Synthesis and Bioassay of Antagonists of the Luteinizing Hormone Releasing Hormone Having the Azagly¹⁰ Moiety

Karl Folkers^{*,+}, Cyril Y. Bowers⁺, Wilson B. Lutz^{*}, Klaus Friebel^{*}, Teresa Kubiak^{*}, Bernhard Schircks^{*}, and Georg Rampold^{*}

* Institute for Biomedical Research, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712,

+ Tulane University School of Medicine, New Orleans, Louisiana 70112

Z. Naturforsch. 37b, 1075-1081 (1982); received March 23, 1982

Antagonist, Luteinizing Hormone Releasing Hormone, Ovulation, Peptides, Azaglycine

Seven new analogs of the luteinizing hormone releasing hormone (LHRH), having an Azagly¹⁰ moiety, and three corresponding Gly¹⁰-analogs were synthesized for bioassay and comparison of inhibitory potencies. This study was toward a possible advantage of the Azagly¹⁰ moiety to minimize C-terminal degradation, *in vivo*. Of the three procedures which were studied to achieve Azagly¹⁰-peptides, the reaction of cyanate ion with hydrazides was the most favorable. Variations of substitution in position 1 were also studied. The data from the antiovulatory assay showed that an Azagly¹⁰ moiety may not depress activity, and may allow equal or even higher activity than the Gly¹⁰ moiety, depending on the analog. [N-Ac-D-Thr¹, D-*p*-Cl-Phe², D-Trp^{3,6}, Azagly¹⁰]-LHRH was more inhibitory than the corresponding Gly¹⁰-analog. Based on pairs of analogs, the following relationships appeared: (1) N-Ac-D-Thr¹ was more effective than N-Ac-*p*-Cl-Phe¹; (2) The L-configuration of Ala as N-Ac-Ala¹⁻ was more effective than the D-; (3) N-Ac-Ala¹ appeared more effective than the N-Ac-D-Thr¹; (4) D-Trp⁶ appeared more effective than D-Phe⁶. In an ultimate clinical use of an antagonist of LHRH to block ovulation, the Azagly¹⁰ moiety may be advantageous for limitation of enzymatic degradation.

Introduction

The luteinizing hormone releasing hormone (LHRH) functions in the mechanisms of evolution and conception. Over a thousand analogs of LHRH have apparently been synthesized, some of which were significant agonists, super-agonists or antagonists.

We have synthesized and bioassayed a series of analogs (Table I), most of which have the azaglycineamide (Azagly) moiety, I, in position 10. For three of these analogs, the corresponding peptides having the glycinamide (Gly) moiety, II, in position 10 were synthesized for comparison of inhibitory activities.

I, -NH-NH-CO-NH₂ II, -NH-CH₂-CO-NH₂

The rationale for synthesizing and bioassaying these analogs with Azagly was that the C-terminal might be protected, *in vivo*, against enzymic degradation in contrast to the corresponding Gly¹⁰ analogs. Such protection might not be observed by routine *in vivo* assays for activity, but might be

0340 - 5087/82/0800 - 1075/\$ 01.00/0

important for subsequent studies toward the ultimate clinical use of an antagonist of LHRH to prevent ovulation.

Tab. I. Analogs of LHRH.

- 1. [N-Ac-D-p-Cl-Phe^{1,2},D-Trp^{3,6},Azagly¹⁰]-LHRH
- 2. [(N-Ac-Pro-Pro)¹,D-p-Cl-Phe²,D-Trp^{3,6},
- Azagly¹⁰]–LHRH
- 3. $[(N-Ac-Pro-Pro)^1, D-p-Cl-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6}]$ -LHRH
- 4. $[N-Ac-D-Ala^1, D-p-Cl-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6}, Azagly^{10}]-LHRH$
- 5. $[N-Ac-Ala^1, D-p-Cl-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6}, Azagly^{10}]-LHRH$
- 6. $[N-Ac-D-Thr^1, D-p-Cl-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6}, Azagly^{10}]-LHRH$
- 7. $[N-Ac-D-Thr^1, D-p-Cl-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6}]-LHRH$
- 8. $[N-Ac-Thr^1, D-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6}, Azagly^{10}]-LHRH$
- 9. $[N-Ac-Thr^1, D-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6}]-LHRH$
- 10. [N-Ac-Thr¹,D-Phe^{2,6},D-Trp³,Azagly¹⁰]-LHRH

In all of the analogs, the amino acid residues in positions 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 were identical to those in the same positions of LHRH, *i.e.*, Ser, Tyr, Leu, Arg and Pro. Variations were introduced at positions 1, 2, 3, 6, and 10. N-terminal residues (D-Ala, L-Ala, D-Thr, D-p-Cl-Phe, L-Thr and the dipeptide L-Pro-L-Pro) were N-acetylated.

^{*} Reprint requests should be sent to Dr. Karl Folkers, Institute for Biochemical Research, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

Variations of the solid phase method of Merrifield were used to synthesize the peptides. The glycinamide analogs (compounds 3, 7, and 9) were prepared from benzhydrylamine resins. The azaglycinamide analogs (compounds 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10) were prepared from chloromethyl Merrifield resins by attaching the penultimate amino acid (Pro) to the resin and completing of the synthesis to the Nterminus. The C-terminal Azagly moiety was then introduced after the peptide was cleaved from the resin.

Two methods for introducing the Azagly residue were studied. Analogs 4, 6, 8, and 10 were synthesized by cleaving the peptide-Merrifield resin with hydrogen fluoride to give the unprotected Nacetylated peptide carboxylic acids. Condensation of the latter with semicarbazide (azaglycinamide) by means of N–N'-dicyclohexylcarbodiimide (DCC) afforded the peptides for purification.

Analogs 1, 2, and 5 were synthesized by a variation of the azide procedure of Dutta et al. [1] which gave better yields and fewer difficulties with purification than the method which coupled semicarbazide by DCC. In this azide procedure, the peptide-Merrifield resins were subjected to hydrazinolysis to afford protected peptides as hydrazides. Treatment of these hydrazides with butyl nitrite in acidic dioxan gave azides which were then allowed to react with semicarbazide. The protecting groups were then removed with liquid HF. The conditions of hydrazinolysis may have possibly resulted in minor loss of the N-terminal acetyl group. Phillips [2], and Schmer and Kreil [3], have shown that complete removal of N-acetyl groups by hydrazinolysis is possible at 100 °C for about 17 h. All of the Azaglycontaining peptides gave strong positive tests [4] for hydrazine following complete acid hydrolysis.

A new method of introducing the azaglycine moiety was extended. Dutta and Morley [5] reported the use of cyanate ion to convert hydrazides to azaamino acid derivatives. In this method, a peptide hydrazide was treated with cyanate ion in acidic solution. We used N–Z–L-proline (11) as a model. Condensation of 11 with hydrazine by means of DCC in the presence of 1-hydroxybenzotriazole (1-HBT) afforded the N–Z–L-prolylhydrazide (12), which was isolated as the *p*-toluene sulfonate salt. When 12 was allowed to react with sodium cyanate in dilute aqueous acetic acid, N–Z–L-prolylazaglycinamide (13) was formed in high yield. This method appears to offer advantages for continuation of the synthesis of new types of $Azagly^{10}$ -analogs of LHRH.

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & &$$

All of the peptides were purified by combinations of gel-filtration counter-current distribution (CCD) partition chromatography, and high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC).

Experimental

Amino acid derivatives were purchased from Peninsula Laboratories, San Carlos, California except for D-*p*-chlorophenylalanine which was provided by the Southwest Foundation for Research and Education, San Antonio, Texas. Alpha amino functions were protected by the Boc group except that the Aoc group was used for arginine. Side chain functions were protected by Z(Ser,Thr), Tos(Arg) and o-Br-Z(Tyr). Benzhydrylamine (BHA) resin was purchased from Beckman Bioproducts, Palo Alto, California. DCC, Et₃N, CH₂Cl₂, and DMF were distilled prior to use. All other chemicals were reagent grade.

General method of synthesis

The peptides were synthesized by the solid phase method using a Beckman Model 990 peptide synthesizer. Attachment of the first amino acid to a BHA resin was by double DCC-mediated coupling. Attachment of the first amino acid to a chloromethyl resin was by single coupling of the Boc amino acid cesium salt. Two coupling programs were employed for peptide chain elongation. Program B was identical to Program A except that step 14 was replaced by two steps, 14 and 15; step 14: DMF $(3 \times 2 \text{ min})$ and step 15: CH₂Cl₂ $(3 \times 2 \text{ min})$. If a ninhydrin test [7] indicated an incomplete acylation of amino groups, a second coupling was performed by a repetition of steps 6 through 14. Sequences resulting from incomplete coupling, even after double coupling were terminated by acetyla-tion. Acetylation of the N-terminal amino acid moiety was accomplished by adding 25% acetic anhydride in CH₂Cl₂-pyridine in place of steps 10 and 11 of the coupling program. Peptides were removed from BHA resins by treatment with anhydrous liquid HF containing ca. 20% anisole for 1 h at 0 °C, as described [8].

TLC was performed on E. Merck silica gel G plates with detection by fluorescence, chlorine-tolidine spray, and ferric ferricyanide. Values for R_f^{1} , R_f^{2} , R_f^{3} and R_f^{4} refer to the systems: 1-butanol-acetic acid-ethyl acetate-water (1:1:3:1), ethanol-water (7:3); 2-propanol-1M acetic acid (2:1); and 1butanol-pyridine-acetic acid-water (50:33:1:40), respectively. Optical rotations were measured on a Perkin-Elmer Model 141 digital readout polarimeter. Amino acid analyses were performed on a Beckman Amino Acid Analyzer Model 119. Samples were hydrolyzed with constant boiling hydrochloric acid containing about 1 mg of phenol for 24 h at 110 °C in sealed evacuated tubes.

Biological assays for *in vitro* LH releasing and *in vivo* antiovulatory activity were carried out, as described [9], with one exception. The *in vitro* assay of [N-Ac-Ala¹,D-*p*-Cl-Phe²,D-Trp^{3,6},Azagly¹⁰]-LHRH was conducted using a culture of enzymatically dispersed anterior pituitary cells according to Vale *et al.* [10].

DCC couplings

Synthesis of $[N-Ac-D-Thr^1, D-p-Cl-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6}, Azagly^{10}[LHRH: To a mixture of 90 mg]$ of [N-Ac-D-Thr1,D-p-Cl-Phe2,D-Trp3,6,desGly10]-LHRH, 450 mg of semicarbazide, and 5 ml of DMF, was added 490 mg af DCC. The mixture was stirred for 28 h at room temperature, treated with 15 g of ice, and then the mixture was extracted 4 imes with 20 ml portions of ethyl acetate. The organic extract was washed with 30 ml of water. Lyophilization of the combined aqueous extract afforded the crude peptide which was purified by gel filtration in 2 M acetic acid on a column of Sephadex G-25 and by semipreparative HPLC on a column of Bondapak C₁₈ with 50% CH₃CN-0.01 M ammonium acetate, pH 5, as the eluting solvent; 15.2 mg of peptide was obtained. Analogs 4, 6, 8 and 10 were synthesized similarly.

Protected peptide hydrazides

To about 1 g of the protected peptide-Merrifield resin suspended in DMF, was added 0.77 ml of anhydrous hydrazine, and the mixture stirred 4 d at room temperature. The cleaved resin was filtered and washed with DMF. The combined filtrate and washings were evaporated, *in vacuo* (oil pump), and the residue was dried overnight over concd. H_2SO_4 . After an ether wash, the residue was dissolved in an appropriate solvent. The following hydrazides were obtained by using the indicated dissolution and precipitation solvents [11, 12].

- 14 N-Ac-D-*p*-Cl-Phe-D-*p*-Cl-Phe-D-Trp-Ser(Bzl)-Tyr(BrZ)-D-Trp-Leu-Arg(Tos)-Pro-NHNH₂ (precursor of 1); methanol/ether.
- 15 N-Ac-Pro-Pro-D-*p*-Cl-Phe-D-Trp-Ser(Bzl)-Tyr(BrZ)-D-Trp-Leu-Arg(Tos)-Pro-NHNH₂ (precursor of 2); ethanol/ether.
- 16 N-Ac-Ala-D-*p*-Cl-Phe-D-Trp-Ser(Bzl)-Tyr(BrZ)-D-Trp-Leu-Arg(Tos)-Pro-NHNH₂ (precursor of 5); DMF/H₂O.

Azide couplings

Synthesis of N-Ac-D-p-Cl-Phe-D-p-Cl-Phe-D-Trp-Ser(Bzl)-Tyr(BrZ)-D-Trp-Leu-Arg(Tos)- $Pro-NHNH-CO-NH_2$: The general procedure of Klausner and Bodanszky [13] was followed. To a solution of 0.467 g (0.266 mM) of hydrazide 14 in 2.5 ml of DMF at -30 °C, was added 0.22 ml (1.33 mM) of 6 M HCl in dry dioxan, followed by 0.08 ml of 50% isoamyl nitrite in isoamyl alcohol (0.298 mM, 12% excess). After 30 min at -25 to 30 °C, the solution was cooled to -60 °C. Triethylamine (0.185 ml, 1.33 mM) was added, followed by semicarbazide hydrochloride (35.6 mg, 0.319 mM, 20% excess), and additional triethylamine (0.044 ml, 0.319 mM). The suspension was stirred at 4 °C for 24 h then at room temperature for two days. A further 35.6 mg-portion of semicarbazide and 0.044 ml of triethylamine were added, and the mixture was stirred for three days. The product was precipitated with water and filtered. The same procedure was used for all three hydrazides.

N-Z-L-Prolylhydrazide p-toluenesulfonate 12: To 598 mg (2 mM) of N–Z–L-proline and 280 mg (2 mM) of 1-HBT in 6 ml of CH₂Cl₂, was added 458 mg (2.4 mM) of DCC. The mixture was swirled for ca. 5 min at room temperature, and filtered into a solution of 1.30 g (39.2 mM) of anhydrous N_2H_4 in 8 ml of CH_3CN with vigorous magnetic stirring. After 5 min, the mixture was evaporated to a small volume on a rotating evaporator. To remove residual N_2H_4 , 3 ml of 1-butanol was added and evaporated, and this step was repeated. Ethyl acetate (5 ml) was added, and some insoluble material was removed by filtration. The filtrate was treated with 380 mg of p-toluenesulfonic acid monohydrate which resulted in a clear solution, from which a crystalline solid rapidly separated. Filtration afforded 773 mg (89%) of a solid, m. p. 154-166 °C. Two recrystallizations from methanol/ethyl acetate raised the m.p. to 177.5–180 °C; $[a]_{\rm D}^{23}$ — 31.4 °C (c 1.04 MeOH) TLC R_{f^1} 0.71, R_{f^2} 0.63, R_{f^3} 0.72, R_{f} 0.64. The analytical data were in agreement with C₂₀H₂₅N₃O₆S.

N-Z-L-Prolylazaglycinamide (13): To 179 mg (0.41 mM) of 12 in 2 ml of warm water containing 0.05 ml of acetic acid, was added 31 mg (0.48 mM) of sodium cyanate. The solution was kept at room temperature for 45 min and at 4 °C for 18 h. Filtration afforded 101 mg (80%) of 13, 187–189 °C. Recrystallization of the product from 2-propanol raised the m.p. to 187–189.5 °C (reported [1] m.p. 189–190 °C); $[a]_{12}^{25}$ –56.6 °C (c 1.44 MeOH), $[a]_{12}^{23}$ –90.6 °C (c 1.42 DMF) (reported [1] $[a]_{12}^{24}$ –43.6 °C (c 1.4 DMF)); TLC R_{f^1} 0.75, R_{f^2} 0.73, R_{f^3} 0.73, R_{f^4} 0.69. The analytical data were in agreement with C₁₄H₁₈N₄O₄.

Results and Discussion

Dutta *et al.* [1] reported the synthesis of some analogs of LHRH which have Azagly¹⁰ moieties.

They found that some of their analogs had agonist and others had antagonist activities, in certain assays. Simpson et al. [14] found [D-Nal(2)6. Azaglv¹⁰]-LHRH (Nal(2) is 3(2-naphthalene)-alanine) to be one of the most potent known agonists. Since the Azagly residue in position 10 of antagonists might protect the C-terminal from enzymatic degradation, in vivo, in contrast to enzymic attack of the naturally occurring Glv¹⁰ in LHRH, it was considered important to extend the chemical and biological data on Azagly¹⁰ analogs of LHRH, and particularly for analogs which have multiple substitutions for the amino acids in LHRH. These substitutions have been based upon the results of investigations by several groups of investigators. including Ling and Vale [15]: Prasad et al. [16]: Cov et al. [17]; Rivier et al. [18]; Channabasavaiah and Stewart [19].

Our synthesis of seven new Azagly¹⁰ analogs resulted from our use and comparison of three procedures to introduce the Azagly¹⁰ moiety. The newest procedure involved the use of cyanate ion in an acidic medium to convert hydrazides into Azagly moieties, and appeared to provide a simpler and better procedure. For a preliminary model, this method was used to synthesize Z-L-prolylazaglycinamide (13); the analytical data and melting point of 13 were in agreement, but the optical rotation was considerably higher than that in data reported by Dutta *et al.* [1]. The general experience of investigators, who have synthesized analogs of LHRH toward more effective and potent inhibitors of the release of LH for the control of ovulation, has been that relationships between sequence and anti-ovulatory activity may have some generally, but the generality may be limited. The relationships may be applicable to restricted groups of sequence changes. On the basis of such generality and limitation, the following interpretations can be made of the antiovulatory activities of the ten new analogs according to the *in vivo* data of Table III.

Analog 1 with the N-Ac-D-p-Cl-Phe¹ moiety is compared with analog 6, with the N-Ac-D-Thr¹ moiety; the rest of the sequence of both analogs is identical, [-D-p-Cl-Phe², D-Trp^{3,6}, Azagly¹⁰]-LHRH. The N-Ac-D-Thr¹-peptide showed 100% inhibition at a dosage of 25 μ g/rat, but the N-Ac-p-Cl-Phe¹-analog was inactive at this dosage, which shows the superiority of N-Ac-D-Thr¹ over N-Ac-p-Cl-Phe¹, for this pair.

Analog 2 has the Azagly¹⁰ moiety and analog 3 has the Gly¹⁰ moiety, with the rest of the sequence of both analogs being identical, $[(N-Ac-Pro-Pro)^1, D-p-Cl-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6}-]-LHRH$. The analog with Azagly¹⁰ showed 60% inhibition at a level of 50 µg/rat and the Gly¹⁰ analog showed 20% inhibition at 25 µg/rat. Analog 2 may have contained a little of the deacetylated peptide. Possibly, the

Peptides	Arg	Tyr	Leu	\mathbf{Pro}	Ser	Ala	Thr	Gly	Phe	NH_3	pClPhe
1 2a 3 4 ^b	$1.05 \\ 1.02 \\ 0.97 \\ 1.09$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.98 \\ 1.02 \\ 0.96 \\ 0.99 \end{array}$	$0.99 \\ 1.06 \\ 0.87 \\ 1.01$	$egin{array}{c} 1.10 \\ 3 imes 1.0 \\ 3 imes 0.9 \\ 1.04 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.00 \\ 1 \ 1.00 \\ 9 \ 0.99 \\ 0.91 \end{array}$	0.96		0.98		$0.87 \\ 1.27$	2.3 1.08
5 6 7 8 9 10	$1.00 \\ 0.95 \\ 1.03 \\ 0.98 \\ 0.93 \\ 1.06$	$1.07 \\ 0.98 \\ 0.97 \\ 1.00 \\ 0.95 \\ 0.89$	$1.03 \\ 1.02 \\ 0.99 \\ 1.02 \\ 0.98 \\ 0.98$	$1.01 \\ 1.11 \\ 1.13 \\ 0.98 \\ 1.07 \\ 1.16$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.98 \\ 0.97 \\ 0.93 \\ 0.96 \\ 1.04 \\ 1.00 \end{array}$	1.06	$0.97 \\ 0.96 \\ 0.89 \\ 0.99 \\ 0.94$	0.99 1.07	$1.00 \\ 0.95 \\ 2 imes 0.98$	$1.95 \\ 1.77 \\ 1.17 \\ 1.16 \\ 3 \ 1.16$	

Tab. II. Amino acid analytical datac.

^a This product behaved as a mixture of two peptides, which were difficult to separate. The limitation of sample and lack of feasibility to resynthesize this peptide justified assay of the sample. This sample may have contained a little of the deacetylated peptide; ^b Purification of this analog was difficult. Eventually, a preparation was obtained which showed two approximately equal peaks by HPLC and two spots by TLC; R_t values of 0.73 and 0.92. The spot having R_t^3 0.73 was ninhydrin positive, but the spot of R_t^3 0.62 was ninhydrin negative. Since the analysis for amino acids was satisfactory, it was concluded that the peptide with R_t 0.73 may be deacetylated and the peptide with R_t 0.62 is the N-Ac-D-Ala¹-peptide; ^c Qualitative tests for hydrazine in the hydrolysate were positive. Tryptophan was generally detected, but not quantitated. Parachlorophenylalanine was detected, but not quantitated. Parachlorophenylalanine and tryptophan were quantitated as a pair using a separate standard containing these two amino acids. Azagly¹⁰-analog might be more effective than the Gly¹⁰ analog.

Analog 4, having the N-Ac-D-Ala moiety and analog 5 having the N-Ac-Ala¹ moiety, have the same remaining sequence, $[-D-p-Cl-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6},$ Azagly¹⁰]-LHRH. The N-Ac-Ala¹ analog elicited 50% inhibition at a level of 6 µg/rat and the N-Ac-D-Ala¹ analog exhibited 14% inhibition at a level of 6.5 µg/rat. This comparison indicates that the L-configuration of Ala in position 1 is superior to the D-configuration. Analog 4 may have contained a little of the deacetylated peptide.

Analog 5, with the N-Ac-Ala¹ moiety, and analog 6, with the N-Ac-D-Thr¹ moiety, have the

same remaining sequence, $[-D-p-Cl-Phe^2, D-Trp^{3,6}, Azagly^{10}]$ -LHRH. The N-Ac-D-Thr-analog caused 100% inhibition at 25 µg/rat and the M-Ac-Ala¹ analog caused 50% inhibition at a level of 6 µg/rat. Although there was a 4-fold difference in the test levels, the biological data indicate preference of N-Ac-Ala over N-Ac-D-Thr for position 1 in this pair of analogs.

Analog 6 has the Azagly¹⁰ moiety and analog 7 has the Gly¹⁰ moiety, but both analogs are otherwise identical, having [N-Ac-D-Thr¹, D-p-Cl-Phe², D-Trp^{3,6}-]-LHRH. The Azagly¹⁰ analog caused 50% inihibition at a level of $6.5 \,\mu$ g/rat and the corresponding Gly¹⁰ analog at the same level caused

Table III. Antiovulatory activities.

Analog	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Dose} \\ \mu \text{g/rat} \end{array}$	Rats ovulating/treated	No. of ova/SEM ovulating rat (\pm)	Inhibition %	
1 Control	25	6/6 5/5	$egin{array}{cccc} 12.3 & \pm \ 0.7 \ 12.4 & \pm \ 1.1 \end{array}$	0 0	
2 Control	50	$2/5\ 5/5$	$\begin{array}{ccc} 4.4 & \pm \ 2.8 \\ 12.4 & \pm \ 1.1 \end{array}$	60 0	
3	25	4/5	9.6 ± 2.5	20	
4 Control	$\begin{array}{c} 25\\ 6.5\\ -\end{array}$	$2/6 \\ 6/7 \\ 11/11$	$\begin{array}{rrrr} 3.8 & \pm \ 2.5 \\ 11.9 & \pm \ 2.0 \\ 13.4 & \pm \ 0.6 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 67\\ 14\\ 0\end{array}$	
5 6	$\begin{array}{c} 6\\ -\\ 25\\ 12\\ 6.5\end{array}$	4/8 6/6 0/6 3/7 5/10	$egin{array}{cccc} 5.6 &\pm 2.4 \ 11.5 &\pm 1.5 \ 0 \ 5.4 &\pm 2.6 \ 6.8 &\pm 2.3 \end{array}$	$50 \\ 100 \\ 57 \\ 50$	
Control	-	11/11	$13.4 \stackrel{-}{\pm} 0.6$	0	
7 Control	$\begin{array}{c} 25\\ 6.25\\ -\end{array}$	$1/5 \\ 4/5 \\ 8/8$	$egin{array}{ccc} 0.8 & \pm \ 0.8 \\ 8.4 & \pm \ 2.3 \\ 11.9 & \pm \ 7 \end{array}$	$\begin{smallmatrix} 80\\ 20\\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}$	
8 Control	$200 \\ - \\ 50^{a} \\ 50^{b} \\ 50^{c}$	$0/11 \\ 15/15 \\ 3/6 \\ 1/6 \\ 1/8$	$egin{array}{cccc} 0 & \pm 0.72 \ 4.3 & \pm 2.3 \ 0.17 \pm 0.17 \ 1.3 & \pm 1.2 \end{array}$	$100 \\ 0 \\ 50 \\ 83.3 \\ 87.5$	
Control	-	5/5	$9.0 ext{ }\pm ext{ }1.3 ext{ }$	0	
9 Control	$\begin{array}{c} 200\\ 100\\ 50 \end{array}$	1/7 2/9 4/9	$egin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		
Control	200 ^d	0/6 5/5	$ \begin{array}{c} 13.10 \pm 1.11 \\ 0 \\ 10.6 \pm 0.7 \end{array} $	100	
10	100 50	0/6 7/10	$ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 7.1 \\ +1.9 \end{array} $	100 30	
Control	_	5/5	$9.0 \hspace{0.2cm} \stackrel{+}{\pm} \hspace{0.2cm} \stackrel{1.0}{1.3}$	0	

^a Dispersed in medium 30-40 min before injection; ^b dispersed in medium 60-90 min before injection; ^c dispersed in medium 195 min before injection; ^d reassayed after 3 months.

a 20% inhibition, showing a superiority of Azagly¹⁰ over Gly¹⁰.

Analog 8 having the Azagly¹⁰ moiety and analog 9 having the Gly¹⁰ moiety were otherwise identical, having [N–Ac–Thr¹, D–Phe², D–Trp^{3,6}–]–LHRH. The Azagly¹⁰ analog caused 100% inhibition at a level of 200 μ g/rat and the corresponding Gly¹⁰ analog caused an 86–100% inhibition at 200 μ g/rat, which possibly favors the Azagly¹⁰ analog, although the error of the assay limits appraisal. Interestingly, when analog 8 having the Azagly¹⁰ moiety was dispersed in the medium for assay, the effectiveness of inhibition was improved, since one-fourth (50 μ g) of the test level increased inhibition from 50 to 83%. The dispersion of the sample led to more effective inhibition.

Analog 9 having a D-Trp⁶ moiety and analog 10 having a D-Phe⁶ moiety were otherwise identical

with the sequence, $[N-Ac-Thr^1, D-Phe^2, Azagly^{10}]-LHRH$. The D-Trp⁶-analog elicited 100% inhibition at a level of 200 µg/rat and the corresponding D-Phe⁶-analog elicited 100% inhibition at 100µg/rat indicating superiority of D-Trp⁶ over D-Phe⁶; a level of 50 µg of the D-Trp⁶-analog inhibited 50% in comparison with 50 µg of the D-Phe⁶-analog which inhibited 30%.

The data on the *in vitro* assay of these analogs for antagonist activity are in Table IV. All of the analogs except 5 were assayed as described by Bowers *et al.* [20], which was based upon using pituitaries from 20-day old female rats of the CDI strain. The analog and LHRH were added at appropriate periods of incubation, and the release of LH and FSH were recorded as Δ LH and Δ FSH. The LH and FSH values are in nanograms, based on standards. Analog 5 was assayed *in vitro*, by the

Table IV. In vitro antagonist activity.

Analog	dose* ng/ml	LH ⊿ng/ml	$\frac{\text{SEM}}{(\pm)}$	Р	FSH ⊿ng/ml	$\frac{\text{SEM}}{(\pm)}$	Р	Analog	dose* ng/ml	LH ⊿ng/m	1 SEM (±)	Р	FSH ⊿ng/m	(\pm)	Р
1	-	724	24	_	6816	224	_	6	_	487	45	_	9811	980	_
	1	585	36	< 0.05	7546	797	n.s.		3	58	17	< 0.001	1526	289	< 0.0
	3	419	28	< 0.001	6942	266	n.s.		10	45	13	< 0.001	1111	109	< 0.0
	10	477	118	n.s.	6729	594	n.s.		30	25	10	< 0.001	555	112	< 0.0
	30	233	40	< 0.001	5146	466	< 0.01		-	465	20	-	9052	885	
2	-	336	21	-	4505	266			1	125	11	< 0.001	4409	276	< 0.0
	3	228	7	< 0.001	4710	498	n.s.		3	14	31	< 0.001	1179	859	< 0.0
	10	151	43	< 0.01	1834	713	< 0.01		10	14	61	< 0.001	928	201	< 0.0
	30	59	24	< 0.001	1411	217	< 0.001	7		343	47	-	5428	745	
	100	69	17	< 0.001	1639	308	< 0.001		1	139	25	< 0.001	3345	663	n. :
3	-	336	21	-	4505	266	_		3	118	30	< 0.001	2771	503	< 0.0
	1	237	35	< 0.05	4070	489	n.s.		10	25	12	< 0.001	138	244	< 0.0
	3	185	15	< 0.001	3308	325	< 0.02		30	37	39	< 0.001	-319	240	< 0.0
	10	204	9	< 0.001	3233	363	< 0.002	8	-	560	86	—	5769	482	-
	30	36	46	< 0.001	1784	311	< 0.001		10	113	13	< 0.001	1721	94	< 0.0
4		465	20	-	9052	885	-		30	28	6	< 0.001	261	198	< 0.0
	3	164	18	< 0.001	5097	295	< 0.01		100	14	10	< 0.001	-54	219	< 0.0
	10	64	17	< 0.001	1347	214	< 0.001		1000	9	4	< 0.001	-152	141	< 0.0
	30	4	13	< 0.001	555	242	< 0.001		-	487	45	-	9811	980	-
5	-	123	20	_					3	284	40	< 0.01	8154	1048	n .:
	0.02	2702	47	< 0.001					10	188	39	< 0.001	3743	629	< 0.0
	0.67	410	22	< 0.001					30	32	10	< 0.001	780	115	< 0.0
	2.0	389	10	< 0.001				9	-	562	158	-	6530	1218	
									30	60	12	< 0.01	956	303	< 0.0
									100	5	37	< 0.01	-168	244	< 0.0
									1000	33	24	< 0.01	459	42	< 0.0
								10	-	784	56	-	7746	430	-
									10	188	38	< 0.001	2412	570	< 0.0
									30	72	46	< 0.001	1586	323	< 0.0
									100	49	37	< 0.001	359	328	< 0.(
									1000	52	16	< 0.001	416	100	< 0.0

* In presence of 0.6 ng of LHRH per ml of medium.

procedure of Vale *et al.* [10], which uses cultures of dispersed pituitary cells. Analogs 1,3, and 7 at levels of 1 μ g significantly (p < 0.05-0.001) inhibited the release of LH. Analogs 3, 4, and 6 significantly (p < 0.001) inhibited at levels of 3 μ g. Analogs 8, 9, and 10 showed significant (p < 0.01-0.001) inhibition at levels of 10, 30 and 10 μ g, respectively.

As a group, these nine analogs were more inhibitory for the release of LH than for FSH, since analogs 1, 2, 3, and 7 did not inhibit release of FSH at levels effective for inhibition of the release of LH, but analogs 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10 did inhibit release of FSH at the same level which inhibited LH. By the culture of dispersed pituitary cells, analog 5, at a level of 0.02 nanograms, significantly (p < 0.001) inhibited the release of LH. It is evident that the Azagly¹⁰ moiety in comparison with the Gly¹⁰ moiety in analogs which are otherwise identical does not cause a significant reduction in activity for inhibition of ovulation. The Azagly¹⁰ analogs are apparently equal to the Gly¹⁰ analogs in activity, and perhaps may be desirable to study the metabolic stability of Azagly¹⁰ analogs under conditions which more closely simulate potential clinical use.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Marvin Karten, and to NIH, NICHD Contract NO1-HD-O-2833, and to the Robert A. Welch Foundation for their respective support. We are grateful to Drs. Albert Parlow for the NIAMDD program, NIH; Gordon Niswender; and L. E. Reichert for their RIA preparations and procedures.

- A. S. Dutta, B. J. A. Furr, and M. B. Giles, Chem. Soc. Perkin I 1979, 379.
- [2] D. M. P. Phillips, Biochem. J. 86, 397 (1963).
- [3] G. Schmer, and G. Kreil, Analytical Biochem. 29, 186 (1969).
- [4] F. Feigl and V. Anger in : Spot Tests in Inorganic Analysis, Elsevier Biomedical Press, New York 1975, p. 340.
- [5] A. S. Dutta and J. S. Morley, Chem. Soc. Perkin I 1975, 1712.
- [6] J. Humphries, Y.-P. Wan, T. Wasiak, K. Folkers, and C. Y. Bowers, J. Med. Chem. 22, 774 (1979).
- [7] E. Kaiser, R. L. Colescott, C. D. Bossinger, and P. T. Cook, Anal. Biochem. 34, 595 (1970).
- [8] J. Humphries, G. Fisher, Y. P. Wan, K. Folkers, and C. Y. Bowers, J. Med. Chem. 17, 569 (1974).
- [9] J. Humphries, Y.-P. Wan, K. Folkers, and C. Y. Bowers, J. Med. Chem. 20, 1674 (1977).
- [10] W. Vale, G. Grant, M. Amoss, R. Blackwell, and R. Guillemin, Endocrinol. 91, 562 (1972).
- [11] M. Ohno and C. B. Anfinsen, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 89, 5994 (1967).

- [12] J. K. Chang, M. Shimizu, and S. Wang, J. Org. Chem. 41, 3255 (1976).
- [13] Y. S. Klausner and M. Bodanszky, Bioorg. Chem. 2, 354 (1973).
- [14] J. J. Nestor (Jr.), T. L. Ho, R. A. Simpson, B. L. Horner, and G. H. Jones, Seventh American Peptide Symposium, Abstracts, June 14–19, 1981, Madison, Wisconsin, p. 138.
- [15] N. Ling and W. Vale, Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 63, 801 (1975).
 [16] K. U. Prasad, R. W. Roeske, R. L. Weitl, J. A.
- [16] K. U. Prasad, R. W. Roeske, R. L. Weitl, J. A. Vilchez-Martinez, and A. V. Schally, J. Med. Chem. 19, 492 (1976).
- [17] D. H. Coy, J. A. Vilchez-Martinez, E. J. Coy, and A. V. Schally, J. Med. Chem. **39**, 423 (1976).
- [18] J. Rivier, M. Brown, C. Rivier, and W. Vale in: Peptides 1976, A. Loffet, Ed., Editions del-Universite de Bruxelles, Brussells 1977, p. 427.
- [19] K. Channabasavaiah and J. M. Stewart, Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 86, 1266 (1979).
- [20] C. Ý. Bowers, J. Humphries, T. Wasiak, K. Folkers, G. A. Reynolds, and L. E. Reichert (Jr.), Endocrinol. 106, 674 (1980).