Amide-to-Ester Substitution Allows Fine-Tuning of the Cyclopeptide Conformational Ensemble**
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Natural or designed peptide ligands rarely bind to cognate receptors in their most stable conformation when in solution.[3] The receptor, through reciprocal induced fitting,[2] applies pressure on the conformational ensemble of the peptide to select its complementary conformation. Given the flexible nature of the peptides’ modular architecture, a bioactive sequence must often be primed for recognition of its target to achieve high binding affinity or specificity. For rational peptide design, cyclization or structure-inducing residues have been successfully used to accomplish ligand preorganization.[3] However, deconvolution of the averaged NMR spectra of strained peptides or other macrocycles had shown that the bound-state conformations are poorly populated in the free uncomplexed state.[4] In small cyclic peptides, the stereochemistry of the backbone, rather than interactions with or among side chains, determines the conformational ensemble in solution. For the introduction of the H-bond pattern of the backbone, which influences the conformational ensemble as well as its equilibrium distribution, this influence is achieved through modulation of the backbone torsional preferences and H-bonding pattern, respectively.[6]

As a model we choose cilenitide (CIL), which is an Arg-Gly-Asp (RGD) peptide of sequence cyclo[RGD(NMe)Val] (see Scheme 1), with well-characterized biological and conformational properties.[7] CIL displays nanomolar inhibition of vitronectin binding to the isolated αvβ3 and αvβ5 integrin receptors, and it blocks integrin-dependent adhesion of tumor and endothelial cells to immobilized extracellular matrix (ECM) proteins and reduces angiogenesis and tumor growth in vivo.[8] Modulation of the internal H-bond pattern of nonmethylated CIL precursors—achieved by changing the flexibility or the chirality of the backbone—was found to influence the antagonist activity on the vitronectin (VN) and fibrinogen (FB) receptors, and has been proposed to control laminin P1 vs. vitronectin receptor specificity.[9]

We synthesized all five depsipeptides of the cyclopeptide CIL (D1–D5) by stepwise assembling of the linear precursors on 2-CTC resin (Fmoc/iBu strategy) and cyclization in solution. For the introduction of the α-hydroxy acid residues onto the growing peptide chain, their HFA-activated/protected derivatives were used[10] (Scheme 1). For the acylation of the free hydroxy group, DIPDCI/DMAP-activation was used.[11] For conventional peptide cyclization, the optimal site for macrocycle formation is between the Gly (acting as the C terminus) and Asp (acting as the N terminus) residues because Gly cannot epimerize. This strategy was used for the synthesis of parent CIL, D1, and D2 depsipeptides with PyBOP/HOAt.[12] The macro lactamization required for the preparation of D3 was successful with MSNT activation and NMI as the base. For the depsipeptides D4 and D5, certain particularities of the ester bond had to be taken into account. Our attempts to synthesize the linear precursor of D4 (OGly analogue) starting from OGly as the C terminus, resulted in low yields, and was likely because of cleavage of the ester bond that was mediated by base during repeated treatment with piperidine. Therefore, NMeVal was chosen as the C terminus. For the preparation of D5, the cyclization was performed at the (apparently) less attractive position between (D)Phe and NMeVal. Macrolactamization at less hindered sites was impeded by intramolecular nucleophilic attack on the ester bond, which occurred during peptide chain elongation, and eliminated the (D)Phe–NMeVal couple as dioxopiperazinone.[13] Given the increased steric demand of the N-terminal NMeVal, we chose the more reactive PyAOP as the coupling reagent and HOAt as the additive.[14]

After cleavage from the solid support, all linear peptide and depsipeptide precursors were obtained in over 85 % yield. Head-to-tail cyclization was performed in solution and gave good yields in all cases and, finally, the protecting groups on the side chains were removed using [Pd(PPh3)4]/phenylsilane...
for the allyl group of D3, and TFA/TIS/H2O for the Bz group of all other peptides. Finally, purification by HPLC provided the macrocycles CIL and D1–D5 in 95 % purity.

For the synthesized compounds, their antagonist activity towards distinct integrin subtypes was tested indirectly as the capacity to inhibit the initial adhesion of a set of cellular lines to the appropriate ECM protein substrate. Adhesion inhibition assays of integrin αβ3 and αβ5 were carried out by performing a double-dependent adhesion study of HUVEC and M21 melanoma cells on VN.[15] Inhibition was assessed by 1D and 2D 1H NMR spectroscopy. The high temperature coefficient of the NH–Arg group, the narrow range on which the JHABN coupling constants were distributed, and a observed in these assays. HT29 cells also adhere to fibronectin (FN) through the closely related αβ6 integrin subtype; neither CIL nor depsipeptides D1–D4 inhibited the adhesion of HT29 cells to this substrate (data not shown), in contrast, D5 showed moderate inhibitory activity (IC50 value: 8.64 µM). As expected, neither CIL nor any of the depsipeptides inhibited the adhesion of M21 cells to collagen or FN (α2β1- and α3β1-dependent adhesion[16]), thus indicating that they do not antagonize αv-containing integrins (data not shown).

Ligand-occupied αβ3 and αβ5 receptors down-regulate apoptotic signals from unattached integrins and promote the survival of differentiated endothelial cells.[17] CIL antagonizes occupied αβ3 and αβ5 integrin and inhibits the proliferation of HUVEC cells plated on purified VN (Table 2). Analogue D5 displayed an IC50 value ten-fold lower than that of CIL. Analogs D4 and D1 showed inhibitory activity similar to that of CIL, whereas D2 was more than ten-fold less potent. Again D3 showed no inhibitory activity. As a positive control, we used the anti-αv-integrin monoclonal antibody Mab 17E6.[14]

The conformation of the synthesized compounds in solution was studied by 1D and 2D 1H NMR spectroscopy. The high temperature coefficient of the NH–Arg group, the narrow range on which the JHABN coupling constants were distributed, and a

Table 1: Adhesion inhibition assays of CIL and D1–D5. IC50 values are given in µM and the standard deviations are in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptides</th>
<th>αvβ3 + αvβ5</th>
<th>αvβ3</th>
<th>αvβ5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUVEC on VN</td>
<td>M21 on VN</td>
<td>M21 on FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>0.46 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.21 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.32 (0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>0.84 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.45 (0.21)</td>
<td>0.37 (0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>4.32 (0.82)</td>
<td>5.35 (0.75)</td>
<td>5.67 (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>0.27 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.06)</td>
<td>0.20 (0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>0.18 (0.06)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.10 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mab 17E6</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A conserved pattern of conformationally relevant NOE interactions (see the Supporting Information for details) suggest that the cyclodepsipeptide analogues of cilengitide retain the overall conformation and side chain topology of the parent cyclopeptide. The time- and ensemble-averaged 3D structures of the synthesized compounds, obtained by simulated annealing (SA) calculations, were generally very similar—with most variability limited to the (d)Phe φ angle and the Asp ψ angle (i.e., the tilt angle of the Asp-(d)Phe amide group; see Figure 1 and the Supporting Information). The only significant violation of the NMR constraints was found in the lowest-energy conformation of D4, in which the amide plane of Asp-(d)Phe was flipped about 130° with respect to its restrained position, thus suggesting that a conformational equilibrium is occurring in this cyclodepsipeptide analogue. Despite the likeness of their lowest-energy NMR structures, the antagonist potencies of the cyclodepsipeptides on the integrin receptors differed by more than two orders of magnitude.

The observation that the solution (Figure 1; picture to the left of each structure) and the integrin-bound cilengitide structures[19] show different arrangements of the RGD sequence led us to the following hypothesis: divergence in the IC50 values for cyclodepsipeptide analogues of cilengitide may result from a differential population of the RGD conformation competent for receptor binding (see the Supporting Information).

We then attempted molecular dynamics (MD) calculations to gain insight into the distributions that make up the averages of the conformational properties, as determined by NMR spectroscopy. Unrestrained simulation trajectories of 22 ns in water were generated using a polarizable force field.[20] The lowest-energy SA conformations were used as starting structures (see the Supporting Information). Cluster analysis of the trajectories obtained by the MD calculations confirmed that CIL and RGD cyclodepsipeptides D1–D5 populate similar conformational ensembles. These ensembles are composed of several conformers that differed by the twisting and flipping angles of the planes for amide and ester bonds.

The residence time of single conformers (mostly 10^{-8}–10^{-9}s) and the dynamics of the conformational changes, which are associated with the ester or amide plane flipping, are governed by the torsional preferences of the ester bonds and by the fast (10^{-11}s) formation and disruption of backbone-to-backbone H-bonds. Such an ensemble approach correlates well with the observed NOE interactions and other NMR measurements, and furnishes an explanation for the bioactivity of RGD cyclodepsipeptides. In CIL, fast flipping of the amide plane for the Arg-Gly bond defines two major families of conformers, A (including the SA structure) and B (including the integrin bound, and the previously published cilengitide solution structure[7]), which are populated 55% and 35% of the simulation time, respectively (Figure 2a). While in the A or B conformer, CIL oscillates between several closely related conformers in fast equilibrium among their torsional forms. Analogue D2 can be described by an equilibrium of two closely related A and A’ conformers, in which the amide groups of the bioactive RGD sequence are oriented in the same direction (Figure 2a). The two conformers differed by the twist angle of the ester group.

In analogy with CIL, the flip of the plane for the Arg-Gly amide group, which converts conformer A into B, was also observed during the MD calculations of D2. Conformer B of D2, however, appeared less stable and with a shorter residence time than that of its all-amide counterpart (com-
D2 with CIL: Figure 2b). In D3, three conformers rapidly interconvert through uncoupled flipping of the Arg-Gly and the NMeVal-Arg amide groups—where the NMeVal residue displaces from the α region to the β region of the Ramachandran plot[21]—an A conformer (55% populated) converts into a B conformer (20%) by flipping of the former, or into a C conformer (25%) by flipping of the latter. Molecular dynamic calculations of D4 shows only one conformation analogous to the B conformer of cilengitide, in which the carbonyl oxygen atoms of the Gly and Arg residues have an alternate orientation. The behavior of D5 in solution can be described by an A conformer converting into a B conformer by simultaneous flipping of the plane for the OArg-Gly amide and the NMeVal-OArg ester bonds. Concomitant transient closure of a seven-membered H-bond arrangement involving the Arg-CO and the HN-Asp moieties contributes to the increased stability of the B conformer in D5 compared to cilengitide (75% vs. 35% of the simulation time). A unique C conformer is 7% populated in D5, and it features an unusual β turn at the Gly-Asp (i + 2, i + 1) couple that is stabilized by a canonical ten-membered H-bond arrangement. For D3, D4, and CIL the upfield shift of the α proton in (o)Phe and the intensity of NOE interactions between the HN-(o)Phe amide proton and the proton in HN-Asp amide or the protons in NMe suggest the existence of a different, significantly populated D conformer, (similar to the lowest-energy structure of D4 calculated by SA, Figure 1), which originates from flipping of the plane for the Asp-(o)Phe amide group. This motion was occasionally observed only in the D3 trajectory; for D4 and CIL its dynamics lies outside of our simulation window (between 10⁻⁸ and 10⁻¹ s).

Analysis of the NMR data, the trajectories determined by MD calculations, and the antagonist potencies of cyclodepsi-peptide analogues of cilengitide allowed us to formulate a model for the recognition of RGD sequence by the αvβ3 and αvβ5 receptors. In this model an alternate conformation of the Gly-Asp and the Arg-Gly amide groups—pointing in opposite directions—is critical for the formation of ligand–receptor encounter complexes. Subsequent evolution to an high-affinity complex is driven by the formation of intramolecular (GlyCO to HN(o)Phe) and intermolecular

Figure 2. Top: CIL and D1–D5 representative conformations and their relative distributions, which were obtained by MD calculations. Arrows indicate the bonds about which rotations (that mediate conformer interconversion) occur. Bottom: Glycine Φ angle variation in CIL and D1–D5 during the MD calculations. Abrupt changes indicate Arg-Gly amide group flipping [A (uncompetent) – B (competent) Conformer conversion].
that reduce the allowed backbone conformational flexibility and cyclopeptides and cyclodepsipeptides to the α integrins. The conformational preference of the nanomolar antagonist cilengitide is still dominated by an unproductive A conformer that represents the most stable conformation in solution, while the alternate B conformer is only 35% populated (Figure 2a). Accordingly, D5 had improved potency because the alternate conformation is promoted by the concomitant flip of the plane for the ester bond and stabilized by the formation of a transient backbone H-bond. Analogue D3, despite significantly populating the B “alternate” conformer, has no H-bond donor capability at the Asp residue because the NH group is substituted by an oxygen atom, and it lacked any antagonistic activity. Analogue D2 showed severely diminished antagonist character because it poorly populates the B conformer (Figure 2a).

So far, the use of MD calculations to quantify conformation-activity relationships have been severely limited by the time resolution of state-of-art MD calculations, which is restricted to the μs range, and therefore inadequate to capture some aspects of the conformational flexibility of peptides and proteins. In this study, such an analysis is further complicated by the general inaccuracy of current force fields for the description of nonstandard residues. Indeed, our 22 ns MD calculations failed to completely reproduce the conformational behavior of all RGD macrocycles. As gauged by MD calculations, D4 mostly adopts the complementary B-receptor conformer, whereas the NMR data showed evidence of a significantly populated D conformer (which remained unexplored during the dynamics experiments). Then, MD calculations led to an overestimation of the population for the B conformer and the antagonist potency of D4. According to the presence of the D conformer, D4 displayed an antagonist potency comparable to that of CIL and inferior to that of analogue D5.

Taken together these results demonstrate that the targeted application of amide-to-ester substitution or “Ester Scan” in the design of cyclic peptides can be used to fine-tune the backbone conformation and to select a bioactive conformer from the conformational pool. Remarkably, D5 had three- to ten-fold increased potency with respect to the parent compound, depending on the assay. To the best of our knowledge, D5 is the most potent small-molecule dual αvβ3 and αvβ5 antagonist discovered to date. Preorganization of flexible peptides into their bioactive conformations has been often achieved by adding local conformational constraints that reduce the allowed backbone Φ and Ψ angles. Herein, we have described a complementary approach which relies on relieving specific conformational constraints by amide replacement with ester groups, thus leading to a targeted reorganization of the internal equilibrium of the conformational ensemble.
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