

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Bioorganic & Medicinal Chemistry Letters

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/bmcl

Parallel synthesis of *N*-biaryl quinolone carboxylic acids as selective M₁ positive allosteric modulators

Feng V. Yang^a, William D. Shipe^{a,*}, Jaime L. Bunda^a, M. Brad Nolt^a, David D. Wisnoski^a, Zhijian Zhao^a, James C. Barrow^a, William J. Ray^b, Lei Ma^b, Marion Wittmann^b, Matthew A. Seager^b, Kenneth A. Koeplinger^c, George D. Hartman^a, Craig W. Lindsley^a

^a Department of Medicinal Chemistry, Merck Research Laboratories, 770 Sumneytown Pike, PO Box 4, West Point, PA 19486, USA ^b Department of Alzheimer's Research, Merck Research Laboratories, 770 Sumneytown Pike, PO Box 4, West Point, PA 19486, USA ^c Department of Drug Metabolism, Merck Research Laboratories, 770 Sumneytown Pike, PO Box 4, West Point, PA 19486, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 9 October 2009 Revised 18 November 2009 Accepted 19 November 2009 Available online 24 November 2009

Keywords: M₁ Positive allosteric modulator

ABSTRACT

An iterative analog library synthesis approach was employed in the exploration of a quinolone carboxylic acid series of selective M_1 positive allosteric modulators, and strategies for improving potency and plasma free fraction were identified.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

One of the pathological hallmarks of Alzheimer's disease (AD) is the progressive degeneration of the cholinergic neural system.¹ The cholinergic neurons release acetylcholine and are critical for higher brain function and memory, so their deterioration leads to irreversible loss of cognitive faculties. Cholinesterase inhibitors such as donepezil, galantamine, and rivastigmine were developed based on this hypothesis and were the first successful symptomatic treatments for AD.² The efficacy of cholinesterase inhibitors is modest, of brief duration, and limited by tolerability, but indicates that enhancing cholinergic function is an effective strategy to combat AD.

The muscarinic receptors are metabotropic, class A, G-protein coupled receptors (GPCRs) activated by acetylcholine.³ The M_1 receptor is one of the five muscarinic receptor subtypes (M_1 through M_5) that have been identified to date, and its high expression in the hippocampus, striatum, and cortex suggest a role in learning and memory.⁴ Direct activation of M_1 as an approach to treat the symptoms of AD has been explored in the clinical setting with a number of nonselective muscarinic agonists.⁵ While cognitive improvement was observed, the studies were limited by cholinergic side effects hypothesized to result from nonselective action on other muscarinic receptor subtypes.

High orthosteric site conservation across muscarinic receptor subtypes has made agonist selectivity for the M_1 receptor difficult to achieve. As a strategy for attaining subtype selectivity, we

explored the possibility of identifying positive allosteric modulators (potentiators).^{6,7} Allosteric binding sites are under less evolutionary pressure than the orthosteric site, so potentiators of M_1 may display good subtype selectivity. A high-throughput screen for M_1 potentiators identified compound **1** (Fig. 1), recently reported by Ma et al., as a selective positive allosteric modulator of M_1 .⁸ This N-benzylated quinolone carboxylic acid potentiates the response of M_1 to acetylcholine with no effect on other muscarinic receptor subtypes, and was further characterized as a potential lead compound. This Letter describes efforts to optimize **1** through modifications to the quinolone core and the *N*1-benzyl substituent employing an iterative analog library synthesis approach.

Compound potencies were determined in the presence of an EC₂₀ of acetylcholine in human M₁-expressing CHO cells using calcium mobilization readout on a FLIPR₃₈₄ fluorometric imaging plate reader.^{7,9} Plasma protein binding was determined using the



Figure 1. In vitro profile of quinolone carboxylic acid 1.



^{*} Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 215 652 6527; fax: +1 215 652 6345. *E-mail address*: william_shipe@merck.com (W.D. Shipe).

⁰⁹⁶⁰⁻⁸⁹⁴X/\$ - see front matter \odot 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2009.11.100



Scheme 1. General synthesis of quinolone carboxylic acids.



potency

Figure 2. Representative scaffolds explored.

Table 1

M₁ FLIPR data for select compounds



		n n			
#	R ¹		M ₁ Pot IP	(nM) ^a	
		a R ² = H R ³ = H	b R ² = H R ³ = F	$c R^2 = F R^3 = H$	d R ² = F R ³ = F
	who				
14		1700	4000	ND	3000
15	nhu lu	>100,000	24,000	ND	ND
16		13,000	22,000	ND	ND
17	-ntor F Br	ND	1200	1100	860
18	F F	ND	1000	1300	610
19	ntr	ND	1200	830	ND
20	so ₂ Me	18,000	13,000	ND	16,000
21	CONH2	4300	3400	ND	ND
22	OMe	820	1100	2000	ND
23	OMe	2800	2700	2100	4200
24	CF3	ND	980	1500	760
25	CF3	7200	2700	ND	1600
26	CF3	4300	6900	ND	2300
27	ocF3	1800	2100	2800	1300
28	OCF3	4100	3600	5900	3200

Table 1 (continued)



ND = not determined.

 $^{\rm a}$ Values represent the numerical average of at least two experiments. Interassay variability was \pm 30% (IP, nM), unless otherwise noted.

equilibrium dialysis method in the presence of human and rat serum. Compound **1** had an M_1 inflection point (IP) of 820 nM (Fig. 1) and a plasma free fraction that varied between human and rat (0.9% and 4.3%, respectively). The pharmacokinetic profile of **1**, characterized by low clearance and excellent oral bioavailability across preclinical species, was very encouraging and gave us confidence to further pursue this structural series. Our efforts sought to improve on the M_1 potency of **1** while maintaining an acceptable physicochemical profile.

We viewed the structure of lead compound 1 as a context suitable for iterative parallel synthesis, so a general synthesis of quinolone analogs was employed as outlined in Scheme 1. Anilines 2 were heated with diethyl ethoxymethylenemalonate (3) in the absence of solvent to provide enamines 4. These intermediates were dissolved in diphenyl ether and further heated to elicit cyclization to the quinolone nucleus (5). Under basic conditions, 5 was regioselectively alkylated with activated halides 6 to furnish N-substituted quinolones 7, and subsequent basic hydrolysis of the ethyl ester yielded the carboxylic acid targets 8. To increase the scope of our efforts, we also used a route wherein primary amines 12 could serve as a source of structural diversity. Here, o-fluorobenzovl chlorides were used to acylate ethyl 3-(dimethylamino)acrylate (10) to produce the N,N-dimethyl enamines 11, which underwent smooth substitution with amines 12. The resultant enamines 13 could be cyclized to the quinolones 7 under basic conditions.

Optimization of the substitution pattern on the quinolone core required beginning the synthesis with diversely substituted anilines **2** or benzoyl chlorides **9**. Each scaffold was substituted with a number of common benzyl groups at the N1-position to enable a rough stack-ranking assessment across scaffolds. After canvassing a variety of fused bicyclic scaffolds, in most cases derived using the chemistry described above, we concluded that fluorine or hydrogen atom substitution at the 5- and/or 8-position of a quinolone nucleus was preferred for M₁ potency (Fig. 2).

We then turned to the optimization of the N1-substituent, and chose to operate on these four 'preferred' scaffolds. A broad selection of monomers was employed in the diversity-yielding step, and the products were screened in the FLIPR assay. While it was difficult to make predictive generalizations on the basis of the data (Table 1), some trends did appear. Benzyl substitution at the 1-position was strongly preferred over alkyl (14 vs 15), and branching at the benzyl position was poorly tolerated (14 vs 16). Halogenated and lipophilic substituents were better tolerated than polar groups (17–19 vs 20–21). A para substituent on the benzyl group was preferred over meta- or ortho-substitution (22 vs 23, 24 vs 25-26, 27 vs 28). These data did little to differentiate the four quinolone scaffolds, and relatively few compounds matched the potency of the HTS lead 1 (=22a). However, the four biphenyl compounds 29a-d that combined lipophilicity with placement at the para position represented a potency breakthrough.

Unsurprisingly, **29a–d** displayed a high degree of plasma protein binding, most likely owing to the lipophilicity of the biphenyl substituent (Table 2). During the course of our efforts, we found that high protein binding correlated with decreased CNS exposure in vivo, so we next focused on addressing this limitation. To this end, we designed biaryl compound libraries to explore variation of the distal aryl group with *para* disubstitution on the proximal phenyl ring (Scheme 2). Employing the N1-benzylation route described in Scheme 1, *p*-bromobenzyl quinolone carboxylic esters **30** were prepared, and basic hydrolysis yielded the corresponding carboxylic acids **31**. These aryl bromides were combined with substituted aryl pinacolboronate esters or boronic acids **32** under Suzuki–Miyaura cross-coupling reaction conditions to produce the target biaryl compounds **33**.

Table 2

M1 FLIPR and plasma protein binding data for select compounds



#	R ¹	R ²	R ³	R ⁴	M_1 Pot IP ^a (nM)	Human PB ^b	Rat PB ^b	c Log P ^c
29a	2 2 2 2	Н	Н	Н	210	99.5	98.8	2.78
29b	× ×	Н	F	Н	380	98.0	97.8	2.99
29c	× C	F	Н	н	84	99.2	98.7	2.99
29d	25 C	F	F	Н	270	99.6	99.5	3.20
34	25 C	Н	Н	F	50	98.8	96.3	2.99
35	25 C	Н	Н	Cl	120	>99.9	>99.9	3.45
36	N	н	F	Н	540	99.4	99.4	2.87
37	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	F	Н	Н	400	99.1	98.5	2.87
38	S O N OH	Н	F	Н	99	97.6	98.3	1.66
39	× ^s ↓	Н	F	Н	110	98.1	99.6	2.69
40	3 NH	Н	F	Н	76	99.8	99.8	3.28
41	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	F	Н	Н	190	99.0	98.5	3.18
42	S NH ₂	Н	F	Н	210	96.4	97.8	2.24
43	S NMe ₂	Н	F	Н	94	99.0	98.8	3.15
44	NMe ₂	Н	F	Н	220	95.2	95.2	1.50

^a Values represent the numerical average of at least two experiments. Interassay variability was ±30% (IP, nM), unless otherwise noted.

^b Percent bound.

^c c Log P values were calculated using the Cerius² product marketed by Accelrys Software.



Scheme 2. General synthesis of biaryl quinolone carboxylic acids.

A series of substituted biphenyl compounds was first made in an attempt to improve plasma free fraction (Table 2). Halogen substitution on the phenyl ring proximal to the quinolone core improved M_1 potency (**29a** vs **34–35**) but only marginally improved free fraction in the case of **34**. Inclusion of polar groups (**36–39**) and fused bicyclic heterocycles (**40–41**) was generally ineffective,

Table 3

M1 FLIPR and plasma protein binding data for select compounds



^a Values represent the numerical average of at least two experiments. Interassay variability was ±30% (IP, nM), unless otherwise noted.

^b Percent bound.

^c c Log P values were calculated using the Cerius² product marketed by Accelrys Software.

but aniline **42** represented an incremental improvement. While its *N*,*N*-dimethyl analog **43** was highly protein bound, the homologous basic tertiary amine **44** had a free fraction of nearly 5% in both human and rat.

In addition to providing improved M₁ potency with greater consistency, libraries incorporating heterocyclic biaryls were even more fruitful in the search for compounds with decreased protein binding (Table 3). A number of pyridines (45-52) were examined, and among this group were two (46–47) with \sim 5% free fraction. Pyrimidines **53** and **54** also lowered protein binding significantly, but with a considerable loss of potency (~10-fold with respect to pyridine **46**). Pyrazole **55** represents another example combining excellent potency with appreciable free fraction. Inclusion of a fluorine atom at the quinolone 5-position (56) or an *N*-methyl group on the pyrazole (57) maintained potency, but had a detrimental effect on the free fraction. Comparison of calculated Log Pvalues for the biphenvls as a group versus the heterocyclic biaryls largely demonstrates the expected inverse relationship between c Log P and plasma free fraction. However, within the group of heterocyclic biaryls, 45 and 46 showed a higher free fraction than might have been predicted on the basis of the *c* Log *P*, providing some validation of our choice to pursue this series of compounds with parallel synthesis.

There is evidence to suggest that drug concentration in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) is a reasonable predictor for unbound drug concentration in the brain.¹⁰ A number of compounds in this series were therefore orally dosed to rats at 10 mg/kg, and CSF was used as a surrogate for in vivo assessment of CNS exposure. Compounds **44** and **46** are discussed as representative of the biphenyl and heterocyclic biaryl subseries, respectively. At a time point of 1 h, compound **44** showed a concentration of only 11 nM in the CSF; **46** a concentration of 24 nM. In a P-glycoprotein efflux assay, **44** and **46** both showed efflux ratios greater than 3, indicating that they are substrates for P-gp. Thus, the lower than expected exposures observed here may result from the action of these or other efflux transporters at the blood–brain barrier.

Selective M_1 positive allosteric modulators were discovered based on N-benzylated quinolone carboxylic acid lead **1**. Efforts driven by parallel synthesis identified that fluorine atom substitution at the 5- and/or 8-positions of the quinolone ring system were preferred in terms of M_1 potency. Analog libraries also led to the discovery that biaryl substituents at N1 further enhanced potency, providing a 20-fold improvement over lead compound **1**. Incorporation of a basic tertiary amine or certain heterocycles distal to the quinolone core were found to be effective strategies for decreasing plasma protein binding,¹¹ but these compounds nevertheless showed poor brain exposure, possibly as a result of the action of CNS transporters. Further studies are underway to identify selective M_1 allosteric modulators with improved CNS exposure.

Acknowledgments

We thank Wei Lemaire, Scott D. Mosser, Rodney A. Bednar, Michael W. Marlatt, Kristi L. Hoffman, Bang-Lin Wan, Charles W. Ross, III, Joan S. Murphy, Vincent van Nostrand, Kevin B. Albertson, Ray T. McClain, Anna Dudkina, April Cox, and Christopher J. Denicola for technical support of this work.

References and notes

- 1. (a) Terry, A. V.; Buccafusco, J. J. J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther. **2003**, 306, 821; (b) Geula, C. Neurology **1998**, 51, 18.
- Hansen, R.; Gartlehner, G.; Webb, A. P.; Morgan, L. C.; Moore, C. G.; Jonas, D. E. Clin. Interv. Aging 2008, 3, 211.
- (a) Bonner, T. I.; Buckley, N. J.; Young, A. C.; Brann, M. R. Science 1987, 237, 527;
 (b) Bonner, T. I. Trends Pharmacol. Sci. 1989, 11.
- 4. Levey, A. I. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 1996, 93, 13541.
- Bodick, N. C.; Offen, W. W.; Levey, A. I.; Cutler, N. R.; Gauthier, S. G.; Satlin, A.; Shannon, H. E.; Tollefson, G. D.; Rasumussen, K.; Bymaster, F. P.; Hurley, D. J.; Potter, W. Z.; Paul, S. M. Arch. Neurol. **1997**, *54*, 465.
- (a) Christopoulos, A. Nat. Rev. Drug Disc. 2002, 1, 198; (b) Wess, J. Mol. Pharmacol. 2005, 68, 1506.
- 7. For prior efforts to develop selective allosteric modulators of M₁, see: (a) Marlo, J. E.; Niswender, C. M.; Days, E. L.; Bridges, T. M.; Xiang, Y.; Rodriguez, A. L.; Shirey, J. K.; Brady, A. E.; Nalywajko, T.; Luo, Q.; Austin, C. A.; Williams, M. B.; Kim, K.; Williams, R.; Orton, D.; Brown, H. A.; Lindsley, C. W.; Weaver, C. D.; Conn, P. J. *Mol. Pharmacol.* **2009**, *75*, 577; (b) Conn, P. J.; Jones, C. K.; Lindsley, C. W. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* **2009**, *30*, 148. and references cited therein.
- Ma, L.; Seager, M.; Wittmann, M.; Jacobsen, M.; Bickel, D.; Burno, M.; Jones, K.; Kuzmick-Graufelds, V.; Xu, G.; Pearson, M.; McCampbell, A.; Gaspar, R.; Shughrue, P.; Danziger, A.; Regan, C.; Flick, R.; Pascarella, D.; Garson, S.; Doran, S.; Kreatsoulas, C.; Veng, L.; Lindsley, C. W.; Shipe, W.; Kuduk, S. D.; Sur, C.; Kinney, G.; Seabrook, G. R.; Ray, W. J. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 2009, 106, 15950.
- 9. Select compounds in this structural series were examined in functional assays at other muscarinic receptors and showed no activity at M₂, M₃, or M₄ receptors. They were also shown to be potent potentiators of the human M₁ receptor, eliciting a robust leftward shift of the acetylcholine dose-response curve at fixed concentrations of the potentiator.
- 10. Lin, J. Curr. Drug Metab. 2008, 9, 46.
- Further studies explored compounds containing a heterocyclic aryl group proximal to the quinolone core as another strategy to reduce protein binding: Kuduk, S.D.; Di Marco, C.N.; Cofre, V.; Pitts, D.R.; Ray, W.J.; Ma, L.; Wittmann, M.; Seager, M.A.; Koeplinger, K.A.; Thompson, C.D.; Hartman, G.D.; Bilodeau, M.T. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. **2009**, *19* (manuscript following this one) doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2009.11.059.