Accepted Manuscript

Design, synthesis, 3D Pharmacophore, QSAR, and docking studies of carboxylic acid derivatives as cytotoxic agents

Mona M. Abdel-Atty, Nahla A. Farag, Shaymaa E. Kassab, Rabah A.T. Serya, Khaled A. Abouzid

PII:S0045-2068(14)00073-XDOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bioorg.2014.08.006Reference:YBIOO 1754To appear in:Bioorganic Chemistry

Received Date: 19 May 2014



Please cite this article as: M.M. Abdel-Atty, N.A. Farag, S.E. Kassab, R.A.T. Serya, K.A. Abouzid, Design, synthesis, 3D Pharmacophore, QSAR, and docking studies of carboxylic acid derivatives as cytotoxic agents, *Bioorganic Chemistry* (2014), doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bioorg.2014.08.006

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 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.

Design, synthesis, 3D Pharmacophore, QSAR, and docking studies of carboxylic acid derivatives as cytotoxic agents

Mona M. Abdel-Atty^a, Nahla A. Farag^a, Shaymaa E.Kassab^b, Rabah A. T. Serya^c and Khaled A. Abouzid^{c,*}

^a Pharmaceutical Chemistry Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Misr International University, Cairo, Egypt 11431

^c Pharmaceutical Chemistry Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt 11566

*Corresponding author. Tel: +201222165624; e-mail: abouzid@yahoo.com

Abstract

In this study, five series of (E)-6-(4-substituted phenyl)-4-oxohex-5-enoic acids **IIb-f** (E), (E)-3-(4-(substituted)-phenyl)acrylic acids IIIa-g (E), 4-(4-(substituted)phenylamino)-4-oxobutanoic acids VIa,b,e, 5-(4-(substituted)phenylamino)-5-oxopentanoic acids VIIa,f 2-[(4-(substituted)phenyl) and carbamoyl]benzoic acids VIIIa,e were designed and synthesized. Selected compounds were screened in vitro for their cytotoxic effect on 60 human NCI tumor cell lines. Compound IIf (E) displayed significant inhibitory activity against NCI Non-Small Cell Lung A549/ATCC Cancer cell line (68% inhibition) and NCI-H460 Cancer cell line (66% inhibition). Moreover, the final compounds were evaluated in vitro for their cytotoxic activity on HepG2 Cancer cell line in which histone deacetylase (HDAC) is overexpressed. Compounds IIc (E), IIf (E), IIIb (E), and IIIg (E) exhibited the highest cytotoxic activity against HepG2 human cancer cell lines with IC₅₀ ranging from 2.27-10.71 μ M. In addition, selected compounds were tested on histone deacetylase isoforms (HDAC1-11). Molecular docking simulation was also carried out for HDLP enzyme to investigate their HDAC binding affinity. In addition, generation of 3Dpharmacophore model and quantitative structure activity relationship (QSAR) models were combined to explore the structural requirements controlling the observed cytotoxic properties.

Key words:

Synthesis, Histone Deacetylase, 3D QSAR Pharmacophore Model, Cytotoxic activity

1. Introduction

Histone acetylation has been shown to be one of the major regulatory mechanisms for gene expression. [1] Control of expression is dependent on the balance between the competing activities of histone acetyl transferases (HATs) and histone deacetylases (HDACs) on the regulation of chromatin structure by acetylation of lysines on histone tails. [2] Acetylation of the N-terminal tails of lysine residues is done by HATs which removes positive charges, thereby reducing the affinity between histones and negatively charged DNA. This facilitates access of the transcriptional machinery to the DNA template. [3] Conversely, HDACs remove the acetyl group from the histone tails, reversing the effects of HATs and altering transcription. In general, acetylation is associated with a transcriptionally active state and deacetylation with gene silencing. [4, 5] Studies demonstrated that these two enzymes are not only involved in the regulation of chromatin structure and gene expression, but they can also regulate cellcycle progression and carcinogenic process. [6] HDACs therefore play a pivotal role in the regulation of gene expression, cell growth and proliferation. [7] Over expression of HDACs has been linked to the development of cancers in human. [8] Eighteen mammalian HDACs have been identified and categorized into four structural and functionally distinct classes. [9] Class I (HDAC1-3 and 8), class II (HDAC4-7, 9 and 10) and class IV (HDAC11). HDACs share conserved residues in the catalytic core regions and require zinc ion for deacetylation, while class III (SIRT1-7) HDACs are unrelated sirtuin deacetylases and require NAD^+ for their enzymatic activity. [9, 10]

HDAC inhibitors present a promising class of anticancer agents. [11, 12] HDAC inhibition induces transcriptional events involved in growth arrest, cell proliferation, and apoptosis. [13] There are numbers

^b Pharmaceutical Chemistry Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Damanhur University, Damanhur, Egypt

of HDACIs emerging as an exciting novel class of antitumor agents as shown in (Fig. 1), Trichostatin A (TSA) is an effective natural hydoxamate HDACI and Suberoylanilide hydroxamic acid (Vorinostat, SAHA) is the first HDACI approved by FDA in 2006. [14-16] Belinostat and Panobinostat are also hydroxamate HDACIs which induce acetylation of histone at nanomolar concentrations. [17] Mocetinostat and Entinostat are benzamide HDACIs with limited cardiac toxicity in preclinical studies. [18]

During the past 15 years, a number of structurally diverse HDAC inhibitors have been identified which can be divided into structural classes including hydroxamates, cyclic peptides, benzamides, electrophilic ketones and carboxylic acids.[19, 20] Despite their different chemical structures, these agents have a common pharmacophore composed of three portions: (a) zinc binding group (ZBG), which chelates zinc ion at the bottom of pocket, (b) linker (scaffold), usually hydrophobic which occupies the narrow channel, (c) surface recognition moiety (SRM), which interacts with hydrophobic interactions with residues on the rim of active site, (Fig. 1). [21, 22] The common linkers are aliphatic chain, aromatic chain and vinyl-aromatic chain. [21] Any HDACI with its strong ZBG can substitute the native substrate and preserve the 'His-Asp' charge transfer system within the enzyme complex. [23] This 'three-component' structural template has been widely realized as a successful strategy for the design of efficient new HDACI's. [24-26]

Although Hydroxamic acid derivatives from the class of HDAC inhibitors is effective in nanomolar dose (TSA IC50: 12 nM and SAHA IC50: 110–370 nM), [27, 28] it has problems such as poor pharmacokinetic properties, severe toxicities and non-selectivity.[29] The carboxylic acid class is the least investigated inhibitor group probably due to poor HDAC inhibition activity.[19, 22] The carboxylic acid group is thought to be a metal-binding functional group. [28] A limited number of compounds such as VPA (valproic acid), BA (butyric acid) and PBA (phenyl butyric acid) are identified as carboxylic acid class HDAC inhibitors, (Fig. 2). [30] All these inhibitors are in phase trials with high micromolar doses, where they have anti-proliferative, anti-cancer and anti-convulsant effects, and their toxicity studies have been completed. [31, 32] They are used for treatment of cancer and also neurodegenerative diseases such as spinal muscular atrophy (SMA). [33] Most carboxylic acids reported to date have simple alkyl chains and the structure activity relationship studies for this group have been very limited. Therefore, advances are needed in designing new carboxylic acid derivatives with improved HDAC inhibition activity.



Figure 1. Examples of histone deacetylase inhibitors as antitumor agents and the three essential pharmacophore features shown in color codes.



Figure 2. Examples of carboxylic acids based histone deacetylase inhibitors.

2. Rational and design

The design of the newly synthesized compounds was based on earlier study of carboxylic acid as zinc binding functional group in histone deacetylase metallo-enzymes, [28] directing the design towards the synthesis of carboxylic acid derivatives as HDAC inhibitors in an attempt to increase their potency by manipulating the carboxylic acid moiety as zinc binding group to be directly attached to the linker (n = 0) as in series **III** or expand the chain (n = 2,3) as in series **II**, **VI**, **VII** or rigidify the side chain through incorporation of phenyl moiety as in series **VIII.** In addition, modifying the SRM to be heterocyclic or aromatic amine derivatives which are essential for recognizing and binding to the rim of the active pocket of the HDAC enzymes and also developing the hydrocarbon linker which occupies the hydrophobic channel with styrene as in series **II**, **III** or benzamide as in series **VI, VII, VIII** which are approaches to enrich and optimize HDAC inhibition activity [21], as shown in (Fig. 3).

Design of the target compounds was based on molecular docking study which was carried out on x-ray crystal structure of HDLP enzyme (histone deacetylase like protein) PDB code (1C3S) complexed with its binding inhibitor SAHA (suberoylanilide hydroxamic acid) to predict the binding affinities and orientation of the target compounds at the active site of HDAC. In addition, we describe the structural requirements and structure-activity relationships on carboxylic acid derivatives as cytotoxic agents by successfully generating a valid 3D-pharmacophore model which was then combined to generate a validated 2D-QSAR model to explore the structural requirements controlling the observed cytotoxic activity estimated by the effect of the synthesized compounds on HepG₂ cancer cell line.

Selected compounds were evaluated for their cytotoxic effect on sixty human tumor cell lines, under the drug discovery program of the NCI and their enzyme inhibitory effect on different HDAC isoforms. Target compounds were also in vitro tested for their cytotoxic effect on Liver HepG2 Cancer cell line.



Figure 3. Design strategy and structures of target compounds

3. Chemistry

The route adopted for the synthesis of the novel (E)-6-(4-(substituted) phenyl)-4-oxohex-5-enoic acids **IIb-f** (E) and (E)-3-(4-(substituted) phenyl)-acrylic acids **IIIa-g** (E) is depicted in Scheme 1. The key intermediate 4-(substituted) benzaldehyde derivatives **Ia-g** were prepared following the literature methods as illustrated in Scheme 1. [34] 4-(substituted) benzaldehyde derivatives Ia-g were synthesized in good yield through the reaction of p-flurobenzaldehyde 1 with the appropriate amine 2a-g using potassium carbonate and aliquat 336 as a catalyst mixed in dimethylformamide (DMF) under reflux affording the corresponding benzaldehydes Ia-g. (E)-6-(4-(substituted) phenyl)-4-oxohex-5-enoic acids IIb-f (E) were prepared by the condensation of the appropriate aldehyde **Ib-f** and levulinic acid using catalytic amounts of piperidine and acetic acid in benzene under reflux, with azeotropic removal of water using a deanstark trap [35] to give novel hexenoic acid derivatives **IIb-f** (E) as presented in Scheme 1. Under these conditions, the carbanion formed at the α -methyl group of levulinic acid adds to the aldehyde carbon followed by dehydration to afford the arylidine ketoacid derivatives IIb-f (E). ¹H-NMR shows the formation of E-isomers with minor amounts of Z-isomers which were detected by TLC as minor spots that are removed upon recrystallization from the given solvent. Exceptionally, during synthesis of hexenoic acid derivatives IIb (E) and IIf (E), the appropriate Z-isomers were obtained in good yields with their Eisomers and were separated by column chromatography using hexane/ethylacetate 8:2 as the elution system for separation to produce the pure (E)-6-(4-(pyrrolidin-1-yl)phenyl)-4-oxo-hex-5-enoic acid IIb(E), (Z)-6-(4-(pyrrolidin-1-yl)phenyl)-4-oxo-hex-5-enoic acid IIb (Z), (E)-6-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl) phenyl) -4-oxohex-5-enoic acid IIf (E) and (Z)-6-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)phenyl)-4-oxohex-5-enoic acid IIf (Z).

Compound **IIb** (*E*) was confirmed as an *E*-isomer by ¹H-NMR, where the spectrum of its *E*-isomer revealed coupling constants of $-C\underline{H}=C\underline{H}$ - higher than that of its *Z*-isomer. ¹HNMR spectrum of **IIb** (*E*) revealed a doublet signal with an integration of one proton $-C\underline{H}=C\underline{H}$ -CO at $\delta 6.56-6.62$ ppm (1H) with J = 16.2 Hz which was coupled with the other proton $-C\underline{H}=CH$ -CO appearing as doublet signal at $\delta 7.56-7.61$ ppm (1H) with J = 15.9 Hz, while compound **IIb** (*Z*) was confirmed as a *Z*-isomer by ¹HNMR spectrum where $-C\underline{H}=C\underline{H}$ -CO appeared as doublet signal at $\delta 6.56-6.62$ ppm (1H) with J = 8 Hz which was coupled with $-C\underline{H}=CH$ -CO appearing as doublet signal at $\delta 7.52-7.54$ ppm (1H) with J = 8 Hz. Similarly compound **IIf** (*E*) was confirmed as an *E*-isomer by ¹H-NMR spectrum, where the coupling constants of $-C\underline{H}=C\underline{H}$ -where higher than its *Z* isomer. ¹HNMR of $-C\underline{H}=C\underline{H}$ -CO appearing as doublet signal at $\delta 6.61-6.66$ ppm (1H) with J = 16.2 Hz which was coupled with $-C\underline{H}=CH$ -CO appearing as doublet with $-C\underline{H}=CH$ -CO appearing as doublet at $\delta 7.52-7.54$ ppm (1H) with J = 16.2 Hz which was coupled with $-C\underline{H}=CH$ -CO appearing as doublet signal at $\delta 6.61-6.66$ ppm (1H) with J = 16.2 Hz which was coupled with $-C\underline{H}=CH$ -CO appearing as doublet at $\delta 7.53-7.58$ ppm (1H) with J = 16.2 Hz, while compound **IIf** (*Z*) was confirmed as a *Z*-isomer by ¹HNMR where $-CH=C\underline{H}$ -CO appeared as singlet signal at $\delta 6.82$ ppm (1H) and C<u>H</u>=CH-CO appearing as doublet signal at $\delta 7.52-7.54$ (1H) with J = 6.4 Hz.

(*E*)-3-(4-(substituted)-phenyl)acrylic acids **IIIa-g** (*E*) were prepared by mixing of the appropriate aldehyde **Ia-g** and malonic acid in pyridine under reflux using catalytic amount of piperidine as presented in Scheme 1. *E*-isomers were obtained as a sole product and confirmed by ¹H-NMR where the coupling constant of –CH=C<u>H</u>-COOH appeared as doublet at δ 6.20-6.40 ppm (1H) with *J* = 16.2 Hz which was coupled with –C<u>H</u>=CH-COOH appearing as doublet at δ 7.40-7.60 (1H) with *J* = 16.2 Hz.

The pathway applied for the synthesis of 4-(4-(substituted)phenylamino)-4-oxobutanoic acids VIa,b,e, 5-(4-(substituted)-phenylamino)-5-oxopentanoic VIIa,f acids and 2-((4-substituted)phenyl) carbamoyl)benzoic acids VIIIa, e were presented in Scheme 2. The key intermediates 4-(substituted) aniline Va,b,e,f were prepared following the literature methods, [36, 37] Where 1-(amino substituted)-4nitrobenzene IVa, b, e, f were synthesized through the reaction of para nitro chlorobenzene 3 with the appropriate amine **2a,b,e,f** using potassium carbonate and aliquat 336 as a catalyst mixed in dimethyl formamide under reflux affording 1(amino substituted) 4-nitrobenzene IVa,b,e,f. Reduction of the synthesized nitro derivatives **IVa,b,e,f** to their amino derivatives using sodium dithionite in ammonia to yield the corresponding intermediate 4-(substituted) aniline **Va,b,e,f.** Finally stirring of 4(substituted) aniline **Va,b,e,f** with the appropriate anhydride (succinic anhydride, glutaric anhydride and phthalic anhydride) in methylene chloride at room temperature afforded 4-(4-(substituted)phenylamino)-4oxobutanoic acids VIa, b, 5-(4-(substituted)phenylamino)-5-oxopentanoic acids VIIa, f, and 2 - ((4 substituted)phenyl)carbamoyl) benzoic acids VIIIa,e, respectively.



Scheme 1: Synthesis of (E)-6-(4-(substituted)phenyl)-4-oxohex-5-enoic acids **IIb-f** (*E*), (*Z*)-6-(4-(substituted)phenyl)-4-oxohex-5enoic Acids **IIb,f** (*Z*) and (*E*)-3-(4-(substituted) phenyl)acrylic acids **IIIa-g** (*E*). Reagents and conditions: i) potassium carbonate, aliquat 336 in dimethylformamide, reflux, 24 hrs. ii) levulinic acid, piperidine and acetic acid in benzene, reflux, 6 hrs. iii) malonic acid, piperidine in pyridine, reflux, 4 hrs.



Scheme 2: Synthesis of of 4-(4-(substituted) phenylamino)-4-oxobutanoic acids **VIa,b,e**, 5-(4-(substituted) phenylamino) -5-oxopentanoic acids **VIIa,f** and 2-((4-substituted)phenyl)carbamoyl)benzoic acids **VIIIa-e**. Reagents and conditions: i) potassium carbonate, aliquat 336 in dimethylformamide, reflux, 24 hr. ii) sodium dithionite in ammonia, reflux, 6 hr. iii) succinic anhydride in methylene chloride, stir at room temperature. iv) glutaric anhydride in methylene chloride, stir at room temperature.

4. Results and discussion 4.1. Biological evaluation 4.1.1. In vitro anticancer activity 4.1.1.1. Primary single dose (10⁻⁵ M) full NCI 60 cell panel in vitro assay

Ten structures of the final carboxylic acid based products were submitted to National Cancer Institute "NCI" (www.dtp.nci.nih.gov), Bethesda, Maryland, USA, and eight compounds were selected on the basis of degree of structure variation and computer modeling techniques for evaluation of their antineoplastic activity. The tumor growth inhibition properties of the eight compounds **IIb-f** (*E*), **IIIf** (*E*), **VIb** and **VIIf** with their respective NCI codes: NSC D-780150/1, NSC D-780151/1, NSC D-780154/1-, NSC D-780152/1, NSC D-780153/1, NSC D-780155/1, NSC D-780157/1 and NSC D-780156/1, were selected among the synthesized compounds **IIb-f** (*E*), **IIIb,c,f**, **VIb**, **VIIf** by the National Cancer Institute (NCI), USA and were screened on human tumor cell lines, under the drug discovery program of the NCI.

Primary *in vitro* one dose (10⁻⁵ M concentration) anticancer assay was performed in full NCI 60 cell panel. Results for each compound were reported as a mean graph of the percent growth of the treated cells when compared to the untreated control cells. Analysis of historical Development Therapeutics Programme (DTP) was performed and results are represented in Table 1.

Compounds IIf (E) and IIIf (E) among the tested compounds showed selectivity and sensitivity against different NCI cell panel.

In series **II**, compound **IIf** (*E*) showed remarkably lowest cell growth promotion against Non-Small Cell Lung A549/ATCC Cancer cell line (cell growth promotion 32%, inhibition 68%) and NCI-H460 Cancer cell line (cell growth promotion 34%, inhibition 66%). Also it exhibited broad spectrum cell growth inhibition against Leukemia SR Cancer cell line (cell growth promotion 44.38%, inhibition 55.62%), K-562 Cancer cell line (cell growth promotion 65.61%, inhibition 34.39%), Breast T-47D Cancer cell line (cell growth promotion 75.68%, inhibition 24.32%), Non-small cell Lung NCI-H23 Cancer cell line (cell growth promotion 77.6%, inhibition 22.4%). Compound **IIc** (*E*) is the second active compound from series **II**, it was found to be active mostly against breast cancer T-47D cell line (cell growth promotion 77.66%, inhibition 22.34%) and K-562 (cell growth promotion 77.66%, inhibition 22.34%) and K-562 (cell growth promotion 72.14%, inhibition 27.86%) Cancer cell lines. Compound **IIb** (*E*) showed lower inhibition activity, where it shows activity mostly against Breast T-47D Cancer cell line (cell growth promotion 76.6%, inhibition 23.4%). Compounds **IId** (*E*) and **IIe** (*E*) showed lowest inhibition activity among the tested series **II** compounds.

In series **III**, compound **IIIf** (*E*) was found to be most active against Breast cancer MDA-MB-468 cell line (cell growth promotion 42.66%, inhibition 57.34%). Compound **IIIf** (*E*) showed broad spectrum of inhibition activity against Non-small lung cancer NCI-H226 cell line (cell growth promotion 73.05%, inhibition 26.95%), Breast cancer T-47D cell line (cell growth promotion 74.03%, inhibition 25.96%), ovarian cancer OV-CAR8 cell line (cell growth promotion 78.16%, inhibition 21.84%) and Melanoma UACC-257 cell line (cell growth promotion 79.21%, inhibition 20.79%).

While in series **VI** and **VII**, compounds **VIb** and **VIIf** showed insignificant activity against most of the 60 tested Cancer cell lines.

<u>ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT</u>

Table 1. Sixty human tumor cell line anticancer screening data at single dose assay (10^{-5} M concentration) as percent cell growth promotion of **IIb-f** (*E*), **IIIf** (*E*), **VIb**, **VIIf**

•

		IIb (E)	IIc (<i>E</i>)	IId (E) IIe (<u>E</u>)	IIf (<i>E</i>) <u>II</u> If	(E) VIb	VIIf	_
Leukemia										_
CCRF-CEM		89.13	81.60	97.30	95.52	86.34	98.3	4 98.77	113.81	
$H_{-60(TB)}$		0/ 03	77.66	07.58	101.86	81 41	96.2	8 96.63	07.80	
V 562		02.17	77.00	02.02	82.67	65 61	05.2	0 02.03	97.09	
K-302		95.17	/2.14	92.05	82.07	05.01	95.2	0 92.25	90.04	
MOL1-4		91.73	80.57	95.50	92.88	84.32	86.9	6 100.62	99.81	
RPMI-8226		95.12	92.58	101.79	95.69	90.76	95.1	6 106.09	103.14	
SR		107.76	79.02	103.18	98.14	<u>44.38</u>	81.9	9 103.70	98.17	
Non-Small Cell Lung Cance	r									
A 549/ATCC		93.88	90.22	90.92	98.09	32.24	99.7	6 98.62	103 57	
HOP 62		100.21	02.66	109.22	00.49	05.65	02.2	0 101.27	07.20	
HOP-02		100.21	95.00	108.52	99.48	93.03	92.2	9 101.27	97.50	-
HOP-92		92.08	81.93	97.38	91.20	83.75	89.7	5 103.12	105.53	
NCI-H226		91.39	95.21	97.91	99.97	83.73	73.0	5 98.85	102.24	
NCI-H23		93.60	87.90	97.77	98.85	77.60	97.3	5 99.78	97.79	
NCI-H322M		101 29	97 35	96 15	102.97	82.41	91.9	9 111 91	111.03	
NCI H460		105.08	103.05	102 70	102.57	34 23	102.4	5 106.22	104.08	
NCI-II400		105.08	103.95	102.79	106.55	<u>34.43</u> 0(05	102	1 100.22	104.00	
NCI-H522		80.95	82.81	90.00	96.39	80.85	82.0	1 105.55	96.00	
Colon Cancer										
COLO 205		116.44	105.42	115.18	110.00	113.98	116.7	107.53	104.05	
HCC-2998		90.57	94.10	85.84	100.11	84.64	106.2	23 111.41	100.29	
HCT-116		93.80	85 31	92 97	103.48	80.56	86.8	4 101.56	103.85	
HCT 15		108 64	101 44	102.97	103.40	87 27	102 1	0 = 00.41	04.00	
1101-13		100.04	101.00	102.93	103.09	01.31	105.1	99.41	94.90	
H129		85.70	89.58	99.79	102.37	94.59	100.7	8 107.90	104.30	
KM12		100.85	99.22	103.65	104.48	95.08	102.9	04 104.42	106.92	
SW-620		101.15	98.20	107.87	103.26	102.80	103.6	59 104.18	98.51	
CNS Cancer										
SE-268		91 19	95.60	98.41	102 78	107.93	103 4	108 91	99.70	
SE 205		111.04	00.70	102.00	105.74	77 80	100.4	1 00.17	04.00	
SF-295		111.04	99.70	105.99	103.74	//.80	100.0	99.17	94.90	
SF-539		104.24	103.57	95.58	102.50	106.95	99.3	7 101.16	94.06	
SNB-19		101.18	101.61	107.29	103.15	103.85	109.2	28 107.95	107.91	
SNB-75		107.51	97.69	96.55	92.04	107.80	106.8	33 83.02	80.89	
U251		88.17	87.51	94.56	100.31	86.26	88.5	0 104.93	102.63	
Melanoma			0/101			00.20	0010	• • • • • • •		
		04.74	04.29	07.10	00.56	01 70	070	7 100.91	06.00	
		94.74	94.28	97.10	99.50	91.78	0/.0	7 100.81	90.99	
MALME-3M		105.59	96.11	96.47	90.33	89.14	91.3	7 107.02	100.54	
M14		97.37	97.42	92.80	101.54	102.53	105.1	0 99.85	104.41	
MDA-MB-435		103.72	110.11	112.05	109.23	101.79	112.8	36 106.30	103.68	
SK-MEL-2		105.23	103.83	101.13	102.70	96.41	110.1	9 111.07	105.88	
SK-MEL-28		107.18	103.61	100.66	107.25	101 35	111 0	101.69	101 72	
SK MEL 5		07.61	05.01	100.00	107.25	00 02	02.0	0 100.25	101.72	
SK-MEL-J		97.01	95.91	100.55	102.00	90.05	93.0 50.0	1 06.01	104.07	
UACC-257		84.00	88.73	90.69	92.40	90.66	79.2	I 96.91	101.16	
UACC-62		91.26	91.07	104.22	99.41	88.34	97.8	0 111.37	102.69	
Ovarian Cancer										
IGROV1		98.36	91.31	103.69	104.87	106.13	96.6	0 109.23	113.88	
OVCAR-3		97.94	97 29	101 20	110.76	99.33	102 0	108 74	105 96	
OVCAR-4		08.00	104.46	110.24	108.04	07.40	1102.2	100.74	06 74	
OVCAR-4		70.00	104.40	04.42	100.94	97.49	110.3	101.30	90.74	
UVCAK-3		103.04	97.62	94.43	104.46	114.57	/8.1	o 102.86	102.59	
OVCAR-8		97.91	89.90	101.77	102.14	96.72	100.4	101.46	110.34	
NCI/ADR-RES		97.49	98.54	102.70	103.53	92.91	100.9	105.39	100.86	
SK-OV-3		108.7	98.50	116.30	101.52	94.86	112.1	5 108.27	111.43	
Renal Cancer										
786-0		00.06	08 70	06 25	04.00	02.22	97 9	0 03 22	00.20	
		77.00	90.70	90.33	94.90	94.44	ð/.ð	U 93.23	99.29	
ACHN		105.01	100.75	109.65	109.71	107.98	109.9	106.95	100.30	
CAKI-1		101.03	107.18	104.19	108.13	105.26	110.4	91.52	94.33	
RXF 393		95.96	106.10	115.14	107.29	114.99	92.2	1 106.75	104.71	
SN12C		101.09	97.76	106.06	99.89	98.11	106.3	33 105.33	104.38	
TK-10		104 65	100.25	99.13	95.82	91 97	93.8	0 107.24	107.41	
UO 31		00-1.0J	QA EA	96 24	05.02	00.71	90.0 00.0	1 07.24 1 01.64	04.20	
D-31		00.34	84.50	00.50	95.05	70./1	89.2	J 101.00	94.30	
Prostate Cancer										
PC-3		94.10	89.51	97.88	99.49	87.52	101.7	97.11	102.26	
DU-145		94.92	95.64	109.30	105.09	94.75	101.8	30 109.07	109.53	
Breast Cancer										
MCE7		00.40	88 17	05 55	00.07	80 54	94 5	1 06.10	90.29	
		77.07	00.17	95.55	99.07	00.30	00.5	I 90.10	09.28	
MDA-MB 231/ATCC		106.10	88.23	110.81	103.34	98.70	103.1	/ 113.92	109.55	
HS 578T		100.67	100.21	104.72	105.59	105.52	109.4	102.28	100.17	
BT-549		85.01	88.83	100.03	99.14	96.45	88.9	0 102.40	98.74	
T-47D		76,60	61.28	100.53	94.68	75.68	74.0	3 103.93	106.87	
MDA-MB-468		96 70	101 29	102.91	95 99	87 20	12 6	6 103 33	104 53	
		20.70	101.47	104.11	10.11	01.41	74.0	. 105.55	107.33	

O 10-20% growth inhibition, O 20-30% growth inhibition, O 30-40% growth inhibition, O 50-60% growth inhibition, O 60-70% growth inhibition

4.1.1.2. In vitro cytotoxicity assay on HepG2 human liver cancer cell line

Furthermore, 21 synthesized compounds were evaluated for their cytotoxic activity on human liver cancer cell line HepG2 in which HDAC1 is over expressed [38]. Cytotoxicity assay on HepG2 cancer cell line was determined using sulforhodamine B assay method (SRB). The concentration of the test compounds causing 50% inhibition (IC₅₀, μ M) was calculated from the concentration–inhibition response curve (triplet determinations) and are represented in Table 2.

In series II and series III, it was found that compounds IIc (*E*), IIf (*E*), IIIg (*E*), IIIb (*E*) displayed potent cytotoxic activities with IC₅₀ values 2.27, 10.21, 10.63 and 10.71 μ M respectively, comparable with SAHA having IC₅₀ value of 63.48 μ M [39]. Compounds IIIc (*E*), IIIa (*E*), IIIf (*E*), IIId (*E*), and IIb (*E*) displayed significant cytotoxic activity with IC₅₀ values 18.04, 21.01, 32.85, 45.69 and 63.58 μ M respectively. Other compounds IId (*E*), IIe (*E*) and IIIe (*E*) displayed IC50 100 μ M. While series VI, VII, and VIII displayed poor cytotoxic activity compared to series II and III carboxylic acids derivatives. Interestingly compounds IIb (*Z*) and IIf (*Z*) which are representing the *Z*-isomers of 6-(4-(pyrrolidin-1-yl)phenyl)-4-oxo-hex-5-enoic acid and 6-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)phenyl)-4-oxohex-5-enoic acid respectively, displayed poor cytotoxic activity with IC₅₀ values of 413.9 and 849.2 μ M respectively, compared with their *E*-isomers IIb (*E*) and IIf (*E*) with IC₅₀ value of 63.48 and 10.21 μ M respectively.

In conclusion, it is found that series II and series III displayed significant cytotoxic activity utilizing styrene as a linker to be considered essential for its biological effect. On the other hand, insignificant cytotoxic effect was observed in series VI, VII and VIII carboxylic acid derivatives which utilizes benzamide as a linker. Exceptionally, compounds IId (E) (NHR₂ = morpholine), IIe (E) (NHR₂ = methylpiperazine) and IIIe (E) (NHR₂ = methylpiperazine) exhibited poor cytotoxic effect.

Table 2. Data of the In vitro anticancer activity on HepG2 cancer cell line.

Test Compound	$IC_{50}{}^{a}(\mu M)$
IIb (E)	63.58
IIb (Z)	413.9
IIc (E)	<u>2.27</u>
IId (E)	138.1
IIe (E)	904.8
IIf (E)	<u>10.21</u>
$\mathbf{IIf}\left(\mathbf{Z}\right)$	849.2
IIIa (E)	21.02
IIIb (E)	<u>10.71</u>
IIIc (E)	18.04
IIId (E)	45.69
IIIe (E)	430.7
IIIf (E)	32.85
IIIg (E)	<u>10.63</u>
VIa	468.2
VIb	997.2
VIe	672.7
VIIa	629.5
VIIf	725.2
VIIIa	548.1
VIIIe	525.7
SAHA	63.48 ³⁹

^aIC₅₀ value is the compound concentration required to produce 50% inhibition of HepG2 human liver cancer cell line.

4.1.2. In vitro HDAC enzyme inhibition assay

Nine synthesized carboxylic acid compounds **IIb,c,f** (*E*), **IIIb,f,g** (*E*), **VIa**, **VIa** and **VIIIa** were selected as representatives for the five series in the present study to be *in vitro* tested for HDAC1 enzyme inhibition. The percentage inhibition at 10 μ M concentration of the synthesized compounds against HDAC1 is summarized in Table 3. Synthesized Compounds were expected to inhibit HDACs according to molecular docking study that was performed in the present study on HDAC class I homologue (HDAC-like protein, HDLP)/SAHA complex (PDB: 1C3S) which shares 35.2% sequence identity with HDAC1 [23, 10]. Results show that at 10 μ M concentration, none of the tested compounds showed significant inhibitory activity against HDAC1.

Further *in vitro* enzyme inhibition assay was carried out on 3 synthesized carboxylic acid compounds selected as representatives for three series presented in this study, series **II** ((4-(substituted)phenyl)-4-oxohexanoic acids), series **III** (4-(substituted)phenyl) acrylic acids) and series **VII** 5-(4-(substituted) phenylamino)-5-oxopentanoic acid to identify the series endowed with HDAC inhibitory activity on different HDAC isoforms (HDAC2-11). Compounds **IIf** (*E*), **IIIf** (*E*) and **VIIa** were randomly selected to test their percentage inhibition at 50 μ M concentration on different HDAC isoforms (2-11). The percentage inhibition of the tested compounds at 50 μ M concentration is summarized in Table 4. Results show that surprisingly newly synthesized compound **IIf** (*E*) showed remarkable increase in HDACs, based on the validated docking study that was performed prior to synthesis in the present study (-19% inhibition against HDAC2, -73% inhibition against HDAC3, -53% inhibition against HDAC8). Compound **IIIf** (*E*) showed potential enzyme inhibitory activity at 50 μ M concentration against different HDAC isoforms (27% inhibition against HDAC6, 25% inhibition against HDAC8, 20% inhibition against HDAC2), while compound **VIIa** showed no significant inhibitory activity at 50 μ M concentration.

The enzyme inhibitory assay results were in consistency with the fact that carboxylic acid derivatives are poor HDAC inhibitors showing potential HDAC inhibitory activity at high doses. [31, 32] Results implicates a potent zinc binding group is crucial for HDAC inhibitory activity. This work provided some insights to the binding interactions of inhibitors with HDAC and could facilitate development of novel hydroxamate and/or benzamide HDAC inhibitors from the novel synthesized carboxylic acid derivatives in this study in an attempt to synthesize more potent histone deacetylase inhibitors with stronger chelating groups.

Test compound at (10 µM)	IIb (E)	IIc (E) IIf	(E) IIIb (E)	$\operatorname{HIf}\left(E\right)$	IIIg (E)	VIa	VIIa	VIIIa	SAHA (500nM)
HDAC1	-10	-6 -	5 2	-3	1	4	3	5	84
%Inhibition									

Table 3. The percentage inhibition of synthesized compounds at 10 µM concentration against HDAC1.

Table 4. The percentage inhibition of compounds IIf (*E*), IIIa (*E*) and VIIa at 50 μ M concentration against (HDAC2 - 11). ND^a: not done

%Inhibition at 50 μM	HDAC2	HDAC3	HDAC4	HDAC5	HDAC6	HDAC7	HDAC8	HDAC9	HDAC10	HDAC11
$\operatorname{H}\mathbf{f}(E)$	-19	-73	-37	-75	-27	-65	-53	-38	-29	-42
IIIf (E)	15	7	4	20	27	9	25	-5	1	-2
VIIa	6	-1	2	1	-1	2	1	1	3	1
SAHA(500nM)	74	90	ND^{a}	ND	97	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
TSN(30 µM)	ND	ND	88	78	ND	90	89	87	85	84

4.2. Molecular modeling studies *4.2.1. Docking study:*

Molecular docking was performed using Accelrys Discovery studio 2.5 software using the Dock ligands (CDOCKER) protocol which is an implementation of the CDOCKER algorithm. CDOCKER is a grid-based molecular docking method that employs CHARMm-based molecular dynamics (MD) scheme to dock ligands into a receptor binding site. Random ligand conformations are generated using high-

temperature MD. It allows you to run a refinement docking of any number of ligands with a single protein receptor. Various scoring functions were applied to the ligands including -CDOCKER_ENERGY (CHARMm energy: interaction energy plus ligand strain) and -CDOCKER_INTERACTION_ENERGY: interaction energy only). Poses are sorted by CHARMm energy and the top scoring poses are calculated.

Molecular docking was based on crystal structures of HDLP (PDB ID: 1C3S) which is class I HDAC homologue complexed with SAHA (hydroxamic acid inhibitor of HDAC in crystal complex). Protein was prepared using prepare protein parameter which cleans up common problems in the input protein structure in preparation for further processing, where it inserts missing atoms in residues as hydrogen which was added and minimized and it also removes alternate conformations. All the waters were removed as well as all ions except for catalytic zinc ion. Synthesized compounds **IIb-f** (*E*), **IIb,f** (*Z*), **IIIa-g** (*E*), **VIa,b,e**, **VIIa,f** and **VIIIa,e** were prepared from ligands prepare tool which adds hydrogen, fix bad valencies and generates a 3D coordinates using catalyst. Docking was performed using (CDOCKER) protocol. Pose cluster radius was set to 0.5 Å, top hits were set to 10 and other docking parameters were kept at default. Results were analyzed according to -CDOCKER_ENERGY.

4.2.1.1. Docking results

The binding modes of the synthesized carboxylic acids into the active site of histone deacetylase like protein (PDB ID: 1C3S) were in consistency with the proposed design and rational as described in Table 5. CDOCKER energy scores indicated favorable binding modes of SAHA and the newly synthesized compounds **IIc** (E) and **IIIg** (E) into the active site of HDLP (PDB ID: 1C3S) as shown in (Fig. 4).

In (A), it was found that the CDOCKER energy score of the original ligand SAHA was -46.07 forming three hydrogen bond interactions between oxygen of hydroxamic hydroxyl group and histidine (His131) with a distance of 2.41 Å, hydrogen of hydroxamic NH and histidine (His132) with a distance of 1.90 Å and oxygen of amidic carbonyl group and tyrosine (Tyr297) with a distance of 1.79 Å. The distance between oxygen atom of amidic carbonyl group and oxygen of hydroxyl group with zinc ion were 1.79 Å and 1.84 Å, respectively. This was found to retrieve the reported [23] binding mode of SAHA in the X-ray crystal structure of HDLP (PDB ID: 1C3S).

In (B), the newly synthesized compound **IIc** (*E*) showed the best binding affinity with CDOCKER energy score of -51.03 and the most potent cytotoxic activity against HepG2 cancer cell line (in which histone deacetylase enzyme is overexpressed) with measured IC₅₀ of 2.27 μ M. Binding mode was consistent with SAHA, since compound **IIc** (*E*) forms two hydrogen bond interactions between oxygen of ketonic carbonyl group and tyrosine (Tyr297) with a distance of 2.33 Å and oxygen of acidic carbonyl group and histidine (His131) with a distance of 2.18 Å. Phenyl ring of styrene shows additional two pi-pi interaction with the phenyl rings of phenylalanine (Phe141) and phenylalanine (Phe198). The distance between the oxygen atom of ketonic carbonyl group and oxygen atom of acidic carbonyl group with zinc ion were 2.24 and 2.22 Å, respectively.

In (C), the newly synthesized compound **IIIg** (*E*) from series **III** showed the best binding affinity with CDOCKER energy score of -40.02 and the most significant cytotoxic activity with measured IC₅₀ of 10.63 μ M. Binding mode was consistent with SAHA forming three hydrogen bond interactions between oxygen of acidic carbonyl group and tyrosine (Tyr297) with a distance of 2.39 Å, oxygen of acidic hydroxyl group and histidine (His131) with a distance of 2.43 Å and hydrogen of acidic hydroxyl group and histidine (His132) with a distance of 2.15 Å. Phenyl ring of styrene shows additional pi-pi interaction with phenyl ring of phenylalanine (Phe198). The distance between oxygen atom of acidic carbonyl group with zinc ion were 2.15 and 2.64 Å, respectively.

Table 5. Docking results for the synthesized compounds as well as SAHA in the active site of HDLP enzyme PDB (1C3S) showing the H-bonds, Pi-interactions formed with the binding site residues and also distance of atoms related to zinc metal.

Name	^а IС ₅₀ µМ	CDOCKER energy	Hydrogen bonds	Hydrogen bond distance	Pi-Pi interactions	Distance related to zinc
SAHA	63.48	-46.07	HE2 of HIS131 - O of OH NE2 of HIS132 - H of hydroxamic NH HH of TYR297 - O of amidic C=O	2.41 1.90 1.79	none	1.79 (C=O, amide) 1.84 (OH, hydroxamic)
IIb (E)	63.58	-43.27	HE2 of HIS131 - O of acidic C=O HH of TYR297 - O of ketonic C=O HN1 of GLY295 - O of acidic OH	2.14 2.32 2.06	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.19 (C=O, ketonic) 2.27 (C=O, acidic)
IIb (Z)	413.9	-21.96	HH of TYR297 - O of acidic OH	2.00	PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.15 (C=O, ketonic)
IIc (E)	2.27	-51.44	HE2 of HIS131 - O of acidic C=O HH of TYR297 - O of ketonic C=O	2.18 2.33	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.24 (C=O ketonic) 2.22 (C=O acidic)
IId (E)	138.1	-33.33	O of GLY129 - H of acidic OH	2.38	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.18 (OH, acidic)
IIe (E)	904.8	-43.80	O of GLY129 - H of acidic OH	2.14	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.65 (C=O, ketonic) 3.21 (C=O, acidic)
IIf (E)	10.21	-48.8	HE2 of HIS131 – O of acidic C=O HH of TYR297 – O of ketonic C=O	2.14 2.35	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.21 (C=O, ketonic) 2.27 (C=O, acidic)
$\operatorname{IIf}\left(Z\right)$	849.2	-28.40	HH of TYR297 – O of ketonic C=O	2.46	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	7.44 (C=O, acidic)
IIIa (E)	21.02	-28.60	HH of TYR297- O of acidic OH	2.42	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene and imidazole ring	1.53 (C=O, acidic) 2.19 (OH acidic)
IIIb (E)	10.71	-28.14	HH of TYR297 – O of acidic C=O NE2 of HIS132 - H of acidic OH	1.84 2.44	none	2.88 (C=O, acidic) 1.76 (OH, acidic)
IIIc (E)	18.04	-37.68	HH of TYR297 – O of acidic OH	2.82	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.86 (C=O, acidic) 2.43 (OH acidic)
IIId (E)	45.69	-37.23	HH of TYR297 – O of acidic OH	2.94	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.46 (C=O, acidic) 1.83 (OH, acidic)
IIIe (E)	430.7	-31.14	O of GLY140- H of acidic OH	2.38	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.14 (OH acidic)
$\operatorname{IIIf}(E)$	32.85	-37.48	HH of TYR297- O of acidic OH	2.38	PHE141 - phenyl ring of styrene PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.53 (C=O, acidic) 2.48 (OH, acidic)
IIIg (E)	10.63	-40.02	HH of TYR297 - O of acidic C=O HE2 of HIS131 - O of acidic OH NE2 of HIS132 - H of acidic OH	2.39 2.43 2.15	PHE198 - phenyl ring of styrene	2.15 (C=O, acidic) 2.64 (OH, acidic)
VIa	468.2	-30.35	O of GLY140:O – H of acidic OH	2.39	PHE141 - phenyl ring of benzamide PHE198 - phenyl ring of benzamide	2.16 (C=O, acidic)
VIb	997.2	-28.82	O of GLY140 - H of acidic OH	2.45	PHE141 - phenyl ring of benzamide	2.15 (C=O, acidic)
VIe	672.7	-33.44	none	none	PHE141 - phenyl ring of benzamide PHE198 - phenyl ring of benzamide	2.14 (C=O, acidic)
VIIa	629.5	-30.35	O of GLY140 - H of acidic OH	2.41	PHE141 - phenyl ring of benzamide	2.17 (C=O, acidic)
VIIf	725.2	-44.75	O of GLY140 – N of amide	2.26	PHE141 - phenyl ring of benzamide PHE198 - phenyl ring of benzamide	2.27 (C=O, amide)
VIIIa	548.1	-14.50	HE2 of HIS170 - O of amidic C=O	2.10	PHE141 - phenyl ring of pthalic acid PHE198 - phenyl ring of phthalic acid	not significant
VIIIe	526.9	-17.95	none	none	PHE200 - phenyl ring of benzamide PHE141 - phenyl ring of benzamide PHE198 - phenyl ring of benzamide	not significant



Figure 4. Molecular modeling of original ligand (SAHA) and two newly synthesized compounds IIc(E) and IIIg(E) to compare binding interactions within the active site of HDLP (PDB ID: 1C3S). In (A) binding mode of original ligand (SAHA) with HDLP, (B) binding mode of newly synthesized compound IIc(E) with HDLP, (C) binding mode of newly synthesized compound IIIg(E) with HDLP. All interactions are described as H-bonds shown in dotted lines, Pi-Pi interactions shown in orange solid lines and metal coordination distance shown in blue lines. Amino acids involved in interactions and zinc metal were labelled.

4.2.1.2. Docking validation

Validation of docking algorithm was achieved by docking of the selected lead compound, SAHA in the active site of histone deacetylase enzyme homologue (PDB ID:1C3S), this was found to retrieve the reported [23] binding mode of SAHA in the X-ray crystal structure of histone deacetylase enzyme homologue PDB (1C3S) as shown in (Fig. 4) (A). Nevertheless, the root mean square difference (RMSD) between the top docking pose and original crystallographic geometry of SAHA was 0.88 Å. This successful validation provides sufficient confidence in drawing meaningful conclusions from the docking study.

4.2.2. Pharmacophore modeling

In this study, pharmacophore generation was performed using Discovery Studio 2.5 software. The 3D QSAR Pharmacophore Generation protocol (Catalyst HypoGen algorithm) was used to derive structure activity relationship hypothesis models (3D-QSAR pharmacophore models) from a set of ligands with known activity values on a given biological target. [40]

The training set is composed of twenty one synthesized compounds from the present study with measured IC_{50} against HepG2 cancer cell line for the generation of pharmacophore models considered as the certainty value. The uncertainty value was set as 1.5 instead of the default value 3.0. The pharmacophore features used are hydrogen bond acceptor (HBA), hydrogen bond donor (HBD), hydrophobic (HYP), ring aromatic (RA) and negative ionizable features. Though the Zn ion binding function is not included in the catalyst feature dictionary, it can be represented by the hydrogen bond acceptor or donor. [40] Fisher validation was applied and set to 95% significance. Pharmacophores were

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT then generated in HypoGen module and the top nine scoring hypotheses were exported. HypoGen identifies features common to the active compounds and excludes features common to the inactive compounds within conformational allowable regions of space. It further estimates the activity of our newly synthesized and tested compounds using regression parameters. The parameters were computed by regression analysis using the relationship of geometric fit value versus the activity. The better the geometric fit the greater the activity prediction of the compound.

4.2.2.1. Pharmacophore study results

Nine predictive pharmacophore models (hypothesis) were generated via aligning different conformations of the represented training set ligands to bind with the generated pharmacophore models. These pharmacophore models were exported for further studies. All of the generated pharmacophore models contained at least four chemical features. Five out of nine pharmacophore models had two HBA, one HYP, and one RA feature.

The top pharmacophore model generated, Hypothesis 5, was developed having two HBA, one HYP, and one RA feature as shown in (fig. 5) with constraint distances and angles between its features as described in Table 6.



Figure 5. Constraint distances and angles between features of the generated top pharmacophore model with the features considered hydrogen bond donor (HBA) colored in green, ring aromatic (RA) colored in orange, hydrophobic (HYP) colored in cyan. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article).

Table 6. Constraint distances and angles between features of the generated top pharmacophore model.

Constraint distances (Å)	Constraint angles (°)
(HBA_1) - (HBA_2), 2.984; (HBA_1) -(RA_4), 5.842;	(HBA_1) - (HBA_2) - (HYP_3), 103.95; (RA_4) - (HBA_2) - (HBA_1), 91.60;
(HBA_2) - (RA_4), 4.940; (HYP_3) - (HBA_1),10.435; (HVD_2) (BA_4) - 4.621;	(HBA_2) - (HYP_3) - (RA_4), 13.98; (RA_4) - (HYP_3) - (HBA_1), 5.50
(HYP_3) - (KA_4), 4.631; (HYP_3) - (HBA_2), 9.306	

In (fig. 6), SAHA and newly synthesized compound **IIc** (*E*) are represented with the best generated pharmacophore model. Where In (A) SAHA has fit value of 5.90 and its measured IC₅₀ is 63.48 μ M [39] against HepG2 Cancer cell line. Three features out of four were considered, where carbonyl group of hydroxamic acids fits with (HBA_1), hydroxyl group of hydroxamic acid fits with (HBA_2) and phenyl ring fits with (HYP). While in (B) compound **IIc** (*E*) has highest fit value of 7.59 and highest cytotoxic activity against Human Liver HepG2 Cancer cell line with IC₅₀ of 2.27 μ M. Four pharmacophore features were considered, where oxygen of ketonic carbonyl group fits with (HBA_1), oxygen of hydroxyl group fits with (HBA_2), pyridine ring fits with (HYP) and additionally the phenyl ring of styrene fits with (RA).

Features of the generated pharmacophore model mapped with the 21 synthesized compounds as well as SAHA are summarized in Table 7.



Figure 6. The best generated pharmacophore model with the features considered hydrogen bond acceptor (HBA) colored in green, ring aromatic (RA) colored in orange, hydrophobic (HYP) colored in cyan where A) shows SAHA fitted in the pharmacophore with fit value 5.90 (B) shows synthesized structure compound **IIc** (E) fitted in the pharmacophore with fit value 7.59, (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article).

Table 7. The pharmacophore features (hydrogen bond acceptor HBA_1, hydrogen bond acceptor HBA_2, hydrophobic feature HYP_3, and ring aromatic feature (RA)) mapped with the synthesized compounds and SAHA, as well as their fit values.

Compd.	Fit value	HBA_1	HBA_2	HYP_3	RA_4
IIb (<i>E</i>)	6.09	CO of ketone	OH of carboxylic acid	pyrrolidine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIb (Z)	5.29	CO of ketone		pyrrolidine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIc (E)	7.59	CO of ketone	OH of carboxylic acid	piperidine	phenyl ring of styrene
IId (<i>E</i>)	5.67		CO of carboxylic acid	morpholine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIe (E)	5.60		OH of carboxylic acid	4-CH ₃ -piperazine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIf (E)	6.76	CO of ketone	OH of carboxylic acid	piperazine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIf(Z)	5.03	CO of ketone		piperazine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIIa (E)	6.96	CO of carboxylic acid	OH of carboxylic acid	imidazole	phenyl ring of styrene
IIIb (E)	6.67	CO of carboxylic acid	OH of carboxylic acid	pyrrolidine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIIc (E)	6.67	CO of carboxylic acid	OH of carboxylic acid	piperidine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIId (E)	6.63	CO of carboxylic acid	OH of carboxylic acid	morpholine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIIe (E)	5.45	OH of carboxylic acid		4-CH ₃ -piperazine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIIf (E)	6.45	CO of carboxylic acid	OH of carboxylic acid	piperazine	phenyl ring of styrene
IIIg (E)	6.61	CO of carboxylic acid	OH of carboxylic acid	piperazine	phenyl ring of styrene
VIa	5.26	OH of carboxylic acid	CO of amide		phenyl ring of benzamide
VIb	5.04		OH of carboxylic acid	pyrrolidine	phenyl ring of benzamide
VIe	5.14	CO of amide		4-CH ₃ -piperazine	phenyl ring of benzamide
VIIa	5.13		CO of amide	imidazole	phenyl ring of benzamide
VIIf	5.09		CO of carboxylic acid	piperazine	phenyl ring of benzamide
VIIIa	5.19	OH of carboxylic acid	CO of amide		phenyl ring of benzamide
VIIIe	5.21		OH of carboxylic acid	piperazine	phenyl ring of benzamide
SAHA	5.90	CO of hydroxamic acid	OH of hydoxamic acid	phenyl ring	

4.2.2.2. Pharmacophore validation

The pharmacophore models generated should be statistically significant, able to predict the activities of new chemical compounds and retrieve active compounds from the database. The selection of the generated pharmacophore model (hypothesis 5) was be based on its validation using four methods; cost analysis, activity prediction, mapping of SAHA as a reported external reference to the generated pharmacophore and Fisher validation test.

HypoGen selects the best hypothesis by applying a cost analysis. The overall cost of each hypothesis is calculated by summing three cost factors, a weight cost, an error cost, and a configuration cost. However, configuration cost is the main contributor. HypoGen also calculates two theoretical costs, the null and fixed costs that can be used to determine the significance of the selected hypothesis. The fixed cost is the lowest possible cost representing a simplest hypothetical model that fits all data perfectly and the null cost represents the maximum cost of a pharmacophore with no features and estimates the activity to be the average activity of the training set compounds and the total cost for every pharmacophore. A larger difference between the fixed and null costs than that between the fixed and total costs of each hypothesis signifies the quality of a pharmacophore model. The significance of the hypothesis also depends on the cost difference which is measured between the null cost and the total cost of a given hypothesis. The larger the value of the cost difference, the more statistically significant the hypothesis is believed to be.

The quality of the generated pharmacophore hypothesis (hypothesis 5) was evaluated by considering the cost functions calculation by HypoGen module during hypothesis generation. In detail, the null cost and fixed cost of the nine pharmacophore hypothesis were equal to 278.4 and 61.2, respectively. Hypothesis 5 is the best generated pharmacophore hypothesis as it is characterized by the lowest total cost (105.7), the highest cost difference between null and total hypothesis cost (172.7), and the best correlation coefficient (0.88) which indicates the capability of the pharmacophore model to predict the activity of the training set compounds.

The pharmacophore model (hypothesis 5) was also validated through activity prediction of the synthesized structures as training set. Further validation for the pharmacophore model (hypothesis 5) generated was performed through mapping of SAHA using ligand pharmacophore mapping protocol, comparing its fit value with the fit values of the tested compounds which was detected as 5.90 and comparing its predicted activity with its experimental activity. The predicted activities of SAHA and the training set through the pharmacophore model as well as their fit values are represented in Table 8. It should be noted that the predicated anti-proliferative activities by the 3D Pharmacophore QSAR model were very close to those experimentally observed, indicating that these models can be safely applied for prediction of cytotoxic activity of newly synthesized compounds.

Fischer validation is another approach for pharmacophore model validation. The Fischer validation confidence level for hypothesis 5 is 95%. This validation method checks the correlation between the chemical structures and biological activity. This method generates pharmacophore hypothesis using the same parameters as those used to develop the original pharmacophore hypothesis by randomizing the activity data of the training set compounds.

Table 8. Fit values and predicted activities for the synthesized compounds mapped with the generated 3D-pharmacophore model. SAHA mapping on the generated pharmacophore was used for further validation of the model.

-	Compound	Predicted	Experimental	Fit
		activity	activity	value
_		(IC ₅₀ µM)	(IC ₅₀ µM)	•
	IIb (E)	68.08	63.58	6.09
	IIb (Z)	437.1	413.9	5.29
	IIc (E)	2.18	2.27	7.59
	IId (E)	180.1	138.1	5.67
	He (E)	212.1	904.8	5.60
	IIf (E)	14.73	10.21	6.76
	IIf(Z)	785.7	849.2	5.03
	IIIa (E)	9.364	21.02	6.96
	IIIb (E)	17.88	10.71	6.68
	IIIc (E)	18.05	18.04	6.67
	IIId (E)	19.81	45.69	6.63
	IIIe (E)	302.2	430.7	5.45
	$\operatorname{HIf}(E)$	32.14	32.85	6.42
6	IIIg	20.79	10.63	6.61
	VIa	468.3	468.2	5.26
	VIb	763.7	997.2	5.04
	VIe	611.3	672.7	5.14
	VIIa	627.8	629.5	5.13
	VIIf	685.1	725.2	5.09
	VIIIa	549.2	548.1	5.19
_	VIIIe	526.9	525.7	5.21
_	SAHA	72.26	63.48 ³⁹	5.90

4.2.2.3. Conclusion

In conclusion, results of cytotoxic activity against Liver HepG2 Cancer cell line were consistent with pharmacophore fit score values and docking score energies. Where it was observed that compound **IIc** (*E*) ((*E*)-6-(4-(piperidin-1-yl) phenyl)-4-oxo-hex-5-enoic acid) with the lowest IC₅₀ of 2.27 μ M (i.e most potent), showed the best fit value of 7.59 and the highest binding affinity with CDOCKER energy score of -50.27.

Interestingly, 3D QSAR pharmacophore model created to explore the observed cytotoxic activity against HepG2 cancer cell line for the E and Z isomers of the newly synthesized compound **IIf** coincides with

docking. This enabled an explanation for the increase of cytotoxic activity of compound **IIf** (*E*) having an IC₅₀ of 10.21 μ M when compared with its *Z* isomer **IIf** (*Z*) having an IC₅₀ of 849.2 μ M.

In (Fig. 7), compound **IIf** (*E*) has CDOCKER energy score of -48.71, where its two oxygen atoms of ketonic and acidic carbonyl accepts two hydrogen atoms from tyrosine (Tyr297) and histidine (His131) respectively. And its phenyl ring of styrene forms two pi-pi interaction with phenylalanine (Phe141) and phenylalanine (Phe198). The respective distance between the oxygen atoms of ketonic and acidic carbonyl with zinc ion were 2.21 and 2.27 Å, which enabled the coordination of zinc ion. Also compound **IIf** (*E*) has fit value of 6.76 fitting with the four features of the generated pharmacophore model. Where oxygen of ketonic carbonyl group fits with (HBA_1), oxygen of acidic carbonyl fits with (HBA_2), piperazine fits with (HYP_3) and phenyl ring of styrene fits with RA_4.



Figure 7. Docking model (A) coincides with 3D QSAR pharmacophore model (B) for *E*-isomer of newly synthesized compound **IIf** (*E*) having a measured IC_{50} against HepG2 cancer cell line of 10.21 µM. In (A) compound **IIf** (*E*) was docked in the active site of HDAC (PDB code:1C3S) with a CDOCKER energy score of -48.71, interactions are described as H-bonds shown in dotted lines, Pi-Pi interactions shown in orange solid lines and metal coordination shown in blue lines ,amino acids involved in interactions and zinc metal were labelled. In (B) compound **IIf** (*E*) fitted in the pharmacophore model with fit value 6.76. Features considered are hydrogen bond acceptor (HBA) colored in green, ring aromatic (RA) colored in orange and hydrophobic (HYP) colored in cyan.

While Compound **IIf** (**Z**) has CDOCKER energy score of -28.4 score, where oxygen of ketonic carbonyl accepts one hydrogen atom from tyrosine (Tyr297) and its phenyl ring of styrene forms two pi-pi interaction with Phe141 and Phe198. The measured distance of its ketonic carbonyl with zinc ion was 7.44 Å, which showed inability to coordinate the zinc ion. Also, compound **IIf** (**Z**) has the lowest fit value of 5.03 and fits with only three features of the pharmacophore model generated. Where oxygen of ketonic carbonyl group fits with (HBA_1), piperazine fits with (HYP_3) and phenyl ring of styrene fits with (RA_4) as shown in (Fig. 8).





Figure 8. Docking model (A) coincides with 3D QSAR pharmacophore model (B) for Z-isomer of newly synthesized compound **IIf** (Z) having a measured IC₅₀ of 849.2 μ M. In (A) compound **IIf** (Z) was docked in the active site of HDAC (PDB code:1C3S) with a CDOCKER energy score of -28.4, interactions are described as H-bonds shown in dotted lines, Pi-Pi interactions shown in orange solid lines, amino acids involved in interactions and zinc metal were labelled. In (B) compound **IIf**

(Z) fitted in the pharmacophore model with fit value 5.03. Features considered hydrogen bond acceptor (HBA) colored in green, ring aromatic (RA) colored in orange, hydrophobic (HYP) colored in cyan.

From series **III**, compound **IIIg** (*E*) ((*E*)-3-(4-(4-(4-chlorophenyl)piperazin-1-yl)phenyl)acrylic acid) with the lowest measured IC₅₀ of 10.63 μ M, has the best fit value of 6.61 and highest binding affinity with CDOCKER energy score of -40.02.

While all synthesized compounds of series VI (4-(4-(substituted)phenylamino)-4-oxobutanoic acid), VII (5-(4-(substituted)phenylamino)-5-oxopentanoic acid) and VIII (2-((4-substituted)phenyl) carbamoyl) benzoic acid) have insignificant cytotoxic activity IC_{50} 100 µM, lowest binding affinity and lowest fit value ranging from 5.04-5.26.

4.2.3. 2D QSAR study:

The QSAR study was performed using Discovery Studio 2.5 Software. The training set was composed of the twenty one synthesized compounds from the present study with their measured pIC_{50} (-Log IC_{50}) against HepG2 cancer cell line for QSAR modeling. "Calculate Molecular Properties" module was used for calculating the 2D and 3D molecular properties as well as energies of highest occupied and lowest unoccupied molecular orbitals (HOMO and LUMO) [41] of the training set compounds.

2D Descriptors involved: AlogP, fingerprints, molecular properties, surface area and volume, as well as topological descriptors, and the 3D descriptors: dipole, jurs descriptors, principle moments of inertia, and shadow indices.

Furthermore, the training set compounds were fitted against representative pharmacophores and their fit values were added as additional descriptors. The fit values of the training set compounds were calculated automatically using the previously described "3D QSAR Pharmacophore Generation" module.

Multiple linear regression (MLR) analysis was employed to search for optimal QSAR models that combine high quality binding pharmacophores with other molecular descriptors and being capable of correlating bioactivity variation across the used training set collection. Compound **IIf** (**Z**) was identified as a statistical outlier. QSAR model was validated employing leave one-out cross-validation by setting the folds to a number much larger than the number of samples , r^2 (squared correlation coefficient value) and r^2 prediction (predictive squared correlation coefficient value), residuals between the predicted and experimental activity of the test set and training set. [42]

4.2.3.1. QSAR study results

Equation 1 represents the best performing QSAR model -logIC₅₀ = -1260.8 ALogP - 4.059 pKa[1] - 3.313 pKa[2] - 109.98 Molecular_Fractional Polar Surface Area + 2042.3

Abbreviations used: -logIC₅₀ is the negative logarithmic value of the concentration required to produce 50% inhibition of HepG2 cancer cells.; ALogP is a measure of the hydrophobicity of the molecule; it is calculated in Discovery Studio as the Log of the octanol-water partition coefficient using Ghose and Crippen's method [43]; pKa is the pKa value of all ionizable sites; Molecular_Fractional Polar Surface Area is the ratio of the polar surface area divided by the total surface area of the molecule.

According to Equation 1 QSAR model is represented graphically by scattering plots of the experimental versus the predicted bioactivity values $-\log IC_{50}$ for the training set compounds as shown in (Fig. 9).

The method used to build the model was Least-Squares, $r^2 = 0.948$, r^2 (adj) 1.017, r^2 (pred) 0.215, Least-squared error 0.033155, where r^2 (adj) is r^2 adjusted for the number of terms in the model; r^2 (pred) is the prediction r^2 , equivalent to q^2 from a leave-1-out cross-validation.



Figure 9. Shows the corresponding scatter plots of the experimental versus the predicted bioactivity values $-\log IC_{50}$ for the training set compounds according to

Equation **1**. $(r^2 = 0.948)$.

Knowledge of pka values together with partition coefficient can be used for estimating the extent to which the compound enters the bloodstream. Enzyme kinetics are dependent on the the pKa values of many acids and bases and is also a prerequisite for a quantitative understanding of the interaction between acids and bases and metal ions to form complex. In conclusion, Equation 1 describes that the cytotoxic activity of synthesized compounds on Liver HepG2 cancer cell line is affected by three molecular descriptors AlogP, pKa and molecular fractional polar Surface, where cytotoxic activity is increased by decreasing the hydrophobicity (ALogP), pKa value of all ionizable sites and decreasing the molecular fractional polar surface area of the synthesized compounds.

4.2.3.2. QSAR validation

QSAR models were validated internally employing leave-1-out cross-validation where r^2 (squared correlation coefficient value) which is 0.948, r^2 (pred) is the prediction r^2 , equivalent to q^2 from a leave-1-out cross-validation which is 0.215. Validation was also employed by measuring the residuals between the experimental activity and the predicted activity of the training set. The experimental activities and those predicted by QSAR studies were presented in Table 9. It should be noted that the predicated anti-proliferative activities by our QSAR models were very close to those experimentally observed, indicating that these models can be safely applied for prediction of more effective hits having the same skeletal framework.

Table9.compoundsagainst	Compd.	Experimental	Predicted	Residual
Equation 1 ^a		Activity	activity	
Equation 1 :		(-10g IC ₅₀)	(-10g IC ₅₀)	0.246
	IID (E)	-1.803	-2.149	0.346
	IIb (Z)	-2.616	-2.149	-0.467
	IIc (E)	-0.356	-0.508	0.152
	IId (<i>E</i>)	-2.140	-2.063	-0.076
	IIe (E)	-2.956	-2.973	0.016
	IIf (E)	-1.009	-0.942	-0.066
	IIIa (E)	-1.32	-1.32	0.000
	IIIb (E)	-1.029	-1.041	0.011
	IIIc (E)	-1.256	-1.083	-0.172
	IIId (E)	-1.659	-1.725	0.065
	IIIe (E)	-2.634	-2.458	-0.175
	IIIf (E)	-1.516	-1.765	0.249
	IIIg (E)	-1.026	-1.026	0.000
	VIa	-2.67	-2.432	-0.237
	VIb	-2.998	-3.056	0.057
	VIe	-2.827	-3.013	0.186

Experimental activity of the synthesized the predicted activity according to

	ACCE	PTED	MANU	ISCRIPT
VIIa	-2.79	-3.014	0.224	
VIIf	-2.860	-2.634	-0.226	
VIIIa	-2.730	-2.748	0.018	
VIIIe	-2.720	-2.701	-0.018	

5. Conclusion

In summary, it was found that docking coincides with 3D QSAR pharmacophore model generated for the displayed cytotoxic activity of the synthesized compounds against HepG2 Cancer cell line.

It was revealed that *E*-isomers for compounds **IIb**, **IIf** displayed significant cytotoxic activity compared to their Z-isomers which showed insignificant cytotoxic activity. Compounds **IIc** (*E*), **IIf** (*E*), **IIIb** (*E*), and **IIIg** (*E*) displayed the highest cytotoxic activity against HepG2 human cancer cell lines with IC₅₀ ranging from 2.27-10.71 μ M. Compound **IIf** (*E*) (NHR₂ = phenylpiperazine) displayed significant cytotoxic activity against NCI Non-Small Cell Lung A549/ATCC Cancer cell line (68% inhibition activity), NCI-H460 Cancer cell line (66% inhibition activity) and Liver HepG2 Cancer cell line (IC₅₀, 10.21 μ M). And unpredictably, compound **IIf** (*E*) showed remarkable stimulation of HDAC activity towards different HDAC isoforms instead of the expected inhibitory activity against class I HDACs. It is suggested that the significant cytotoxic effect of compound **IIf** (*E*) is maybe due to another mechanism of action. Compound **IIIf** (*E*) (NHR₂ = phenylpiperazine) showed significant inhibitory activity (57.34%) against NCI Breast MDA-MB-468 Cancer cell line and potential HDAC inhibitory activity against different HDAC isoforms (20% HDAC5, 27 % HDAC6 and 25% HDAC8).

It was found that the major structural factors affecting the potency of these compounds were related to their basic skeleton. The results indicated that the carboxylic acid derivatives of series **II** and **III** could serve as promising lead compounds for further optimization.

6. Experimental protocols

6.1. Chemistry

Starting materials and reagents were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and Merck and used without further purification. Melting points were recorded on Stuart Scientific apparatus and were uncorrected. Reactions were monitored using thin layer chromatography (TLC), performed on 0.255 mm silica gel plates, with visualization under U.V. light (254 nm). FT-IR spectra were recorded on a 4100 Jasco spectrophotometer using KBr disc in the Microanalytical center, Cairo University. 1H NMR spectra were recorded in δ scale given in ppm on Varian Mercury VX-300 NMR spectrometer in NMR Lab, Chemistry Department, Faculty of Science, Cairo University and Varian Mercury VX-400 NMR spectrometer in NMR Lab, Chemistry Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Cairo University. Coupling patterns are described as follows: s, singlet; d, doublet; t, triplet; m, multiplet; and 1H, 2H, 3H, etc. *J* describes a coupling constant. The coupling constants were rounded off to one decimal place. MS spectra mass were recorded on Shimadzu GCMS-QP 1000 EX gas chromatograph mass spectrometer in the Microanalytical center, Cairo University. Elemental analyses were performed at the Microanalytical Center, Azhar University.

6.1.1. General method for preparation of 4-(substituted) benzaldehyde (Ia-g) [34]

A mixture of p-fluorobenzaldehyde 1 (25.0 g, 0.200 mol) and appropriate amine **2a-g** (0.300 mol) and anhydrous potassium carbonate (40.0 g) were mixed in DMF (300 mL), after which catalytic amount of Aliquat 336 reagent was added. The mixture was then refluxed for 24 hrs at 100 °C. The mixture was concentrated under low pressure and left to cool. The mixture was then poured into ice water and left overnight. The formed solid was filtered, washed with water and crystallized with methanol to yield compounds **Ia-g**.

6.1.1.1. 4-(1H-imidazol-1-yl) benzaldehyde Ia.

Yield 92% as yellow crystals, mp 152^oC, (as reported) [34, 44]

6.1.1.2. 4-(pyrrolidin-1-yl) benzaldehyde Ib.

Yield 98% as yellow crystals, mp 85° C, (as reported) [45, 46]

6.1.1.3. 4-(piperidin-1-yl) benzaldehyde Ic.

Yield 98% as yellow crystals, mp 64° C, (as reported) [47, 48]

6.1.1.4. 4-morpholinobenzaldehyde Id.

Yield 89% as yellow crystals, mp 69°C, (as reported) [49, 50]

6.1.1.5. 4-(4-methylpiperazin-1-yl) benzaldehyde Ie.

Yield 87% as yellow crystals, mp 64° C, (as reported) [45, 51]

6.1.1.6. 4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl) benzaldehyde If.

Yield 98% as yellow crystals, mp 134° C, (as reported) [52]

6.1.1.7. 4-(4-(4-chlorophenyl) piperazin-1-yl) benzaldehyde Ig.

Yield 92% as yellow crystals, mp 133^oC. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1685 (C=O, CHO), 2724-2822 (C<u>HO</u>). ¹H-NMR (300 MHz)(CDCl₃) δ : 3.26 (t, 4H, piperazine H₃, H₅, *J* = 5.1 Hz), 3.56 (t, 4H, piperazine H₂, H₆, *J* = 5.1 Hz), 6.91-7.04 (m, 6H, aromatic Hs), 7.79 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃^o, H₅^o, *J* = 9 Hz), 9.82 (s, 1H, C<u>H</u>O). MS: *m/z* (%): 300 (M⁺, 89%) & base peak at 105 (100%).

6.1.2. General method for preparation of (E)-6-(4-(substituted)phenyl)-4-oxohex-5-enoic acid IIb-f and (Z)-6-(4-(substituted) phenyl)-4-oxohex-5-enoic acid IIb, f [35]

A mixture of the respective aldehyde **Ib-f** (0.003 mol) and levulinic acid (0.003 mol) were dissolved in benzene (100 mL) containing acetic acid (3 mL) and piperidine (1 mL). The solution was heated under reflux using Dean-Stark water trap under nitrogen until the theoretical amount of water had been collected (~6 hrs). The solvent was then evaporated under vacuum and the formed solid product was washed twice with 10 mL of diethyl ether and then twice with 15 mL of 2 M HCl. The product was dried and purified using solvent crystallization or column chromatography (as illustrated below).

6.1.2.1. (E)-6-(4-(pyrrolidin-1-yl) phenyl) -4-oxo-hex-5-enoic acid IIb (E).

Purified by silica gel column chromatography using hexane/ethyl acetate 8:2 eluent with *E*/*Z* ratio 1 to 3 respectively. Yield 25% as red solid, mp 155°C. IR: ($\max, \operatorname{cm}^{-1}$): 1600 (C=C), 1651 (C=O, ketonic), 1712 (C=O, COOH), 2949-3429 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (300 MHz)(CDCl₃) δ : 2.04 (t, 4H, pyrrolidine H₃, H₄, *J* = 6.6 Hz), 2.73 (t, 2H, CH₂-CH₂-COOH, *J* = 6.6 Hz), 3.03 (t, 2H, CH₂-CH₂-COOH, *J* = 6.6 Hz), 3.40 (t, 4H, pyrrolidine H₂, H₆, *J* = 6.6 Hz), 6.61 (d, 1H, CH=CH-CO, *J* = 16.2 Hz), 6.61 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 8.4 Hz), 7.45 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, *J* = 8.4 Hz), 7.61 (d, 1H, CH=CH-CO, *J* = 15.9 Hz). MS: *m*/*z* (%): 273 (M⁺, 100%), 275 (M⁺+2, 8%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₆H₁₉NO₃: C 70.31, H 7.01, N 5.12; Found: C 70.42, H 7.13, N 5.19.

6.1.2.2. (Z)-6-(4-(pyrrolidin-1-yl) phenyl) -4-oxo-hex-5-enoic acid IIb (Z).

Purified by silica gel column chromatography using hexane/ethylacetate 8:2 eluent with Z/ E ratio 3 to 1 respectively. Yield 75% as yellow solid, mp 188°C. IR: ($\max, \operatorname{cm}^{-1}$): 1600 (C=C), 1644 (C=O, ketonic),

1709 (C=O, COOH), 2964-3445 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (400 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 1.95 (t, 4H, pyrrolidine H₃, H₄, *J* = 6.4 Hz), 2.50 (t, 2H, CH₂-C<u>H</u>₂-COOH, *J* = 6.4 Hz), 2.88 (t, 2H, C<u>H</u>₂-CH₂-COOH, *J* = 6.4 Hz), 3.32 (t, 4H, pyrrolidine H₂, H₆, *J* = 6.4 Hz), 6.58 (d, 1H, CH=C<u>H</u>-CO, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 6.59-6.63 (m, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆), 7.50 (m, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅), 7.54 (d, 1H, C<u>H</u>=CH-CO, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 12.05 (s_{br}, 1H, COO<u>H</u>). MS: *m/z* (%): 273 (M⁺, 40%), 274 (M⁺+1, 28%) & base peak at 64 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₆H₁₉NO₃: C 70.31, H 7.01, N 5.12; Found: C 70.42, H 7.13, N 5.19.

6.1.2.3. (E)-6-(4-(piperidin-1-yl) phenyl) -4-oxo-hex-5-enoic acid IIc (E).

Yield 60% as reddish purple crystals (recrystallized from ethanol), mp 176°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1600 (C=C), 1627 (C=O, ketonic), 1751 (C=O, COOH), 2928-3440 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (300 MHz)(CDCl₃) δ : 1.69 (s_{br}, 8H, piperidine H₃, H₄, H₅ and CH₂-CH₂-COOH), 3.37 (s_{br}, 6H, piperidine H₂, H₆ and CH₂-CH₂-COOH), 6.61 (d, 1H, CH=CH-CO, *J* = 16.2 Hz), 6.89 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 8 Hz), 7.17 (d, 1H, CH=CH-CO, *J* = 16.2 Hz), 7.51-7.54 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, *J* = 8 Hz). MS: *m/z* (%): 287 (M⁺, 17.8%), 288 (M⁺+1, 5.5%) & base peak at 213 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₇H₂₁NO₃: C 71.06, H 7.37, N 4.87; Found: C 71.22, H 7.43, N 4.93.

6.1.2.4. (E)-6-(4-morpholinophenyl) -4-oxo-hex-5-enoic acid IId (E).

Yield 56% as yellow crystals (recrystallized from ether/petroleum ether), mp 101°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1507 (C=C), 1644 (C=O, ketonic), 2964-3440 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (300 MHz)(CDCl₃) δ : 2.69 (t, 2H, CH₂-C<u>H</u>₂-COOH, J = 6.6 Hz), 3.08 (t, 2H, C<u>H</u>₂-CH₂-COOH, J = 6.6 Hz), 3.58-3.70 (m, 8H, morpholine H), 6.75 (d, 1H, CH=C<u>H</u>-CO, J = 15.9 Hz), 7.08 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, J = 8.7 Hz), 7.55 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, J = 8.7 Hz), 7.60 (d, 1H, C<u>H</u>=CH-CO, J = 15.9 Hz). MS: m/z (%): 287 (M⁺-2, 1.58%) & base peak at 149 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₆H₁₉NO₄: C 66.42, H 6.62, N 4.84; Found: C 66.61, H 6.70, N 4.89.

6.1.2.5. (E)-6-(4-(4-methylpiperazin-1-yl) phenyl)-4-oxo-hex-5-enoic acid IIe (E).

Yield 60% as yellow crystals (recrystallized from methanol), mp 190°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1590 (C=C), 1680 (C=O, ketonic), 2955-3423 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (300 MHz)(CDCl₃) δ : 2.44 (s, 3H, CH₃-piperazine), 2.58 (t, 2H, CH₂-C<u>H₂-COOH</u>, *J* = 6.3 Hz), 2.73 (t, 4H, piperazine H₃, H₅, *J* = 5.1 Hz), 3.01 (t, 2H, C<u>H₂-CH₂-COOH</u>, *J* = 6.3 Hz), 3.35 (t, 4H, piperazine H₂, H₆, *J* = 4.8 Hz), 6.64 (d, 1H, CH=C<u>H</u>-CO, *J* = 16.2 Hz), 6.87 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 8 Hz), 7.43 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, *J* = 8 Hz), 7.54 (d, 1H, C<u>H</u>=CH-CO, *J* = 16.2 Hz). MS: *m/z* (%): 302 (M⁺, 100%), 304 (M⁺+2, 2.06%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₇H₂₂N₂O₃: C 67.53, H 7.33, N 9.26; Found: C 67.68, H 7.41, N 9.34.

6.1.2.6. (E)-6-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl) phenyl) -4-oxohex-5-enoic acid IIf (E).

Purified by silica gel column chromatography using hexane/ethylacetate 8:2 eluent with *E*/*Z* ratio 1 to 2 respectively. Yield 35% as yellow needle crystals, mp 171°C. IR: ($\max, \operatorname{cm}^{-1}$): 1596 (C=C), 1693 (C=O, ketonic), 1701 (C=O, COOH), 2954-3429 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (300 MHz)(CDCl₃) δ : 2.68 (t, 2H, CH₂-CH₂-COOH, *J* = 6.6 Hz), 3.02 (t, 2H, CH₂-CH₂-COOH, *J* = 6.3 Hz), 3.25 (t, 4H, piperazine H₃, H₅, *J* = 5.4 Hz), 3.42 (t, 4H, piperazine H₂, H₆, *J* = 5.7 Hz), 6.66 (d, 1H, CH=CH=-CO, *J* = 16.2 Hz), 6.92 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂·, H₆·, *J* = 7.5 Hz), 6.95-7.00 (m, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅), 7.27-7.28 (m, 1H, aromatic H₄·), 7.34 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃·, H₅·, *J* = 7.8 Hz) 7.50 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 6.6 Hz), 7.58 (d, 1H, CH=CH=CO, *J* = 16.2 Hz). MS: *m*/*z* (%): 364 (M⁺, 17%), 365 (M⁺+1, 21.86%) & base peak at 105 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₂₂H₂₄N₂O₃: C 72.50, H 6.64, N 7.69; Found: C 72.59, H 6.69, N 7.82.

6.1.2.7. (Z)-6-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl) phenyl) -4-oxohex-5-enoic acid IIf(Z).

Purified by silica gel column chromatography using hexane/ethylacetate 8:2 eluent with Z/E ratio 2 to 1 respectively. Yield 62.5% as orange solid, mp 230°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1509 (C=C), 1592 (C=O, ketonic), 2966-3446 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (300 MHz)(CDCl₃) δ : 2.28 (t, 2H, CH₂.CH₂.COOH), 2.99 (t, 2H, CH₂.CH₂.COOH), 3.45 (s, 4H, piperazine H₃, H₅), 3.56 (s, 4H, piperazine H₂, H₆), 6.82 (d, 1H, CH=CH-CO), 7.00-7.14 (m, 5H, phenyl piperazine aromatic H's), 7.25 (d, 1H, CH=CH-CO, J = 6.4 Hz), 7.65 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, J = 8.4 Hz), 7.76 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, J = 8.2 Hz). MS: m/z (%): 364

 $(M^+, 3.81\%)$ & base peak at 65 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For $C_{22}H_{24}N_2O_3$: C 72.50, H 6.64, N 7.69; Found: C 72.59, H 6.69, N 7.82.

6.1.3. General method for preparation of (E)-3-(4-substituted phenyl)acrylic acid IIIa-g [53]

A mixture of 0.208 g. (0.002 moles) of malonic acid and 0.166 g. (0.001 mol) of 4-substituted benzaldehyde **Ia-g** and (5 mL) of pyridine was prepared. Malonic acid is dissolved by shaking and warming on a steam bath. Catalytic amount of piperidine was then added and the mixture was heated at 80-85°C for 1 hr. After which the mixture was heated under reflux (109–115°C) for an additional 3 hrs. The reaction mixture was then cooled and poured into cold water. The mixture was then acidified by slow addition of concentrated hydrochloric acid with stirring. The formed light crystals were separated by filtration and washed 4 times with cold water. The crude acid was dissolved in a solution of 5% sodium hydroxide. The resulting solution was filtered, diluted with an additional water, and acidified by adding concentrated hydrochloric acid. The formed solid was filtered and washed with cold water. The solid was further purified by using methanol as the solvent of crystallization to yield titled compounds **IIIa-g**.

6.1.3.1. (E)-3-(4-(1H-imidazol-1-yl)phenyl) acrylic acid IIIa (E).

Yield 75% as pale white solid, mp 326°C, (as reported) [54, 55]

6.1.3.2. (E)-3-(4-(pyrrolidin-1-yl)phenyl) acrylic acid IIIb (E).

Yield 85% as yellow solid, mp 265°C, (as reported) [54, 56]

6.1.3.3. (E)-3-(4-(piperidin-1-yl)phenyl) acrylic acid IIIc (E).

Yield 87% as reddish purple solid, mp 110°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1594 (C=C), 1755 (C=O, COOH), 2928-3420 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (400 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 1.54 (m, H, piperidine H₃, H₄, H₅), 3.39 (t, 4H, piperidine H₂, H₆), 6.47 (d, 1H, CH=C<u>H</u>-COOH, *J* = 16 Hz), 7.01 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 7.50 (d, 1H, C<u>H</u>=CH-COOH, *J* = 15.8 Hz), 7.65 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 8.8 Hz). MS: *m/z* (%): 231 (M⁺, 77%), 232 (M⁺+1, 58%) & base peak at 209 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₄H₁₇NO₂: C 72.70, H 7.41, N 6.06; Found: C 72.84, H 7.48, N 6.19.

6.1.3.4. (E)-3-(4-morpholinophenyl) acrylic acid IIId (E).

Yield 75% as orange solid, mp 198°C, (as reported) [57]

6.1.3.5. (E)-3-(4-(4-methyl piperazin-1-yl)phenyl) acrylic acid IIIe (E).

Yield 90% as yellow solid, mp 228°C, (as reported) [54]

6.1.3.6. (E)-3-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)phenyl) acrylic acid IIIf (E).

Yield 90% as yellow solid, mp 240°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1600 (C=C), 1759 (C=O, COOH), 2920-3452 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (400 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 3.24 (t, 4H, piperazine H₃, H₅, *J* = 4.8 Hz), 3.48 (t, 4H, piperazine H₂, H₆, *J* = 4.8 Hz), 6.25 (d, 1H, CH=C<u>H</u>-COOH, *J* = 15.6 Hz), 6.74-7.21 (m, 5H, phenyl piperazine aromatic Hs), 7.46 (d, 1H, C<u>H</u>=CH-COOH, *J* = 15.6 Hz), 6.71 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 7.69 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 8.8 Hz). MS: *m/z* (%): 310 (M⁺+2, 34%), 311 (M⁺+3, 23%) & base peak at 282 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₉H₂₀N₂O₂: C, 74.00, H 6.54, N 9.08; Found: C 74.13, H 6.41, N 9.17.

6.1.3.7. (E)-3-(4-(4-(4-chlorophenyl)piperazin-1-yl)phenyl)acrylic acid IIIg (E).

Yield 95% as pale yellow solid, mp 201°C. IR: ($\max, \operatorname{cm}^{-1}$): 1594 (C=C), 1699 (C=O, COOH), 2918-3434 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (300 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 3.23 (t, 4H, piperazine H₃, H₅, *J* = 4.5 Hz), 3.53 (t, 4H, piperazine H₂, H₆, *J* = 4.8 Hz), 6.32 (d, 1H, CH=C<u>H</u>-COOH, *J* = 16.2 Hz), 7.02-7.13 (m, 4H, aromatic H₃, H₅, H_{2'}, H_{6'}), 7.48 (d, 1H, C<u>H</u>=CH-COOH, *J* = 16.2 Hz), 6.7 (d, 2H, aromatic H_{3'}, H_{5'}, *J* = 8.4 Hz), 7.82 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆). MS: *m/z* (%): 342 (M⁺, 42%), 344 (M+2, 9%) & base peak at 64 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₉H₁₉ClN₂O₂: C 66.57, H 5.59, N 8.17; Found: C 66.68, H 5.64, N 8.29.

6.1.4. General method for preparation of 1-(substituted)-4-nitrobenzene IVa,b,e,f [34]

A mixture of p-nitro chlorobenzene **3** (25.0 g, 0.200 mol), appropriate secondary amine **2a,b,e,f** (0.300 mol) and anhydrous potassium carbonate (40.0 g) were mixed in DMF (300 mL), and then catalytic drops of Aliquat 336 reagent were added. The mixture was heated from 24-36 hrs at 100° C. The reaction mixture was then concentrated under vacuum, cooled and poured into ice water and left aside overnight. The formed solid was filtered, washed with water and crystallized from ethanol to yield titled compounds **IVa,b,e,f.**

6.1.4.1. 1-(4-nitrophenyl)-1H-imidazole IVa.

Yield 65% as pale yellow solid, mp 203°C, (as reported) [58, 59]

6.1.4.2. 1-(4-nitrophenyl)pyrrolidine IVb.

Yield 98% as orange solid, mp 169°C, (as reported) [60, 61]

6.1.4.3. 1-methyl-4-(4-nitrophenyl)piperazine IVe.

Yield 98% as orange solid, mp 104°C, (as reported) [62]

6.1.4.4. 1-(4-nitrophenyl)-4-phenylpiperazine IVf.

Yield 92% as red solid, mp184°C, (as reported) [63]

6.1.5. General method for preparation of 4-(substituted)aniline Va,b,e,f [36, 37]

To a solution of 1-(substituted) 4-nitrobenzene **IVa,b,e,f** (0.01mol) in NH₄OH (20 mL, 30%), a solution of sodium dithionite (7g, 0.04 mol) in water (30 mL) was quickly added, the reaction mixture was refluxed for 15 min. After cooling, the crude product was filtered, washed and crystallized from methylene chloride to yield target compounds **Va,b,e,f**.

6.1.5.1. 4-(1H-imidazol-1-yl) aniline Va.

Yield 70% as grey solid, mp 147°C, (as reported) [64, 65]

6.1.5.2. 4-(pyrrolidin-1-yl) aniline Vb.

Yield 80% as yellow oil, (as reported) [66]

6.1.5.3. 4-(4-methylpiperazin-1-yl) aniline Ve.

Yield 75% as off white acicular solid, mp 90° C, (as reported) [62, 67, 68]

6.1.5.4. 4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl) aniline Vf.

Yield 80% as white solid, mp 128-130°C, (as reported) [63]

6.1.6. General method for preparation of 4-(4-(substituted) phenylamino)-4-oxobutanoic acid VIa,b,e [69]

A mixture of 4-(substituted) aniline **Va,b,e** (0.003 mol) and succinic anhydride (0.30 g., 0.003 mol) were mixed in 10 (mL) methylene chloride as a solvent. The mixture was allowed to stir on cold for 24 hrs till the product is precipitated. The solid was then filtered, washed with methylene chloride and crystallized with diethyl ether to yield the required product **VIa,b,e**.

6.1.6.1. 4-(4-(1H-imidazol-1-yl)phenylamino)-4-oxobutanoic acid VIa.

Yield 98% as greyish white solid, mp 238°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1654 (C=O, amide), 1715 (C=O, COOH), 3295 (NH), 2965-3220 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (400 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 2.56 (t, 2H, CH₂CH₂COOH, J = 5.4 Hz), 2.63 (t, 2H, CH₂C<u>H₂COOH</u>, J = 5.5 Hz), 7.02 (s, 1H, imidazole H₂), 7.52 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, J = 8.2 Hz), 7.61 (d,1H, imidazole H₄), 7.66 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, J = 8.2 Hz), 8.11 (d, 1H, imidazole H₅), 10.07 (s, 1H, N<u>H</u>), 12.08 (s_{br}, 1H, COO<u>H</u>). MS: m/z (%): 259 (M⁺, 55%), 260 (M⁺+1, 17%) & base peak at 157 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₃H₁₃N₃O₃: C 60.22, H 5.05, N 16.21; Found: C 60.47, H 5.11, N 16.37.

6.1.6.2. 4-(4-(pyrrolidin-1-yl)phenylamino)-4-oxobutanoic acid VIb.

Yield 87% as greyish white solid, mp 195°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1652 (C=O, amide), 1713 (C=O, COOH), 3290 (NH), 2839-3115 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (300 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 1.91-1.95 (m, 4H, pyrrolidine H₃, H₄), 2.48-2.62 (m, 4H, CH₂CH₂COOH), 3.19 (t, 4H, pyrrolidine H₂, H₅, *J* = 6.3 Hz), 6.48 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, *J* = 8 Hz), 7.37 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 8.7 Hz), 9.58 (s, 1H, N<u>H</u>), 12.00 (s_{br}, 1H, COO<u>H</u>). MS: *m*/*z* (%): 262 (M⁺, 48%), 263 (M⁺+1, 26%) & base peak at 161 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₄H₁₈N₂O₃: C 64.10, H 6.92, N 10.68; Found: C 64.23, H 7.01, N 10.81.

6.1.6.3. 4-(4-(4-methylpiperazin-1-yl)phenylamino)-4-oxobutanoic acid VIe.

Yield 85% as greyish white solid, mp 168°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1659 (C=O, amide), 1710 (C=O, COOH), 3297 (NH), 2954-3212 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (400 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 2.19 (t , 4H, piperazine H₃, H₅), 2.34 (s, 3H, CH₃-piperazine), 2.44 (t, 2H, CH₂CH₂COOH, *J* = 6.6 Hz), 2.99 (t, 2H, CH₂CH₂COOH, *J* = 6.6 Hz), 3.34 (t , 4H, piperazine H₂, H₆), 6.81 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 7.36 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 9.65 (s, 1H, NH). MS: *m*/*z* (%): 291 (M⁺, 38%), 292 (M⁺+1, 12%) & base peak at 189 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₅H₂₁N₃O₃: C 61.84, H 7.27, N 14.42; Found: C 62.01, H 7.36, N 14.65.

6.1.7. General method for preparation of 5-(4-(substituted) phenylamino)-5-oxopentanoic acid VIIa,f [70]

A mixture of 4 (substituted) aniline **Va,f** (0.003 mol) and glutaric anhydride (0.34 g., 0.003 mol) were dissolved in (10 mL) methylene chloride. The solution was allowed to stir on cold for 24 hrs till the product is precipitated. The solid was then filtered, washed with methylene chloride and crystallized with diethyl ether to yield the required product **VIIa,f**.

6.1.7.1. 5-(4-(1H-imidazol-1-yl)phenylamino)-5-oxopentanoic acid VIIa.

Yield 90 % as greyish white solid, mp 230 °C.IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1659 (C=O, amide), 1708 (C=O, COOH), 3295 (NH), 2899-3186 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (400 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 1.78 (t, 2H, CH₂-CH₂-CH₂-CH₂-COOH, J = 7.2 Hz), 2.24 (t, 2H, CH₂-CH₂-CH₂-COOH, J = 7.2 Hz), 2.30 (t, 2H, CH₂-CH₂-CH₂-COOH, J = 7.2 Hz), 7.02 (s, 1H, imidazole H₂), 7.49 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, J = 8.8 Hz), 7.61 (d, 1H, imidazole H₄), 7.64 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, J = 8.8 Hz), 8.11 (d, 1H, imidazole H₅), 10.00 (s, 1H, N<u>H</u>), 12.04 (s_{br}, 1H, COO<u>H</u>). MS: m/z (%): 273 (M⁺, 49%), 274 (M⁺+1, 18%) & base peak at 84 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₄H₁₅N₃O₃: C 61.53, H 5.53, N 15.38; Found: C 61.76, H 5.59, N 15.52.

6.1.7.2. 5-(4-(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl)phenylamino)-5-oxopentanoic acid VIIf.

Yield 95% as greyish white solid, mp 223°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1653 (C=O, amide), 1701 (C=O, COOH), 3291 (NH), 2962-3181 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (300 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 1.77-1.82 (t, 2H, CH₂-CH₂-CH₂-COOH, *J* = 7.2 Hz), 2.24-2.33 (m, 4H, CH₂-CH₂-COOH), 3.20-3.27 (m, 8H, piperazine), 6.78 (t, 1H, aromatic H₄, *J* = 7.2 Hz), 6.92 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, *J* = 8 Hz), 7.01 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 8.1 Hz), 7.26 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, *J* = 7.2 Hz), 7.44 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 8 Hz), 9.69 (s, 1H, NH), 12.00 (s_{br}, 1H, COOH). MS: *m*/*z* (%): 367 (M⁺, 37%), 368 (M⁺+1, 29%) & base peak at 80 (100%). Anal. Calcd. ForC₂₁H₂₅N₃O₃: C 68.64, H 6.86, N 11.44; Found: C 68.78, H 6.56, N 11.59.

6.1.8. General method for the preparation of 2-((4-substituted)phenyl)carbamoyl) benzoic acid VIIIa,e [71]

A mixture of 4 (substituted) aniline **Va,e** (0.003 mol) and phthalic anhydride (0.44 g., 0.003 mol) were dissolved in (10 mL) methylene chloride. The solution was allowed to stir on cold for 24 hrs till the product is precipitated. The solid was then filtered, washed with methylene chloride and crystallized with diethyl ether to yield the required product **VIIIa,e**.

6.1.8.1. 2-((4-(1H-imidazol-1-yl)phenyl)carbamoyl) benzoic acid VIIIa.

Yield 95% as greyish white solid, mp 264°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1659 (C=O, amide), 1711 (C=O, COOH), 3295 (NH), 2972-3214 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (400 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 7.06 (s, 1H, imidazole H₂), 7.50-7.63 (m, 4 H, phthalic), 7.57 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, J = 8.8 Hz), 7.65 (d, 1H, imidazole H₄), 7.76 (d, 2H,

aromatic H₂, H₆, J = 8.8 Hz), 8.17 (d , 1H, imidazole H₅), 10.43 (s, 1H, N<u>H</u>). MS: m/z (%): 307 (M⁺, 55%), 308 (M⁺+1, 17%) & base peak at 121 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₇H₁₃N₃O₃: C 66.44, H 4.26, N 13.67; Found: C 66.6, H 4.32, N 13.79.

6.1.8.2. 2-((4-(4-methylpiperazin-1-yl)phenyl)carbamoyl) benzoic acid VIIIe.

Yield 89% as off white solid, mp 192.5°C. IR: (max, cm⁻¹): 1650 (C=O, amide), 1702 (C=O, COOH), 3298 (NH), 2994-3221 (OH, COOH). ¹H-NMR (400 MHz)(DMSO) δ : 1.95 (t, 4H, piperazine H₃, H₅), 2.30 (s, 3H, CH₃-piperazine), 3.22 (t, 4H, piperazine H₃, H₅), 6.91 (d, 2H, aromatic H₃, H₅, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 7.46 (d, 2H, aromatic H₂, H₆, *J* = 8.8 Hz), 7.44-7.60 (m, 4H, phthalic), 10.09 (s, 1H, N<u>H</u>). MS: *m/z* (%): 339 (M⁺, 60%), 340 (M⁺+1, 28%) & base peak at 189 (100%). Anal. Calcd. For C₁₉H₂₁N₃O₃: C, 67.24, H 6.24, N 12.38; Found: C 67.38, H 6.29, N 12.51.

6.2. Cell growth inhibitory activity in cancer cells6.2.1. Evaluation for cytotoxic activity against a panel of sixty human cancer cell lines

National Cancer Institute (NCI) for *in vitro* anticancer assay evaluates different compounds for their anticancer activity. The screening is a two-stage process, beginning with the evaluation of all compounds against the full NCI 60 cell lines panel representing leukemia, Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer, melanoma, colon cancer, CNS cancer, breast cancer, ovarian cancer, renal cancer and prostate cancer at a single dose of 10⁻⁵ M. The output from the single dose screen is reported as a mean graph and is available for analysis by the COMPARE program. Compounds which are selected are evaluated against the 60 cell panel at five concentration levels.

6.2.1.1. Assay protocol

Methodology of assay is as reported. [72, 73] The human tumor cell lines of the cancer-screening panel are grown in RPMI 1640 medium containing 5% fetal bovine serum and 2 mM L-glutamine. For a typical screening experiment, cells are inoculated into 96 well microtiter plates in 100 ml at plating densities ranging from 5000 to 40,000 cells/well depending on the doubling time of individual cell lines. After cell inoculation, the microtiter plates are incubated at 37°C, 5% CO2, 95% air and 100% relative humidity for 24 hrs prior to addition of experimental drugs. After 24 hrs, two plates of each cell line are fixed in situ with TCA, to represent a measurement of the cell population for each cell line at the time of drug addition (Tz). Experimental drugs are solubilized in dimethyl sulfoxide at 400-fold the desired final maximum test concentration and stored frozen prior to use. At the time of drug addition, an aliquot of frozen concentrate is thawed and diluted to twice the desired final maximum test concentration with complete medium containing 50 mg/ml Gentamicin. Additional four, 10-fold or ½log serial dilutions are made to provide a total of five drug concentrations plus control. Aliquots of 100 ml of these different drug dilutions are added to the appropriate microtiter wells already containing 100 ml of medium, resulting in the required final drug concentrations. Following drug addition, the plates are incubated for an additional 48 h at 37^{9} C, 5% CO2, 95% air, and 100% relative humidity. For adherent cells, the assay is terminated by the addition of cold TCA. Cells are fixed in situ by the gentle addition of 50 ml of cold 50% (w/v) TCA (final concentration, 10% TCA) and incubated for 60 min at 4° C. The supernatant is discarded, and the plates are washed five times with tap water and air dried. Sulforhodamine B (SRB) solution (100 ml) at 0.4% (w/v) in 1% acetic acid is added to each well, and plates are incubated for 10 min at room temperature. After staining, unbound dye is removed by washing five times with 1% acetic acid and the plates are air dried. Bound stain is subsequently solubilized with 10 mM trizma base, and the absorbance is read on an automated plate reader at a wavelength of 515 nm. For suspension cells, the methodology is the same except that the assay is terminated by fixing settled cells at the bottom of the wells by gently adding 50 ml of 80% TCA (final concentration, 16% TCA).

6.2.1.2. Data analysis

Using the seven absorbance measurements [time zero, (Tz), control growth, (C), and test growth in the presence of drug at the five concentration levels (Ti)], the percentage growth is calculated at each of the drug concentrations levels. Percentage growth inhibition is calculated as: [(Ti - Tz)/(C - Tz)] -100 for concentrations for which Ti>/ ¹/₄ Tz and [(Ti - Tz)/Tz] -100 for concentrations for which Ti < Tz: three dose response parameters are calculated for each experimental agent. [74]

6.2.2. Evaluation for cytotoxicity against HepG2 Cancer cell line: 6.2.2.1. Cell culture

HepG2 human hepatocellular carcinoma cells were grown in RPMI-1640 medium, supplemented with 10% heat inactivated FBS, 50 units/mL of penicillin and 50 mg/mL of streptomycin and maintained at 37° in a humidified atmosphere containing 5% CO₂. The cells were maintained as "monolayer culture" by serial subculturing.

6.2.2.2. SRB cytotoxicity assay

Cytotoxicity was determined using SRB method as previously described by Skehan et al. [75] Exponentially growing cells were collected using 0.25% Trypsin-EDTA and seeded in 96-well plates at 1000-2000 cells/well in RPMI-1640 supplemented medium. After 24 h, cells were incubated for 72 h with various concentrations of the tested compounds. Following 72 h treatment, the cells will be fixed with 10% trichloroacetic acid for 1 h at 4 °C. Wells were stained for 10 min at room temperature with 0.4% SRB dissolved in 1% acetic acid. The plates were air dried for 24 h and the dye was solubilized with Tris-HCl for 5 min on a shaker at 1600 rpm. The optical density (OD) of each well was measured spectrophotometrically at 564 nm with an ELISA microplate reader (ChroMate-4300, FL, USA).

6.2.3. Data analysis

The IC_{50} values were calculated according to the equation for Boltzmann sigmoidal concentration–response curve using the nonlinear regression fitting models (Graph Pad, Prism Version 5).

6.3. Histone deacetylase inhibitory activity 6.3.1. Materials and methods

The histone deacetylase activity was carried out by BPS Bioscience (www.bpsbioscience.com). Single dose concentration of 10 μ M HDAC substrate 3 (BPS#50037) of HDAC1 (BPS#50051), HDAC2 (BPS#50002), HDAC3 (BPS#50003), HDAC6 (BPS#50006) and HDAC10 (BPS#50010) was used in testing. And also it was carried on 2 μ M HDAC substrate 1 (BPS#50040) of HDAC4 (BPS#50004), HDAC5 (BPS#50005), HDAC7 (BPS#50007), HDAC8 (BPS#50008), HDAC9 (BPS#50009) and HDAC11 (BPS#50021). Other materials are used as HDAC Assay Buffer (BPS#50031), HDAC Assay Developer (BPS#50030), SAHA as a reference compound purchased from sigma (St. Louis, MO #SML0061) and TSN as another reference compound purchased from Selleckcom.com (#S1045).

6.3.2. Assay protocols6.3.2.1. In vitro HDAC1 inhibitory assay

A 100 μ M solution of each compound was prepared with 10% DMSO in HDAC assay buffer and 5 μ l of the dilution was added to a 50 μ l reaction so that the final concentration of DMSO is 1% in all of reactions. The enzymatic reactions for the HDAC enzymes were conducted in duplicate at 37°C for 30 minutes in a 50 μ l mixture containing HDAC assay buffer, 5 μ g BSA, HDAC substrate 3, HDAC1 enzyme and a test compound (10 μ M). After enzymatic reactions, 50 μ l of 2 x HDAC Developer was added to each well for the HDAC enzymes and the plate was incubated at room temperature for an additional 15 minutes. Fluorescence intensity was measured at an excitation of 360 nm and an emission of 460 nm using a Tecan Infinite M1000 microplate reader.

6.3.2.2. In vitro HDAC2-11 inhibitory assay

A 500 μ M solution of each compound was prepared with 10% DMSO in HDAC assay buffer and 5 μ l of the dilution was added to a 50 μ l reaction so that the final concentration of DMSO is 1% in all of reactions. The enzymatic reactions for the HDAC enzymes were conducted in duplicate at 37°C for 30 minutes in a 50 μ l mixture containing HDAC assay buffer, 5 μ g BSA, HDAC substrate 1/ 3, a HDAC 2-11 enzyme and a test compound (50 μ M). After enzymatic reactions, 50 μ l of 2 x HDAC Developer was added to each well for the HDAC enzymes and the plate was incubated at room temperature for an additional 15 minutes. Fluorescence intensity was measured at an excitation of 360 nm and an emission of 460 nm using a Tecan Infinite M1000 microplate reader.

6.3.3 Data analysis

HDAC activity assays were performed in duplicates at each compound. The fluorescent intensity data were analyzed using the computer software, Graphpad Prism. In the absence of the compound, the fluorescent intensity (F_t) in each data set was defined as 100% activity. In the absence of HDAC, the fluorescent intensity (F_b) in each data set was defined as 0% activity. The percent activity in the presence of each compound was calculated according to the following equation: %activity = ($F-F_b$)/(F_t-F_b), where F= the fluorescent intensity in the presence of the compound. % Inhibition was calculated as: % inhibition = 100 (%) _ % activity.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to The National Cancer Institute, Maryland, USA for performing anticancer activity and would like to thank BPS Bioscience for EGFR binding assay. And also would like to thank Dr. Ahmed Essmat (Pharmacology &Toxicology Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, AinShams University, Cairo, Egypt 11566) for performing the *in vitro* cytotoxicity assays against Liver HepG2 Cancer cell line.

References and notes

- [1] W. D. Cress, E. Seto, J. Cell. Physiol. 184 (2000) 1-16.
- [2] B. D. Strahl, C. D. Allis, Nature 403 (2000) 41-45.
- [3] V. Morales, H. Richard-Foy, Mol. Cell. Biol. 20 (2000) 7230-7237.
- [4] K. Struhl, Genes Dev. 12 (1998) 599-606.
- [5] P. A. Wade, Hum. Mol. Genet. 10 (2001) 693-698.
- [6] A. J. de Ruijter, A. H. van Gennip, H. N. Caron, S. Kemp, , A. B. van Kuilenburg, Biochem. J. 370 (2003) 737-749.
- [7] C. Hildmann, D. Riester, A. Schwienhorst, Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 75 (2007) 487-497.
- [8] D. C. Drummond, C. O. Noble, D. B. Kirpotin, Z. Guo, G. K. Scott, C. C. Benz, Annu. Rev. Pharmacol. Toxicol. 45 (2005) 495-528.
- [9] H. Lu, Y. Chen, B. Yang, Q. You, Acta Pharma. Sin. B 1 (2011) 240-247.
- [10] A.Vannini, C. Volpari, P. Gallinari, P. Jones, M. Mattu, A. Carfi, , R. De Francesco, C.
- Steinkuhler, S. Di Marco, EMBO Rep. 8 (2007) 879-884.
- [11] K. B. Glaser, Biochem. Pharmacol. 74 (2007) 659-671.
- [12] M. Dokmanovic, P. A. Marks, J. Cell. Biochem. 96 (2005) 293-304.
- [13] S. Ropero, M. Esteller, Mol. Oncol. 1 (2007) 19-25.
- [14] M. Duvic, R. Talpur, X. Ni, C. Zhang, P. Hazarika, C. Kelly, J. H. Chiao, J. F. Reilly, J. L. Ricker,
- V. M. Richon, S. R. Frankel, Blood 109 (2007) 31-39.
- [15] P. A. Marks, R. Breslow, Nat. Biotechnol. 25 (2007) 84-90.
- [16] X. Kong, Z. Lin, D. Liang, D. Fath, N. Sang, J. Caro, Mol. Cell. Biol. 26 (2006) 2019-2028.
- [17] A. Grassadonia, P. Cioffi, F. Simiele, L. Iezzi, M. Zilli, C. Natoli, Cancers (Basel) 5 (2013) 919-942.
- [18] B. Venugopal, T. R. Evans, Curr. Med. Chem. 18 (2011) 1658-1671.
- [19] O. Moradei, C. R. Maroun, I. Paquin, A. Vaisburg, Curr. Med. Chem. Anticancer Agents 5 (2005) 529-560.

- [20] J. E. Bolden, M. J. Peart, R. W. Johnstone, Nat. Rev. Drug Discov. 5 (2006) 769-784.
- [21] F. Wang, W. Lu, T. Zhang, J. Dong, H. Gao, P. Li, S. Wang, Zhang, J. Bioorg. Med. Chem. 21 (2013) 6973-6980.
- [22] T. A. Miller, , D. J. Witter, Belvedere, S. J. Med. Chem. 46 (2003) 5097-5116.
- [23] M. S. Finnin, J. R. Donigian, A. Cohen, V. M. Richon, R. A. Rifkind, P. A. Marks, R. Breslow, N. P. Pavletich, Nature 401 (1999) 188-193.
- [24] Y. D. Chen, Y. J. Jiang, J. W. Zhou, Q. S. Yu, Q. D. You, J. Mol. Graph. Model 26 (2008) 1160-1168.
- [25] M. Jung, G. Brosch, D. Kolle, H. Scherf, C. Gerhauser, P. Loidl, J. Med. Chem. 42 (1999) 4669-4679.
- [26] S. M. Sternson, J. C. Wong, C. M. Grozinger, S. L. Schreiber, Org. Lett. 3 (2001) 4239-4242.
- [27] B. Gopalan, T. Ponpandian, V. Kachhadia, K. Bharathimohan, R. Vignesh, V. Sivasudar, S.

Narayanan, B. Mandar, R. Praveen, N. Saranya, S. Rajagopal, S. Rajagopal, Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 23 (2013) 2532-2537.

- [28] A. V. Bieliauskas, S. V. Weerasinghe, M. K. Pflum, Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 17 (2007) 2216-2219.
- [29] E. Hahnen, J. Hauke, C. Trankle, I. Y. Eyupoglu, B. Wirth, I. Blumcke, Expert. Opin. Investig. Drugs 17 (2008) 169-184.
- [30] G. Bora-Tatar, D. Dayangac-Erden, A. S. Demir, S. Dalkara, K.Yelekci, H. Erdem-Yurter, Bioorg. Med. Chem. 17 (2009) 5219-5228.
- [31] J. S. Chen, D. V. Faller, R. A. Spanjaard, Curr. Cancer Drug Targets 3 (2003) 219-236.
- [32] M. Gottlicher, S. Minucci, P. Zhu, O. H. Kramer, A. Schimpf, S. Giavara, J. P. Sleeman, F. Lo
- Coco, C. Nervi, P. G. Pelicci, T. Heinzel, EMBO J. 20 (2001) 6969-6978.
- [33] J. Pearn, Lancet 1 (1980) 919-922.

[34] Z. Q. Liang, C. X. Wang, J. X. Yang, H.W. Gao, Y. P. Tian, X. T. Tao, M. H. Jiang, New J. Chem. 31 (2007) 906-910.

- [35] K. Abouzid, P. Frohberg, J. Lehmann, M. Decker, Med. Chem. 3 (2007) 433-438.
- [36] S. Mowafy, N. A. Farag, K. A. M. Abouzid, Eur J. Med. Chem. 61 (2013) 132-145.
- [37] H. A. A. Shady, S. L. El-Ansary, , D. A. A. El-Ella, N. A. Farag, Bull. Fac. Pharm. Cairo Univ. 42 (2004) 31-42.
- [38] S. Ray, C. Lee, T. Hou, I. Boldogh, A. R. Brasier, Nucleic Acids Res. 36 (2008) 4510-4520.
- [39] H. Su, A. Nebbioso, V. Carafa, Y. Chen, B. Yang, L. Altucci, Q. You, Bioorg. Med. Chem 16 (2008) 7992-8002.
- [40] H. Li, J. Sutter, R. Hoffmann, HypoGen: An Automated System for Generating Predictive 3D Pharmacophore Models, in: Pharmacophore Perception, Development, and use in Drug Design. O. F. Güner (Ed.), International University Line, La Jolla, CA 2000 pp171–187.
- [41] R. F. George, N. S. M. Ismail, J. Stawinski, A. S. Girgis Eur J. Med. Chem. 68 (2013) 339-351.
- [42] A. S. Girgis, J. Stawinski, N. S. M. Ismail, H. Farag, Eur J. Med. Chem. 47 (2012) 312-322.
- [43] A. K. Ghose, G. M. Crippen, J. Comput. chem. 7 (1986) 565-577.
- [44] L. Zhu, G. Li, L. Luo, P. Guo, J. Lan, J. You, J. Org. chem. 74 (2009) 2200-2202.
- [45] D. Kumar, K. K. Raj, M. Bailey, T. Alling, T. Parish, D. S. Rawat, Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 23 (2013) 1365-1369.
- [46] M. Sarma, T. Chatterjee, S. Ghanta, S. K. Das, J. Org. chem. 77 (2012) 432-444.

[47] N. R. Eibergen, I. Im, N. Y. Patel, P. Hergenrother, J. Chembiochem : A Eur. J. chem. biology 13 (2012) 574-584.

- [48] P. G. Mandhane, R. S. Joshi, D. R. Nagargoje, A. V. Chate, C. H. Gill, Phosphorus, Sulfur Silicon Relat. Elem. 186 (2010) 149-158.
- [49] R. S. Joshi, P. G. Mandhane, S. D. Diwakar, S. K. Dabhade, C. H. Gill, Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 20 (2010) 3721-3725.
- [50] M. Meciarova, S. Toma, P. Magdolen, Ultrason. Sonochem. 10 (2003) 265-270.
- [51] S. Lieber, F. Scheer, W. Meissner, S. Naruhn, T. Adhikary, S. Muller-Brusselbach, W. E.
- Diederich, R. Muller, J. Med. Chem. 55 (2012) 2858-2868.
- [52] L. Heping, G. Cancheng, R. Jianming, H. Boyun, Chinese J. Org. Chem. 24 (2004) 783-787.

- [53] S. R. Byeon, Y. J. Jin, S. J. Lim, J. H. Lee, K. H. Yoo, K. J. Shin, S. J. Oh, D. Kim, J. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 17 (2007) 4022-4025.
- [54] A. Bombrun, U.S. Patent 6, 306, 870B1, 2001.
- [55] I. Sircar, B. L. Duell, J. A. Bristol, R. E. Weishaar, D. B. Evans, J. Med. Chem. 30 (1987) 1023-1029.

[56] S. Sasmal, D. Balasubrahmanyam, H. R. Kanna Reddy, G. Balaji, G. Srinivas, S. Cheera, C. Abbineni, P. K. Sasmal, I. Khanna, V. J. Sebastian, V. P. Jadhav, M. P. Singh, R. Talwar, J. Suresh, D. Shashikumar, K. Harinder Reddy, V. Sihorkar, T. M. Frimurer, O. Rist, L. Elster, T. Hogberg, Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 22 (2012) 3163-3167.

- [57] J. Guo, W. Dong, W. Liu, Z. Yan, N. Wang, Z. Liu, Eur J. Med. Chem. 62 (2013) 670-676.
- [58] K.Yang, Y. Qiu, Z. Li, Z. Wang, S. Jiang, J. Org. Chem. 76 (2011) 3151-3159.
- [59] Q. Zhang, J. Luo, Y. Wei, Synth. Commun. 42 (2011) 114-121.
- [60] R. N. Prabhu, R. Ramesh, Tetrahedron Lett. 54 (2013) 1120-1124.
- [61] B. Sreedhar, R. Arundhathi, P. L. Reddy, M. L. Kantam, J. Org. Chem. 74 (2009) 7951-7954.
- [62] M. I. Husain, S. K. Agarwal, Ind. J. Chem. 13 (1975) 1238-1239.
- [63] M. Khatri, S. K. Rai, S. Alam, A. Vij, M. Tiwari, Bioorg. Med. Chem. 17 (2009) 1890-1897.
- [64] J. M. Smallheer, R. S. Alexander, J. Wang, S. Wang, S. Nakajima, K. A. Rossi, A. Smallwood, F. Barbera, D. Burdick, J. M. Luettgen, R. M. Knabb, R. R. Wexler, P. K. Jadhav, Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 14 (2004) 5263-5267.
- [65] J. Engel-Andreasen, B. Shimpukade, T. Ulven, Green Chem. 15 (2013) 336-340.
- [66] S. K. Singh, M. Srinivasa Reddy, M. Mangle, K. Ravi Ganesh, Tetrahedron 63 (2007) 126-130.
- [67] P. Xiang, T. Zhou, L. Wang, C. Y. Sun, J. Hu, Y. L. Zhao, L. Yang, Molecules 17 (2012) 873-883.
- [68] Desai, D. Akshay, E-J. Chem. 2 (2005) 15-20.
- [69] Y. Liu, L. Shang, H. Fang, H. Zhu, J. Mu, Q. Wang, X. Wang, Y. Yuan, W. Xu, Bioorg. Med. Chem. 17 (2009) 7398-7404.
- [70] Y. Xu, N. Yamamoto, D. I. Ruiz, D. S. Kubitz, K. D. Janda, Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 15 (2005) 4304-4307.
- [71] A. M. Granados, R. H. de Rossi, J. Org. Chem. 66 (2001) 1548-1552.
- [72] R. H. Shoemaker, Nat. Rev. Cancer 6 (2006) 813-823.
- [73] M. R. Grever, S. A. Schepartz, B. A. Chabner, Semin. Oncol. 19 (1992) 622-638.
- [74] M. C. Alley, D. A. Scudiero, A. Monks, M. L. Hursey, M. J. Czerwinski, D. L. Fine, B. J. Abbott,
- J. G. Mayo, R. H. Shoemaker, M. R. Boyd, Cancer Res. 48 (1988) 589-601.
- [75] P. Skehan, R. Storeng, D. Scudiero, A. Monks, J. McMahon, D. Vistica, J. T. Warren, H. Bokesch, S. Kenney, M. R. Boyd, J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 82 (1990) 1107-1112.



Graphical abstract



Docking model at the active site of HDLP (PDB ID: 1C3S) coincides with the generated 3D QSAR pharmacophore model for *E*-isomer of compound IIc (*E*) displaying significant antiproliferative activity against HepG2 Cancer cell line (IC₅₀, 2.27 μ M).

Highlights

6-(4-Substituted phenyl)-4-oxohex-5-enoic acids were synthesized

Compound IIf (E) displayed significant inhibitory activity against NCI Non-Small Cell Lung

Compounds were tested on Histone deacetylase isoforms

3D-pharmacophore model and QSAR were generated

Acceleration