# A EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF CHEMICAL BIOLOGY CHEMBIO CHEM

SYNTHETIC BIOLOGY & BIO-NANOTECHNOLOGY

## **Accepted Article**

Title: A Tandem Enzymatic sp2-C-Methylation Process: Coupling In situ S-Adenosyl-L-Methionine Formation with Methyl Transfer

Authors: Joanna C Sadler, Luke D Humphreys, Glenn Burley, and Radka Snajdrova

This manuscript has been accepted after peer review and appears as an Accepted Article online prior to editing, proofing, and formal publication of the final Version of Record (VoR). This work is currently citable by using the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) given below. The VoR will be published online in Early View as soon as possible and may be different to this Accepted Article as a result of editing. Readers should obtain the VoR from the journal website shown below when it is published to ensure accuracy of information. The authors are responsible for the content of this Accepted Article.

To be cited as: ChemBioChem 10.1002/cbic.201700115

Link to VoR: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cbic.201700115



WILEY-VCH

www.chembiochem.org

3

#### WILEY-VCH

# A Tandem Enzymatic sp<sup>2</sup>-C-Methylation Process: Coupling *In Situ* S-Adenosyl-L-Methionine Formation with Methyl Transfer

Joanna. C. Sadler,<sup>[a],[b]</sup> Luke D. Humphreys,<sup>\*[a],[c]</sup> Radka Snajdrova,<sup>[a]</sup> Glenn. A. Burley<sup>\*[b]</sup>

**Abstract:** A one-pot, two-step biocatalytic platform for the regiospecfic *C*-methylation and *C*-ethylation of aromatic substrates is described. The tandem process utilizes SalL (*Salinospora tropica*) for *in situ* synthesis of *S*-adenosyl-L-methionine, followed by alkylation of aromatic substrates using the *C*-methyltransferase NovO (*Streptomyces spheroides*). Application of this methodology is demonstrated by regiospecific methyl, ethyl and isotopically-labelled <sup>13</sup>CH<sub>3</sub>, <sup>13</sup>CD<sub>3</sub> and CD<sub>3</sub> groups from their corresponding SAM analogues formed *in situ*.

Regiospecific, late-stage methylation is a powerful strategy for tuning the physical and biological properties of small molecules and biomacromolecules.<sup>[1]</sup> At present, synthetic methodologies that methylate C(sp<sup>2</sup>)-H bonds are predominantly limited to transition metal-catalyzed strategies, which require elevated temperatures and the need for additives such as ligands and oxidants.<sup>[2–4]</sup> In addition, these methodologies are typically regioselective rather than regiospecific, which further restricts their scope.<sup>[5,6]</sup> In contrast, Nature routinely employs *S*adenosyl-L-methionine (SAM) dependent methyltransferases (MTs) to methylate at *O*-, *N*-, *S*- and *C*- sites. Thus, MTs hold considerable potential for the development of a biocatalytic alkylation platform of small molecules.<sup>[7–9]</sup>

Of the various MTs available, C-MTs are particularly attractive as they enable C-C bond formation under mild conditions relative to traditional Friedel-Crafts reactions.<sup>[10,11]</sup> One C-MT exemplar is NovO, which methylates the C-8 position of **1a** in the biosynthesis of the antibiotic novobiocin to form **2a** (Scheme 1a).<sup>[12]</sup> We and others have shown that regiospecific methylation of the 8-position of **1b** is catalyzed by a novel His-Arg motif, which facilitates the deprotonation of the phenolic proton in the 7-position, followed by methylation at position 8 by SAM to form **2b**.<sup>[13,14]</sup> NovO is also effective in catalysing Friedel-Crafts alkylations using non-natural SAM analogues to alkylate **1b-d** regiospecifically.<sup>[8,11]</sup> Furthermore, NovO accepts non-natural substrates such as **3** to exclusively form **4** (Scheme 1b), which is currently only accessible by this process.<sup>[11]</sup>

[a]	J. C. Sadler, L. D. Humphreys, R. Snajrova
	GlaxoSmithKline Medicines Research Centre
	Gunnels Wood Road, Stevenage, SG1 2NY (UK)
[b]	J. C. Sadler, Dr G.A. Burley*
	WestCHEM, Department of Pure and Applied Chemistry
	University of Strathclyde
	295 Cathedral Street, Glasgow G1 1XL (UK)
	Email: glenn.burley@strath.ac.uk
[c]	Dr L. D. Humphreys*
	Current address: Gilead Alberta ULC
	1021 Hayter Road NW, Edmonton, AB T6S 1A1, Canada.

Email: luke.humphrevs@gilead.com

Supporting information for this article is given via a link at the end of the document.

At present, the broader applicability of small-molecule MTs is hampered by the inherent instability of SAM (942 min at pH 8) as the corresponding methylating agent.<sup>[15,16]</sup> Additionally, the synthesis of SAM by chemical methods results in the formation of a diastereomeric mixture, which increases the cost of the process and has the potential for undesirable *C*-MT inhibition by the unwanted diastereomer.<sup>[17,18]</sup>



**Scheme 1.** Biocatalytic C-methylation of **(a)** coumarins **(1a-d)** and **(b)** 2,7dihydroxynaphthalene **(3)** catalysed by NovO. Both studies require the formation of SAM prior to C-methylation. **(c)** Development of a one-pot, twoenzyme process involving *in situ* SAM formation (SalL) and C-methylation (NovO). SAM: S-adenosylmethionine. SAH: S-adenosylhomocysteine.

A powerful strategy that overcomes the need to prepare and isolate SAM and SAM analogues would produce the cofactor *in situ*, followed by alkyl transfer.<sup>[19–23]</sup> The enzyme SalL (*Salinospora tropica*) is known to form SAM from 5'-deoxy-5chloroadenosine (CIDA, **5**) and methionine (Met, **6**).<sup>[24–28]</sup> As CIDA is readily prepared from adenosine in a one-pot process, the use of SalL offers an inexpensive and atom-efficient alternative to the use of methionine adenosyl transferases, which utilizes expensive ATP as the corresponding adenosyl donor and have been used previously for *in situ* SAM formation.<sup>[21,29–32]</sup>

At present, there have not been any reports on the utility of the SalL-catalysed SAM production in tandem with C-MTs in a one-pot procedure. Herein, we describe such a process for the methylation of small molecule aromatic scaffolds using SalL and the C-MT NovO (Scheme 1c). Additionally, we show that this

#### COMMUNICATION

tandem strategy can be used to transfer ethyl groups and isotopically-labeled methyl groups.  $^{[33-35]}$ 

Initial investigations focused on determining the compatibility of SalL and NovO to operate in a one-pot process. The model substrate **1b** was used with an excess of CIDA (**5**, 2 eq.) and Met (**6**, 50 eq.) using an *E. coli* cell-free extract from the overexpression of NovO (**Figure 1a; Entry A**). Based on the previously reported kinetic parameters for SAM formation



**Figure 1. (a)** Reaction optimization using substrate **1b**. *E. coli* cell lysates were used and % conversion determined by HPLC (area/area%) after 24 h. *Reagents and conditions:* (i) CIDA, Met, BSA, DTT, NovO cell lysate in 50 mM phosphate buffer, pH 6.5 resuspended at 10 mL/ g pellet, SalL cell free extract in 50 mM phosphate buffer, pH 6.8 resuspended at 5 mL/ g pellet. **A:** 2 eq. CIDA, 50 eq. Met; **B:** 1 eq. CIDA, 50 eq. Met; **C:** 2 eq. CIDA, 2 eq. Met; **D:** 2 eq. CIDA, 1 eq. Met; **E:** 2 eq. CIDA, no Met added; **F:** No CIDA or Met added. (**b**) Reaction optimization using purified enzymes. *Reagents and conditions:* (i) Met, SalL, BSA, 50 mM potassium phosphate buffer pH 6.5, CIDA, 37 °C, 8 hours. (ii) NovO, 37 °C, 16 hours. **A:** 2 eq. CIDA, 10 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **B:** 2 eq. CIDA, 10 eq. Met; 2 uM SAHH added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 1.5 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 2 eq. Met, 1 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, no Met added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 2 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 1 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **D:** 1.1 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **D:** 1.1 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **D:** 1.1 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq. CIDA, 0 eq. Met, 0.5  $\mu$ M MTAN added with NovO; **C:** 1.5 eq.

compared to CIDA formation, low levels of chloride present in the system were not anticipated to affect conversion levels.<sup>[36]</sup> No other sources of chloride were added to the system.

This resulted in quantitative conversion of **1b** into the methylated product **2b** in 24 hours. We then optimised the reaction conditions, firstly by minimising the number of equivalents of Met and CIDA relative to substrate **1b** (Figure 1a and Table S1). When the number of equivalents of CIDA was reduced from 2 to 1.5 eq., a drop off in the formation of **2b** was observed (Table S1). Quantitative conversion was optimal with 2 equivalents of Met (Figure 1a, Entry C). Decreasing the amount of Met further to 1 eq. reduced the conversion of **1b** to **2b** to 77% (Figure 1a, Entry D). However, when the reaction was run without the addition of Met, 30% methylation of **1b** was observed

#### WILEY-VCH

(Figure 1a, Entry E). To determine whether this was due to residual SAM or Met present in the reaction mixture, the reaction was also run in the absence of CIDA (Figure 1a, Entry F). In this case, no conversion to 2b was observed, which was indicative of background methylation being caused by residual Met present in the cell lysate and cell free extract (Table S3).

To address this issue, purified enzymes were used (Figure 1b and Table S2). Additionally, methylthioadenosine nucleosidase (MTAN) or SAH hydrolase (SAHH) was added to remove SAH from the reaction mixture, which is a known inhibitor of many SAM dependent MTs.[18,37,38] Since CIDA inhibits both MTAN<sup>[39]</sup> and SAHH<sup>[40]</sup>, SAM was pre-formed in situ before the addition of NovO and MTAN or SAHH. Initially, the reaction was carried out using 2 eq. CIDA and 10 eq. Met with either MTAN or SAHH (Figure 1b, Entries A and B). Whilst only 68% conversion was achieved with SAHH, nearly quantitative methylation of 1b was observed using MTAN as an additive. Further optimisation enabled the reduction of the number of equivalents of CIDA from 2.0 to 1.5 without loss of conversion to 2b when 1 eq. DTT was added.<sup>[41]</sup> Carrying out the reaction in the absence of MTAN decreased the conversion by ~40%, confirming the role of MTAN decreasing by-product inhibition caused by SAH. Indeed, an  $IC_{50}$  value of 9.8  $\mu$ M for CIDA has been reported for MTAN from E. coli, which was used in our study.<sup>[42]</sup> Finally, only 4% methylation was observed when the reaction was carried out in the absence of Met, which may be due to residual SAM bound in NovO (Figure 1b and Table S2).

With optimised conditions for a one-pot, tandem SAM formation C-methylation process in hand, we next explored the scalability of the methodology. The tandem process was carried out with Met, three isotopically labelled Met analogues and ethionine; using 20 mg of 1b, 1c or 3 in each case. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that a tandem process which involved the in situ formation of SAM has been used on preparative scale. For the transfer of an unlabelled methyl group crude E. coli cell lysate (NovO) and E. coli cell free extract (SalL) was used, whilst purified enzymes were employed for the transfer of isotopically labelled and ethyl groups. Moderate (65%) to excellent (88-100%) levels of conversion were obtained for transfer of CH<sub>3</sub>, <sup>13</sup>CH<sub>3</sub>, CD<sub>3</sub> and <sup>13</sup>CD<sub>3</sub>, with 1c showing quantitative conversion and isolated yields 76-91% in all cases (Table 1). High levels of conversion (88-97%) were also obtained for 1b, although isolated yields were lower due to poor solubility of the corresponding products during work-up. Alkylation of 3 was also successful on this scale to form 4 in high conversions (69-87%) using purified SalL and NovO, whilst 65% of 4 was formed using the cell lysate.

In summary, we have demonstrated a scalable biocatalytic platform for a Friedel-Crafts alkylation using SalL for *in situ* cofactor SAM analogue synthesis from inexpensive starting materials. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge this is the first example of using SalL for *in situ* cofactor production in tandem with a MT for the site specific *C*-methylation/alkylation of a small molecule. We envisage that our enzymatic platform could form the basis of a valuable biocatalytic tool for late-stage, regiospecific labelling of small molecules.<sup>[33,43–45]</sup>

### COMMUNICATION

#### WILEY-VCH

Table 1. Preparative [(20 mg st	arting material	[0.07 mmol	1b and	<b>1c</b> ; 0.125
mmol 3)] scale tandem enzymatic	alkylation.			



[a] Reaction carried out using NovO cell lysate and SalL cell free extract and purified MTAN. [b] 32 hour pre-incubation with SalL. *Reagents and conditions*: (i) SalL (0.5 mol%), BSA (1 mg/mL), DTT (1 eq.), 50 mM potassium phosphate buffer pH 6.5, CIDA (**5**, 1.5 eq.), Met or Met analogue (2 eq.), 37 °C, 7 hours (CH<sub>3</sub>, <sup>13</sup>CH<sub>3</sub>, CD<sub>3</sub> and <sup>13</sup>CD<sub>3</sub>) or 32 hours (Et). (ii) NovO (4 mol%), MTAN (0.05 mol%), 37 °C, 16 hours. Reactions carried out using 20 mg of substrate. Yields of isolated products in parentheses. Representative chromatograms for each substrate are shown in the Supporting Information.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) and the EPSRC for funding through the GSK-University of Strathclyde Industrial Ph.D. scheme.

**Keywords**: methyltransferase • alkylation • biocatalytic • Sadenosylmethionine • multi-enzyme reaction

- H. Schönherr, T. Cernak, Angew. Chemie Int. Ed. 2013, 52, 12256–12267.
- [2] T. Cernak, K. D. Dykstra, S. Tyagarajan, P. Vachal, S. W. Krska, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 2015, 45, 546–576.
- [3] R. Shang, L. Ilies, E. Nakamura, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2016, 138, 10132–10135.
- [4] P. S. Thuy-Boun, G. Villa, D. Dang, P. Richardson, S. Su, J. Q. Yu, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 17508–17513.
- [5] T. Kubo, N. Chatani, Org. Lett. 2016, 18, 1698–701.
- [6] D. Tu, X. Cheng, Y. Gao, P. Yang, Y. Ding, C. Jiang, Org. Biomol. Chem. 2016, 14, 7443–6.
- S. Klimasauskas, E. Weinhold, *Trends Biotechnol.* 2007, 25, 99– 104.
- [8] M. Tengg, H. Stecher, L. Offner, K. Plasch, F. Anderl, H. Weber, H. Schwab, M. Gruber-Khadjawi, *ChemCatChem* 2016, 8, 1354–1360.
- [9] B. J. C. Law, M. R. Bennett, M. L. Thompson, C. Levy, S. A. Shepherd, D. Leys, J. Micklefield, *Angew. Chemie Int. Ed.* 2016, 128, 2733–2737.
- [10] M. Liebhold, X. Xie, S.-M. Li, Org. Lett. 2012, 14, 4882–5.

- [11] H. Stecher, M. Tengg, B. J. Ueberbacher, P. Remler, H. Schwab, H. Griengl, M. Gruber-Khadjawi, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 2009, 48, 9546–8.
- [12] M. Pacholec, J. Tao, C. T. Walsh, *Biochemistry* 2005, 44, 14969–76.
- J. C. Sadler, C.-W. Chung, J. E. Mosley, G. A. Burley, L. D. Humphreys, *ACS Chem. Biol.* 2017, 10.1021/acschembio.6b01053.
   T. Pavkov-Keller, K. Steiner, M. Faber, M. Tengg, H. Schwab, M.
  - Gruber-Khadjawi, K. Gruber, *PLoS One* 2017, *12*, e0171056.
    M. Tengg, H. Stecher, L. Offner, K. Plasch, F. Anderl, H. Weber, H.
- M. Tengg, H. Stecher, L. Offner, K. Plasch, F. Anderl, H. Weber, H. Schwab, M. Gruber-Khadjawi, *ChemCatChem* 2016, *8*, 1354–1360.
   T. D. Huber, F. Wang, S. Singh, B. R. Johnson, J. Zhang, M.
- Sunkara, S. G. Van Lanen, A. J. Morris, G. N. Phillips, J. S. Thorson ACS ChemBio 2016, 11, 2484–2491.
  S. Khani-Oskouee, J. P. Jones, R. W. Woodard, *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 1984, 121, 181–187.
  - R. T. Borchardt, J. A. Huber, Y. S. Wu, *J. Med. Chem.* **1976**, *19*, 1094–1099.
  - R. Wang, K. Islam, Y. Liu, W. Zheng, H. Tang, N. Lailler, G. Blum, H. Deng, M. Luo, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 1048–1056.
- [20] R. Wang, W. Zheng, M. Luo, *Anal. Biochem.* 2014, 450, 11–19.
   [21] M. Dippe, W. Brandt, H. Rost, a. Porzel, J. Schmidt, L. a.
- Wessjohann, *Chem. Commun.* 2015, *51*, 3637–3640.
  [22] S. Singh, J. Zhang, T. D. Huber, M. Sunkara, K. Hurley, R. D. Goff, G. Wang, W. Zhang, C. Liu, J. Rohr, et al., *Angew. Chemie Int. Ed.* 2014, *53*, 3965–3969.
  [23] S. Mordhorst, J. Siegrist, M. Müller, M. Richter, J. N. Andexer,
  - Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 2017, 56, 1–6.
- [24] A. S. Eustáquio, R. P. McGlinchey, Y. Liu, C. Hazzard, L. L. Beer, G. Florova, M. M. Alhamadsheh, A. Lechner, A. J. Kale, Y. Kobayashi, et al., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2009, *106*, 12295–300.
- [25] A. S. Eustáquio, F. Pojer, J. P. Noel, B. S. Moore, *Nat. Chem. Biol.* 2008, 4, 69–74.
- J. M. Lipson, M. Thomsen, B. S. Moore, R. P. Clausen, J. J. La Clair, M. D. Burkart, *Chembiochem* 2013, *14*, 950–3.
- [27] M. Thomsen, S. B. Vogensen, J. Buchardt, M. D. Burkart, R. P. Clausen, *Org. Biomol. Chem.* 2013, *11*, 7606–10.
   [28] C. Vranken, A. Fin, P. Tufar, J. Hofkens, M. Burkart, Y. Tor, *Org. Biomol. Chem.* 2016, 6189–6192.
- [29] T. D. Huber, B. R. Johnson, J. Zhang, J. S. Thorson, Curr. Opin. Biotechnol. 2016, 42, 189–197.
- [30] F. Muttach, A. Rentmeister, *Angew. Chemie Int. Ed.* 2015, n/a-n/a.
- [31] F. Muttach, A. Rentmeister, *Methods* **2016**, *107*, 3–9.
- [32] S. Singh, J. Zhang, T. D. Huber, M. Sunkara, K. Hurley, R. D. Goff,
   G. Wang, W. Zhang, C. Liu, J. Rohr, et al., *Angew. Chemie Int. Ed.* 2014, 53, 3965–3969.
- [33] A. Chokkathukalam, D.-H. Kim, M. P. Barrett, R. Breitling, D. J. Creek, *Bioanalysis* 2014, 6, 511–24.
  - C. J. Unkefer, R. A. Martinez, Drug Test. Anal. 2012, 4, 303–307.
- [35] C. S. Elmore, R. A. Bragg, *Bioorganic Med. Chem. Lett.* 2015, 25, 167–171.
- [36] A. S. Eustáquio, F. Pojer, J. P. Noel, B. S. Moore, *Nat. Chem. Biol.* 2008, 4, 69–74.
- [37] J. Zhang, Y. G. Zheng, ACS Chem. Biol. 2016, 11, 583–597.

[38] J. Jiracek, M. Collinsova, I. Rosenberg, M. Budesinsky, E. Protivinska, H. Netusilova, T. A. Garrow, J. Med. Chem. 2006, 49, 3982–9.

[39] V. Z. and A. E. P. F. Della Ragione, M. Porcelli, M. Carteni-Farina, J. Biochem. 1985, 232, 335–341.

[40] T. Zimmerman, G. Wolberg, G. Duncan, G. Elion, *Biochemistry* 

[34]

#### WILEY-VCH

#### **1980**, *19*, 2252–2259.

COMMUNICATION

- [41] G. Lindwall, M.-F. Chau, S. R. Gardner, L. A. Kohlstaedt, *Protein Eng. Des. Sel.* 2000, 13, 67–71.
- [42] K. A. Cornell, W. E. Swarts, R. D. Barry, M. K. Riscoe, Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 1996, 732, 724–732.
- [43] M. Pellecchia, D. S. Sem, K. Wüthrich, Nat. Rev. Drug Discov. 2002, 1, 211–219.
- [44] T. G. Gant, J. Med. Chem. 2014, 57, 3595–3611.
- [45] K. M. Brindle, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2015, 137, 6418–27.

#### WILEY-VCH

#### Entry for the Table of Contents (Please choose one layout)

Layout 1:

#### COMMUNICATION

COMMUNICATION

Joanna. C. Sadler, Luke D. Humphreys,

Radka Snajdrova, Glenn. A. Burley\*

**Tandem SAM:** A one-pot, two-enzyme C-methylation process is described. Linking SAM production using SalL (*S. Tropica*) with the C-methyltransferase NovO (*S. Spheroides*) enables the synthesis a suite of methylated and ethylated cuomarin products.

- [a] J. C. Sadler, L. D. Humphreys, R. Snajrova GlaxoSmithKline Medicines Research Centre Gunnels Wood Road, Stevenage, SG1 2NY (UK)
- [b] J. C. Sadler, Dr G.A. Burley\* WestCHEM, Department of Pure and Applied Chemistry University of Strathclyde 295 Cathedral Street, Glasgow G1 1XL (UK)
- Email: glenn.burley@strath.ac.uk [c] Dr L. D. Humphreys\* Current address: Gilead Alberta ULC 1021 Hayter Road NW, Edmonton, AB T6S 1A1, Canada. Email: luke.humphreys@gilead.com

Supporting information for this article is given via a link at th the document.