Graphical Abstract

Identification of potent and selective retinoid acid receptor gamma (RAR γ) antagonists for the treatment of osteoarthritis pain using structure based drug design.

Leave this area blank for abstract info.

Norman E. Hughes, Thomas J. Bleisch, Scott A. Jones, Timothy I. Richardson, Robert A. Doti, Yong Wang, Stephanie L. Stout, Gregory L. Durst, Mark G. Chambers, Jennifer L. Oskins, Chaohua Lin, Lisa A. Adams, Todd J. Page, Robert J. Barr, Richard W. Zink, Harold Osborne, Chahrzad Montrose-Rafizadeh, Bryan H. Norman*

Identification of potent and selective retinoic acid receptor gamma (RAR γ) antagonists for the treatment of osteoarthritis pain using structure based drug design.

Norman E. Hughes,^a Thomas J. Bleisch,^a Scott A. Jones,^a Timothy I. Richardson,^a Robert A. Doti,^a Yong Wang,^a Stephanie L. Stout,^a Gregory L. Durst,^a Mark G. Chambers,^b Jennifer L. Oskins,^b Chaohua Lin,^b Lisa A. Adams,^c Todd J. Page,^c Robert J. Barr,^a Richard W. Zink,^a Harold Osborne,^a Chahrzad Montrose-Rafizadeh,^a Bryan H. Norman^{a*}

^aDiscovery Chemistry Research and Technologies, Eli Lilly and Company, Lilly Corporate Center, Indianapolis, IN 46285

^bMusculoskeletal Research, Eli Lilly and Company, Lilly Corporate Center, Indianapolis, IN 46285

^cToxicology/Drug Disposition, Eli Lilly and Company, Lilly Corporate Center, Indianapolis, IN 46285

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received

Revised

Accepted

Available online

Keywords:

Retinoic Acid Receptor

RAR γ

Antagonist

Osteoarthritis

Pain

ABSTRACT

A series of triaryl pyrazoles were identified as potent pan antagonists for the Retinoic Acid Receptors (RARs) α , β and γ . X-ray crystallography and structure-based drug design were used to improve selectivity for RAR γ by targeting residue differences in the ligand binding pockets of these receptors. This resulted in the discovery of novel antagonists which maintained RAR γ potency but were greater than 500-fold selective vs. RAR α and RAR β . The potent and selective RAR γ antagonist LY2955303 demonstrated good pharmacokinetic properties and was efficacious in the MIA model of osteoarthritis-like joint pain. This compound demonstrated an improved margin to RAR α -mediated adverse effects.

2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Retinoic acid receptors (RAR α , β and γ) are part of a superfamily of nuclear receptors (NRs) that behave as ligand-activated transcription factors and operate as part of a complex signaling network.¹ It has been shown that the natural ligand for the RARs, All Trans Retinoic Acid (ATRA), is deleterious to articular cartilage health and is associated with the breakdown of cartilage in osteoarthritis.² Both natural and synthetic retinoids (RAR agonists) are catabolic to cartilage, block early chondrogenesis and promote chondrocyte hypertrophy via RAR-mediated signaling.³ It was also demonstrated that retinoid levels are increased in the synovial fluid of OA patients as a function of disease severity.⁴ Finally, ATRA has been shown to cause nociceptive pain in rodents and this effect can be blocked by a pan-RAR antagonist.^{5,6} It has been postulated that RAR antagonists may prevent or reverse retinoid-mediated cartilage destruction and mitigate OA pain.

A RAR pan antagonist (BMS-189453) was previously shown to improve clinical scores in rodent models of joint pain and inflammation,⁷ albeit with unacceptable adverse effects on testes.⁸ Based on the severe testicular effects observed in RAR α

knock-out mice,⁹ this effect is largely believed to be RAR α -mediated. In contrast, we recently showed that a selective RAR γ agonist was sufficient to cause an increase in markers of articular cartilage catabolism, such as the proteolytic enzyme ADAMTS-5, in rats and a selective RAR γ antagonist could reverse those effects.¹⁰ Thus, due to the apparent importance of RAR γ in the joint, and the clear safety issues associated with RAR α antagonism in other tissues, we sought to identify RAR γ antagonists with very high selectivity vs. RAR α for potential use in the treatment of OA and OA pain.

Our lead generation began with the identification of **1** (Figure 1), which contained the tetramethyl-tetrahydronaphthalene substructure (in red), common to many synthetic retinoids. This compound was a potent RAR γ binder, but with only modest (~10 x) selectivity vs. RAR α and β . Additionally, **1** demonstrated full RAR γ antagonist function in a cellular co-transfection assay (K_B = 2.2 nM, max inhibition >100%).^{11,12} Removal of the tetramethyl-tetrahydronaphthalene substructure resulted in **2**, which maintained similar potency, but diminished selectivity.

*Corresponding author

Email address: norman@lilly.com

Figure 1. RAR Pan Antagonist Hits.

Crystallography and structure-based drug design were used to improve selectivity of this scaffold. With sufficient potency for RAR γ , we focused on the solution of a structure bound to RAR α . Our goal was to disrupt RAR α binding in a way that could potentially maintain RAR γ binding. Thus, we solved the structure of **2** bound to the ligand binding domain of RAR α (Figure 2). Based on previously reported RAR structures,¹³ we were not surprised by the binding pose of **2** with the benzoic acid functionality anchored to the subtype conserved arginine and the methylsulfonyl-phenyl group bound near helix

Figure 2. 1.85Å structure of **2** (grey) bound to the RAR α ligand binding pocket (green, PDB: 5K13), aligned and overlaid with the RAR γ ligand binding pocket (orange) from the agonist structure (PDB: 1EXA) with helix 12 truncated.

12.¹⁴ Similar to other NHR antagonists, this aromatic group perturbs helix 12 in a way that prevents coactivator binding, which is necessary for antagonist function.

The ligand binding domain of RARs are highly conserved with differences occurring in only 3 residues, as noted in Table 1.¹⁵ Our attention was drawn to the residues in helix 5. Specifically, we were interested in the single residue difference between RAR α and RAR β vs. RAR γ in this region. We

hypothesized that the branched sidechain of Ile270 (RAR α) and Ile263 (RAR β) would occupy more three dimensional space and be less tolerant to ligand-associated steric volume, than the linear sidechain of Met272 found in RAR γ . Thus, to potentially disrupt RAR α and RAR β binding, but maintain RAR γ affinity, we added functional groups to the C5 position of this aryl ring, which, as shown in Figure 2, was less than 4 Å away from the sidechain atoms of Ile270 in RAR α .

Table 1. Residue differences in RAR subtype ligand binding domains

	Helix 3	Helix 5	Helix 11
RAR α	S232	I270	V395
RAR β	A225	I263	V388
RAR γ	A234	M272	A397

The impact of C5-substitution is shown in Table 2. Increasing the size of this substituent led to progressively poorer affinity towards RAR α and RAR β , but maintained high affinity to RAR γ . In addition to maintaining good RAR γ binding affinity and >100x selectivity vs. RAR α and RAR β , **5** also demonstrated potent antagonist function in the cellular co-transfection assay (K_B = 35 nM, Max. inhibition > 100%).

Table 2. Binding affinity and subtype specificity of RAR γ antagonists

R	Binding Ki + SEM (nM) ^a			Selectivity γ vs. α
	RAR α	RAR β	RAR γ	
2 H	1.8 ± 0.3	4.3 ± 0.9	1.1 ± 0.5	1.6x
3 Me	6.2 ± 3.3	10.0 ± 2.6	1.1 ± 0.4	5.6x
4 <i>i</i> -Pr	87 ± 7.8	131 ± 9.9	1.6 ± 0.2	54x
5 <i>t</i> -Bu	461 ± 93	995 ± 196	4.4 ± 0.8	106x

^aAll reported data derived from at least 3 replicates.

While we had optimized the selectivity via substitutions near helix 5, the resulting antagonists, such as **5**, demonstrated poor solubility (<100 ng/mL) in simulated intestinal fluid. To mitigate the potential for solubility limiting absorption, we explored amides and found that they were suitable sulfone replacements, as shown in Table 3. In fact, compared to sulfone **5**, substituted amides maintained RAR γ affinity and showed even higher selectivities vs. RAR α and RAR β , in contrast to pan antagonist BMS-189453, which, as expected, was not selective in our hands. Furthermore, compounds in this series were similarly potent and selective in the RAR γ co-transfection (CTF) functional assay in HEK293 cells (LY2955303: RAR α K_B > 4440 nM; RAR β K_B = 1510 nM; RAR γ K_B = 7.11 nM). Additionally, being a zwitterion, LY2955303 showed dramatic solubility improvement (>1.0 mg/mL in simulated intestinal fluid).

<Insert Table 3 (Double Column, see below)>

Having identified a potent and selective RAR γ antagonist, with suitable properties, we sought to test our hypotheses around (a) improved pharmacokinetic profile in rats, (b) efficacy in a rat model of OA-like joint pain and (c) improved safety profile vs.

RAR α mediated testicular effects. The pharmacokinetic profile for **10** (Figure 3) showed proportional increases in C_{max} and AUC at 10, 30 and 100 mg/kg after oral administration, with no accumulation upon chronic dosing up to 14 days.¹⁶ Thus, we were ready to evaluate this compound in efficacy and safety studies.

Figure 3. Pharmacokinetic profile of LY2955303.

To assess the pharmacodynamic effects of selective antagonism of RAR γ , we evaluated LY2955303 in the mono-iodoacetate (MIA) model of OA-like joint pain in rats.¹⁷ This model assesses differential weight bearing as a measure of joint pain after a single intra-articular injection of MIA into a hind limb joint. At nine days post MIA injection, the differential weight bearing between the contralateral and ipsilateral limbs was about 22 g (Figure 4). On the same day, a single oral dose of LY2955303 demonstrated a dose responsive effect whereby the rat reduced differential weight bearing ($ED_{50} = 0.72$ mg/kg). The maximal analgesic response observed was similar to the maximal response observed for other analgesics.¹⁶

Figure 4. Dose responsive MIA analgesic data for LY2955303.

Previously, Beehler reported that RAR pan-antagonist BMS-189453 was efficacious in the mouse collagen induced arthritis (CIA) model and the streptococcal cell wall induced arthritis (SCWA) model, both at a dose of 15 mg/kg.⁷ It was also reported by Schulze that this same compound demonstrated testicular adverse effects in rats at doses as low as 2 mg/kg.⁸ Based on the previous genetic studies that showed robust testicular degeneration in RAR α ,⁹ but not RAR γ knockout mice,¹⁸ we were eager to learn if a selective RAR γ antagonist could avoid the testicular effects noted with a pan antagonist at efficacious exposures. Thus, we tested LY2955303 in a 14 day

toxicology study in rats and found adverse testicular effects only at doses significantly exceeding the MIA ED_{50} (Table 4). Based on drug exposure (AUC) in the rat at the efficacious dose of 0.72 mg/kg, the margin of exposure at the no effect dose for testicular effects (10 mg/kg) was 59 fold. Testicular degeneration was observed at the 30 mg/kg dose, which had a margin of exposure equal to 239 fold over the exposure at the MIA ED_{50} .

Table 4. Rat toxicological data for LY2955303

Dose (mg/kg)	AUC (ng-hr/ml)	MOE ¹	Testes Effect
0.72 (ED_{50})	154 ²	1	
10	9100 ³	59x	No Adverse effect
30	36800 ³	239x	Degeneration

¹Margin of exposure

²Determined from a rat exposure study at the ED_{50} of 0.72 mg/kg.

³Determined from toxicokinetic study.

The methods used to prepare triaryl pyrazoles have been previously described.¹¹ As a representative example, Scheme 1 outlines the procedure used to prepare compound LY2955303. Methyl 4-acetylbenzoate (**12**) was treated with sodium hydroxide in methanol, followed by the addition of 3,5-di-*tert*-butylbenzaldehyde (**11**), resulting in formation of the intermediate chalcone acid, which was esterified using methanesulfonic acid in methanol to give chalcone ester **13**. **13** was treated with hydrazine **14** and acetic acid in *n*-butanol, condensing and cyclizing to the intermediate pyrazoline, which was oxidized to pyrazole **15** using manganese dioxide in dichloromethane. **15** was treated with N-methylpiperazine, HOBT and EDCI in dichloromethane to give the corresponding amide-ester, which was saponified to complete the synthesis of LY2955303.

Insert Scheme 1 (Double Column)

Scheme 1. Synthesis of compound **10**. Reagents and conditions: (a) NaOH, CH₃OH; (b) CH₃SO₃H, CH₃OH; (c) HOAc, *n*-BuOH; (d) MnO₂, CH₂Cl₂; (e) N-methylpiperazine, HOBT, EDCI, CH₂Cl₂; (f) KOH, THF/water.

In conclusion, we have identified triaryl pyrazoles, a novel RAR antagonist scaffold. We also utilized a ligand-protein x-ray crystal structure to guide a structure-based drug design strategy to improve selectivity. This approach culminated in the identification of LY2955303, which displayed exquisite potency and robust selectivity for RAR γ vs. the other subtypes RAR α and RAR β *in vitro*. This compound showed good pharmacokinetic properties and efficacy in rodents at exposures significantly lower than the exposures that produced testicular toxicity, consistent with our hypothesis that a selective RAR γ antagonist could maintain efficacy with an improved safety profile relative to RAR pan antagonists.

Acknowledgement

This research used resources of the Advanced Photon Source, a U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science User Facility operated for the DOE Office of Science by Argonne National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357.

References and notes

1. Sporn, M. B.; Roberts, A. B.; Goodman, D. S. *The Retinoids, Biology, Chemistry and Medicine*. 2nd Ed. Raven Press, NY, 1993.
2. Kubo, M.; Takase, T.; Matsusue, Y.; Rauvala, H.; Imai, S. *Osteoarthritis Cart.*, **2002**, 10, 968.
3. Johnson, K. A.; van Etten, D.; Nanda, N.; Graham, R. M.; Terkeltaub, R. A. *J. Biol. Chem.*, **2003**, 278, 18824.
4. Davies, M. R.; Ribeiro, L. R.; Downey-Jones, M.; Needham, M. R. C.; Oakley, C.; Wardale, J. *Arth. Rheum.*, **2009**, 60, 1722.
5. Romero-Sandoval, E. A.; Alique, M.; Moreno-Manzano, V.; Molina, C.; Lucio, F. J.; Herrero, J. F. *Inflamm. Res.*, **2004**, 53, 297.
6. Alique, M.; Lucio, F. J.; Herrero, J. F. *Br. J. Pharmacol.*, **2006**, 149, 65.
7. Beehler, B. C.; Hei, Y.; Chen, S.; Lupisella, J. A.; Ostrowski, J.; Starrett, J. E.; Tortolani, D.; Trampusch, K. M.; Reczek, P. R. *J. Rheum.*, **2003**, 30, 355.
8. Schulze, G. E.; Clay, R. J.; Mezza, L. E.; Bregman, C. L.; Buroker, R. A.; Franz, J. D. *Toxicol. Sci.*, **2001**, 59, 297.
9. Lufkin, T.; Lohnes, D.; Mark, M.; Dierich, A.; Gorry, P.; Gaub, M. P.; LeMeur, M.; Chambon, P. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **1993**, 90, 7225.
10. B.H. Norman, B. H.; Geiser, A.; Chambers, M.; Moore, T.; Chandrasekhar, S.; Page, T.; Bleisch, T.; Mitchell, P. *Osteoarthritis Cart.*, **2013**, 21, S287.
11. Bleisch, T. J.; Coates, D. A.; Hughes, N. E.; Jones, S. A.; Norman, B. H. PCT Int. Appl., 2013, WO 2013066640.
12. Binding and functional *in vitro* assays have been previously described (see reference 11). Functional activity was determined using human embryonic kidney HEK 293 cells transiently transfected with hybrid GAL4 DNA binding domain (DBD) fused to RARgamma, alpha, or beta ligand binding domain (LBD) downstream of an SV40 promoter, and a reporter plasmid containing 5X GAL4 response element upstream of a firefly luciferase gene. Antagonist activity was determined in the presence of all trans retinoic acid (ATRA) at the corresponding EC₈₀ concentrations (15nM for RAR alpha and gamma receptors and 10nM for RAR beta). Percent inhibition was calculated based on the response obtained in the presence (baseline) and absence (100% inhibition) of ATRA alone. IC₅₀ was calculated using a 4 parameter logistics. An apparent K_B was calculated using Cheng-Prusoff equation and the EC₅₀ of ATRA determined within each assay.
13. Klaholz, B. P.; Mitschler, A.; Moras, D. *J. Mol. Biol.*, **2000**, 302, 155.
14. The X-ray data for **2** bound to RAR α (Figure 2) have been deposited into the Protein Data Bank with accession code 5K13.
15. Renaud, J.; Rochel, N.; Ruff, M.; Vivat, V.; Chambon, P.; Gronemeyer, H.; Moras, D. *Nature*, **1995**, 378, 681.
16. A rat bioavailability study (2 mg/kg IV and 10 mg/kg PO) demonstrated 26% oral bioavailability.
17. Bove, S. E.; Calcaterra, S. L.; Brooker, R. M.; Huber, C. M.; Guzman, R.E.; Juneau, P. L.; Schrier, D. J.; Kilgore, K. S. *Osteoarthritis Cart.*, **2003**, 11, 821.
18. Lohnes, D.; Kastner, P.; Dierich, A.; Mark, M.; LeMeur, M.; Chambon, P. *Cell*, **1993**, 73, 643.

Table 3. *In vitro* profile of compounds 5-9 and LY2955303.

Cpd.	Binding K _i + SEM (nM) ^a			Selectivity		CTF Functional ^a	
	RAR α	RAR β	RAR γ	γ vs. α	γ vs. β	RAR γ K _B + SEM (nM)	Max. Inhib.
5	461 $\pm$ 93	995 $\pm$ 196	4.4 $\pm$ 0.8	106x	228x	13.5 $\pm$ 6.4	>100%
6	>1700	>2980	4.1 $\pm$ 1.4	>414x	>725x	11.1 $\pm$ 5.9	>100%
7	>1700	>2980	1.4 $\pm$ 0.3	>1259x	>2207x	14.7 $\pm$ 8.8	79%
8	>1700	>2980	2.2 $\pm$ 0.5	>766x	>1342x	21.3 $\pm$ 14.6	>100%
9	>1700	>2980	2.3 $\pm$ 0.1	>752x	>1319x	7.2 $\pm$ 5.5	>100%
LY2955303	>1700	>2980	1.1 $\pm$ 0.3	>1560x	>2734x	7.1 $\pm$ 4.9	>100%
BMS-189453	7.7 $\pm$ 1.1	16.7 $\pm$ 4.4	17.3 $\pm$ 2.8	Not selective	Not selective	18.5 $\pm$ 9.2	>100%

^aAll reported data derived from at least 3 replicates.

Scheme 1. Synthesis of compound LY2955303. Reagents and conditions: (a) NaOH, CH₃OH; (b) CH₃SO₃H, CH₃OH; (c) HOAc, *n*-BuOH; (d) MnO₂, CH₂Cl₂; (e) N-methylpiperazine, HOBT, EDCI, CH₂Cl₂, (f) KOH, THF/water.