor-specific ligand.[17] Activation of TLRs results in downstream signalling and production of pro-inflammatory mediators such as nitric oxide (NO). Compound **15** (27 μ M) inhibited TLR4-mediated NO production but showed negligible effects on the signalling of TLR3, TLR 2/6, TLR 2/1 and TLR7 (Figure 2). These results demonstrated that **15** selectively inhibits LPS-induced TLR4 activation without affecting other homologous toll like receptors.

In order to obtain insights into the possible binding modes of the lead inhibitors, we conducted *in silico* docking simulation for compounds **1** and **15**. Figure 3 shows the top-ranked binding mode of **15** predicted by the *AutoDock 4.0 Simulation Suite*, implying that **15** recognizes the same cleft on the surface of TLR4 to which a protruding loop region of MD-2 binds. These results suggest that **15** may inhibit the TLR4/MD-2 complex formation by competing with MD-2's binding to TLR4. Docking results for compound **1** suggested a similar binding mode to **15** (data not shown), lending further support that the *in silico* prediction is consistent and valid.

An established rat model was employed to test whether the newly discovered TLR4 signalling antagonist was able to potentiate the analgesic effect of morphine *in vivo*¹⁷. The Hargreaves test was employed to measure the time taken to observe radiant heat-induced withdrawal responses by the tails of unrestrained rats¹⁹. Prior to drug administration, two readings were recorded. Following these baseline measurements, drugs were injected intrathecally and the rats' responses to radiant heat re-assessed across a three-hour timecourse (Figure 4). While **15** had no effect on pain responsivity in the absence of co-administered morphine, it robustly potentiated the acute analgesic effects of morphine such that the rats exhibited the maximum analgesia recordable on the test. Using the same assay, compound **1** at an elevated dose (injection of 1 μ l 30 mM solution) was shown to have

similar effects to potentiate and prolong morphine-induced analgesia, suggesting that the analogues of **1** consistently inhibit morphine-induced TLR4 activation *in vivo*. It is noticeable that the moderate *in vitro* inhibitory potency of **1** ($EC_{50}=48.1 \pm 2.1 \mu M$) and **15** ($EC_{50}=18.7 \pm 3.2 \mu M$) is relevant under the physiological conditions *in vivo*. The volume of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) in the rat model that we employed has been determined to be around 100 μL ¹⁸, intrathecal administered morphine, **15**, and **1** (injection volume = 1 μL) are estimated to present at concentrations of 530, 10, and 300 μM , respectively, in the rat CSF, which is consistent with the previously established assay conditions^{18,19}.

In conclusion, we have accomplished our goal of developing and executing an easily modified and scalable synthesis (5 g scale to date) of derivatives of the lead compound **1**. In the process, we developed a reliable and previously unreported Mannich-type reaction. We have shown that the substituents on the benzene rings of **1** affect the *in vitro* activity of the molecule, as well as that one of the enantiomers at the alcohol position is more active than the other. Finally, we have shown **1** and its analogues to be effective at blocking TLR4 activation in live cells and at potentiating morphine analgesia in live animal studies.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank the National Institutes of Health (DA026950, DA025740, NS067425, RR025780, and DA029119 to H. Y.; DA023132, DA024044, NS067807, and DE017782 to L. R. W.) for financial support of this work.

References

1. (a) Yin H, Hamilton AD. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2005; 44:4130. (b) Wells JA, McClendon CL. *Nature*. 2007; 450:1001. [PubMed: 18075579]
2. Gangloff M, Gay N. *J Annu Rev Biochem*. 2007; 76:141–165.
3. Kawai T, Akira S. *Trends Mol Med*. 2007; 13:460–469. [PubMed: 18029230]
4. Hoshino K, Takeuchi O, Kawai T, Sanjo H, Ogawa T, Takeda Y, Takeda K, Akira S. *J Immunol*. 1999; 162:3749. [PubMed: 10201887]
5. Milligan ED, Watkins LR. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2009; 10:23. [PubMed: 19096368]
6. Sheridan C. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2009; 27:114. [PubMed: 19204681]
7. (a) Park BS, Song DH, Kim HM, Choi BS, Lee H, Lee JO. *Nature*. 2009; 458:1191. [PubMed: 19252480] (b) Kim HM, Park BS, Kim JI, Kim SE, Lee J, Oh SC, Enkhbayar P, Matsushima N, Lee H, Yoo OJ, Lee JO. *Cell*. 2007; 130:906. [PubMed: 17803912]
8. Nagai Y, Akashi S, Nagafuku M, Miyake K, Ogata M, Iwakura Y, Akira S, Kitamura T, Kosugi A, Kimoto M. *Nat Immunol*. 2002; 3:667. [PubMed: 12055629]
9. Bsibsi M, Ravid R, Gveric D, van Noort JM. *J Neuropathol Exp Neurol*. 2002; 61:1013. [PubMed: 12430718]
10. Fedichev, PO. Quantum Pharmaceuticals, Ltd. www.q-pharm.com
11. (a) Kürti, L.; Czako, B. *Strategic Applications in Named Reactions in Organic Synthesis*. Elsevier Academic Press; Burlington, MA: 2005. p. 274 (b) Tramontini M, Angiolini L. *Tetrahedron*. 1990; 46:1791. (c) Tramontini M. *Synthesis*. 1973:703. (d) Ragab FA. *Eur J Med Chem*. 2007; 42:1117. [PubMed: 17346862]
12. **General Procedure:** A solution of paraformaldehyde (0.820 g, 27.2 mmol) and methylamine. HCl (0.920 g, 13.6 mmol) was dissolved in ethanol (9.06 mL) and stirred for 1 h, then trisubstituted pyrazole (4.53 mmol) was added and the reaction mixture was stirred at reflux for 12h. The mixture was then cooled to room temperature and quenched with aqueous NaHCO₃ (15 mL). The aqueous layer was extracted 3 times with chloroform (15 mL) and the combined organic layers were washed with brine (30 mL). The organic layer was dried with MgSO₄ and concentrated

under reduced pressure. The resulting yellow oil was purified by flash column chromatography using 3% methanol in dichloromethane as the eluting solvent. The product was isolated as a solid with a melting point near room temperature in a 93% yield.

13. (a) Bevinakatti HS, Banerji AA. *J Org Chem.* 1992; 57:6003. (b) Erhardt PW, Woo CM, Gorczynski RJ, Anderson WG. *J Med Chem.* 1982; 25:1402. [PubMed: 6130153]
14. Schaus SE, Brandes BD, Larrow JF, Tokunaga M, Hansen KB, Gould AE, Furrow ME, Jacobsen EN. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2002; 124:1307. [PubMed: 11841300]
15. Slivka PF, Shridhar M, Lee GI, Sammond DW, Hutchinson MR, Martinko AJ, Buchanan MM, Sholar PW, Kearney JJ, Harrison JA, Watkins LR, Yin H. *ChemBioChem.* 2009; 10:645. [PubMed: 19184989]
16. Buchanan MM, Hutchinson MR, Watkins LR, Yin H. *J Neurochem.* 2010; 114:13. [PubMed: 20402965]
17. Hutchinson MR, Zhang Y, Shridhar M, Evans JH, Buchanan MM, Zhao TX, Slivka PF, Coats BD, Rezvani N, Wieseler J, Hughes TS, Landgraf KE, Chan S, Fong S, Phipps S, Falke JJ, Leinwand LA, Maier SF, Yin H, Rice KC, Watkins LR. *Brain Behav Immun.* 2010; 24:83. [PubMed: 19679181]
18. Sloane E, Langer S, Jekich JB, Mahoney J, Huges T, Frank M, Selbert W, Huberty G, Coats B, Harrison J, Klinman D, Poole S, Maier S, Johnson K, Chavez R, Watkins LR, Leinwand L, Milligan E. *Gene Ther.* 2009; 16:1210. [PubMed: 19571887]




Figure 1.
Retrosynthesis of **1** (T5342126).




Figure 2.

Effect of **15** on TLR-ligand induced nitric oxide (NO) production in RAW264.7 cells. LPS (lipopolysaccharide), poly(I:C) (polyinosinic-polycytidylic acid), FSL-1 ((*S,R*)-(2,3-bisphalmitoyloxypropyl)-Cys-Gly-Asp-Pro-Lys-His-Pro-Lys-Ser-Phe), Pam₃CSK₄ (*N*-palmitoyl-*S*-[2,3-bis(palmitoyloxy)-(2*R,S*)-propyl]-[*R*]-cysteinyl-[*S*]-seryl-[*S*]-lysyl-[*S*]-lysyl-[*S*]-lysyl-[*S*]-lysine.3HCl), and R848 (4-amino-2-(ethoxymethyl)- α,α -dimethyl-1*H*-imidazo[4,5-*c*]quinoline-1-ethanol) were used to selectively activate TLR4, TLR3, TLR2/6, TLR2/1, and TLR7, respectively. Compound **15** (25.0 μ M) selectively inhibited the NO production induced by LPS, but not ligands of other TLRs. Data are means from three independent experiments.




Figure 3.

Results of the molecular-docking simulation predict that **15** disrupts the TLR4/MD-2 interaction by competing with MD-2 binding to TLR4. (A) Side- and (B) top-views of the top-ranked binding modes of **15** (shown in ball-and-stick representation) are shown in complex with full-length TLR4 (orange), competing with MD-2 (red) for the same binding side by mimicking a protruding loop region of MD-2; The structure of TLR4 was taken from the complex with the lymphocyte antigen 96 (PDB ID 2Z65, resolution 2.70 Å).






Figure 4.

(a) Potentiating intrathecal morphine analgesia by intrathecal **15**. Following pre-drug (baseline) assessment of responsivity to radiant heat (Hargreaves test), rats received intrathecal morphine (1 μ l, 15 mg/ml), **15** (1 mM, 1 μ l) or the combination of these same morphine and small molecule doses. While **15** or vehicle alone (5x PBS) had no effect on pain sensitivity, **15** enhanced morphine analgesia. The asterisk denotes significant difference between morphine+vehicle and morphine+**15** ($P < 0.001$) from 85min to 125min. Error bars show s.e.m.




Scheme 1.
Preparation of T5342126 (**1**)



Scheme 2.
Synthesis of enantiopure (+)-1.

Table 1



Results of the SEAP reporter gene activation assay. Percent inhibition was determined by measurement of LPS-induced TLR4-activation in HEK293 cells in the presence of 50 μ M drug compared to blank control.

Compound	R ¹	R ²	Inhibition (%)
1	2-Cl	4-OEt	52%
(-)- 1	2-Cl	4-OEt	61%
(+)- 1	2-Cl	4-OEt	60%
11	4-OMe	4-OEt	4%
12	H	H	1%
13	2-Cl	4-(C ₂ H ₄)OMe	32%
14	2-Cl	2-OMe	36%
15	2-Cl	4-Cl	99%
16	2-F	4-OEt	40%
17	2-OMe	4-OEt	35%
18	2-Me	4-OEt	31%