

Jonnal of Applicable Chemistry

2015, 4 (3): 931-940 (International Peer Reviewed Journal)



Molecular Modeling Studies on Series of A-Aminoacid Functionalized 4-Quinazoline Derivatives Based on Cytotoxic Activity Data Against U 937 Cell Lines

P. Mani Chandrika¹*, T. Yakaiah², B. Narsaiah², S. Gururaj³, T. Parthasarathy³ and A. Raghu Ram Rao⁴

Medicinal Chemistry Division, Bojjam Narasimhulu Pharmacy College for Women, Saidabad, Hyderabad, INDIA
 Fluoroorganic Division, Indian Institute Chemical of Technology, Tarnaka, Hyderabad, INDIA
 Department of Chemistry, Nizam College, Hyderabad, INDIA
 University College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Kakatiya University, Warangal, INDIA

Email: principalbnpcw@gmail.com

Accepted on 9th May 2015

ABSTRACT

In continuation of our efforts on synthesis and in vitro anticancer activity evaluation against U937 cell lines of series of 2-phenyl-6-substituted quinazolin-4-yl amino acetic acid derivatives **6a-6o**, the data was compared with structure–based investigations using Docking studies with the crystal structure of caspase-1 protein (1BMQ). The binding energies estimated by scoring functions were found to have a good correlation with the experimental inhibitory potencies.

Keywords: Cytotoxic activity; amino acids; quinazolines; cell lines; modeling studies.

INTRODUCTION

In general quinazoline derivatives are NOS-II [1], NFKB [2], TNF- α [3] IMPDH-II [4], MAPK [5], IL-6 [6], PDE-3 [7] and PDE-4 [8] inhibitors and also found to show bronchodilatory [9], anti-allergic [10] properties. Some of the known quinazoline derivatives exhibited remarkable anti-cancer activity [11-16]. More specifically trimetrexate (TMQ) and piritrexim (PTX) considered as new generation potent lipophilic DHFR inhibitors [17-19]. Further 4-anilinoquinazolines are considered to be potent and highly selective inhibitors of tyrosine kinase activity [20-22]. In view of the link between use of NSAIDs and altered cancer incidence and a growing evidence of COX-II implication in angiogenesis, a novel series of 4,6-disubstituted quinazoline derivatives [23] , 2,4,6-trisubstituted quinazoline derivatives [24] as well as perfluoroalkyl-1H,1,2,3-triazol-4-yl substituted O-, N-quinazolines [25] published were synthesized by us in our laboratory. The derivatives thus prepared were screened for anti-inflammatory, anti-microbial and anti-cancer activities against various cell lines. Some of the compounds exhibited promising anti-cancer activity with reference to standard drug Etoposide.

With the aim of rationalizing the biological data obtained for the synthesized compounds, 2-phenyl-6-substituted quinazolin-4-yl amino acetic acid derivatives **6a-6o** [23], a Molecular Modeling study was carried out in order to investigate the possible interaction of such compounds with caspase-1 protein.

Molecular Docking methodologies ultimately seek to predict the best binding mode by which a compound will fit into a site of a macro molecular target. The docking studies have been made to explain the observed variance in biological activity which predicts the best drug candidate providing an insight into substitutional and configurational requirements for optimum receptor pit that leads to the development of best pharmacophore activity and reporting here for the first time.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Chemistry: The synthetic sequence involved in preparation of 2-phenyl-6-substituted quinazolin-4-yl amino acetic acid derivatives **6a-60** is outlined below as per our report [23].



Cytotoxic activity: The compounds 2-phenyl-6-substituted quinazolin-4-yl amino acetic acid derivatives **6a-60** were tested against U937 leukemia human lymphoma cancer cell lines [23] and shown significant decrease in cell viability with reference to concentration. Among all, the compound **6i** exhibited maximum cytotoxic activity and is close to standard positive control (Etoposide). The activity presumed to be due to the presence of iodine on 6^{th} position with L-phenylalanine on 4^{th} position. If iodine is replaced with bromine **6h**, the activity is drastically reduced. Alternately on comparison of compounds **6k**, **6l** and **6j** with L-isoleucin on fourth position and Br, I and H on sixth position showed descending order of activity. Similar trend was observed in compounds **6n**, **6o** and **6m** with L-tryptophan and compounds **6e**, **6f** and **6d** with L-methyl glycine. The bromine on 6^{th} position is considered to be optimum to show anticancer activity except in compound **6i**, which showed highest activity with iodine on 6^{th} position. The cytotoxic activity of test compounds with decreasing order of **6i** > **6k** > **6n** > **6o** > **6h** > **6l** > **6m** > **6e** > **6j** is tabulated in **Table-1**.

www.joac.info

Test compound	Structure	IC_{50} (µg/ml) [†]
6i: 2-(6-Iodo-2-phenyl quinazolin-4-yl amino)-3-phenyl propanoic acid	HN COOH	16.11±1.12
6k: 2-(6-Bromo-2-phenyl quinazolin-4-yl amino)-3-methyl pentanoic acid	HN COOH $Br COOH$ $COOH$ $COOH$ $CooH$ $CooH$	32.02±1.73
6n: 6-Bromo-2-phenyl quinazolin-4-(2- amino-3-(1H-indol- 3-yl) propanoic acid)	HN HN COOH Br N C ₆ H ₅	37.90±1.10
60: 6-Iodo-2-phenyl quinazolin-4-(2-amino-3- (1H-indol- 3-yl) propanoic acid	HN HN COOH	46.11±1.21
6h: 2-(6-Bromo-2-phenyl quinazolin-4-yl amino)-3-phenyl propanoic acid	HN COOH	50.38±0.92

Table- 1: Cytotoxic activity of Compounds 6a-6o

61: 2-(6-Iodo-2-phenylquinazolin-4-yl amino)-3-methyl pentanoic acid	CH(CH ₃)CH ₂ CH ₃	
	ну соон	
	I N	52 36+0 61
	N C-H-	02.001
	HN	
6m: 2-Phenyl quinazolin-4-(2-amino-3-(1H-indol-3-vl) propanoic acid		
	ну соон	74.78±1.80
	Ņ	
	N C ₆ H ₅	
for (6 Brome 2 should aving ratio 4 vi		
amino) propanoic acid	Br	104.24+1.85
	N C ₆ H ₅	
	CH(CH ₃)CH ₂ CH ₃	
6j: 3-Methyl-2-(2-phenyl quinazolin-4-yl amino)pentanoic acid	ну соон	
	N	120 71 46 00
		120./1±0.09
6a: (2-Phenyl auinazolin-4-		
6b: (6-Bromo-2-phenyl quinazol 6c: (6-Iodo-2-phenyl quinazoline-4-v		
6d: (2-Phenyl quinazolin-4-yl 6f: (6-Iodo-2-phenyl quinazolin-	ns	
6g: 3-Phenyl-2-(2-phenyl quinazoli	n-4-yl amino) propanoic acid	
 Etoposide*		10.56±0.70

Docking studies: In order to elucidate possible interactions for the cytotoxic activity, we have performed docking studies using FRED (Openeye Scientific Software, Inc) [26]. Conformation and minimization of the compounds was performed using Omega (Openeye Scientific Software, Inc) [26]. After this the output file is used for docking. Docking was carried out against caspase-1 protein (1BMQ) which is the possible anticancer target of quinazoline derivatives. Caspase-1 protein was chosen as a target for docking because the sensitivity of U937 monocytic cells to apoptosis induced by Etoposide and that the apoptotic process involves the activity of members of the caspase-1 subfamily. Selected target protein was retrieved from PDB. (www.rcsb.org\pdb).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The predicted binding energies of 2-phenyl-6-substituted quinazolin-4-yl amino acetic acid derivatives **6a-60** have shown good correlation with the respective inhibitory activities, i.e. **6i** has lowest scoring values and higher inhibitory activity than all analogs which are synthesized but the control Etoposide has lowest scoring value and higher inhibitory activity than all analogs. To visualize the binding conformations of these analogs with in the active site of caspase-1 protein are displayed in **Figure-1**. In the active site region (5 A⁰) the caspase-1 protein twenty amino acids can play an important role are shown in **Figure-2** (namely Pro 177, Arg 178, Arg 179, Thr 180, Ser 236, His 237, Gly 238, Gln 283, Ala 284, Cys 285, Gly 287, Asp 288, Val 338, Ser 339, Thp 340, Arg 341, His 342, Pro 343, Ser 347 and Arg 383). As observed in **Figure-3**, **6i** and **6k** were docked in the active site of protein with a significant binding mode compared with Etoposide molecule.

Further more, differences in the docking studies were observed that the Etoposide is having the lowest scoring values than all molecules like steric interactions, ligand donor interaction with protein acceptor, lipophilic-lipophilic interactions, AMBIG, Acc/Metal interactions and Shape similarity between ligand and protein **Figure-4**.To further validate the binding mode best scored molecule in surface form is given in **Figure-5**.

Docking functions [27-29] for analysis are given in table- 2. The predicted binding energies of novel (6-substituted-2-phenyl quinazolin-4-yl amino) substituted acetic acid derivatives 6(a-o) have shown good correlation with the respective inhibitory activities, i.e. **6i** has lowest scoring values and higher inhibitory activity than all analogs which are synthesized but the positive control Etoposide has lowest scoring value and higher inhibitory activity than all analogs. Further more, differences in the docking studies were observed that the Etoposide is having the lowest scoring values than all molecules like steric interactions, ligand donor interaction with protein acceptor, lipophilic-lipophilic interactions, Ambig, Acc/Metal interactions and Shape, having less interactions of Ambig and Acc/metal are given in table- 3.

Figure Legends: To visualize the binding conformations of these analogs with in the active site of caspase-1 protein are displayed in figure-1.



Figure- 1: All molecules in the protein active-site



Figure- 2: Active-site Amino-acids in ball and stick model

Table - 2: Docking functions

Entry		
Entry	Descriptor code	Description
1	Steric	Steric interactions
		Contribution from ligand donor interaction with protein cceptor
2	Donor	
		Rotatable bond penalty
3	Rb	
		Phenyl interactions with amides, methyl and aryl CH groups
4	Aromatic	
		Piecewise linear potential
5	Plp	
		Clash penalty / screenscore
6	Clash/ss	
		Lipophilic - lipophilic interactions
7	Lipo	
		Lipophilic - polar and polar - polar interactions
8	Ambig	
		All interactions of ligand non-polar atoms
9	Np	
		Ligand acceptor - protein donor and all metal interactions
10	Acc/Metal	
11	Shape	Shape complimentarity between ligand and protein

Descriptor			
code	Etoposide	6i	6k
Steric	-63.46	-50.47	-38.59
Donor	-0.11	-0.10	0.00
Rb	10.93	12 31	12.86
Ro	10.95	12.51	12.00
Aromatic	-2.05	-2.12	-3.46
Plp	-16.40	-25.11	-8.33
Clash/ss	28.66	12.53	12.17
Lipo	-59.39	-49.33	-43.23
•			
Ambig	-43.02	-16.71	-21.42
Np	-30.19	-23.38	-10.23
Acc/Metal	-3.76	-2.78	-1.96
Total	-178.8	-145.2	-102.2
Shape	-529.61	-365.20	-301.07

Table- 3: Docking scores



Figure- 3: 6i and 6k in active site (6i in brown color and 6k in normal color)



Figure- 4: Etoposide molecule in the Active-site

To further validate the binding mode best scored molecule in surface form is given in Figure- 5.



Figure 5: Etoposide in the Active-site area with surface contact in blue color



Figure- 6: 6i molecule in the Active-site

APPLICATIONS

The optimum steric, lipophilic and lipophilic-polar and polar-polar interactions are important to fit in the active site of the target. The binding energies estimated by scoring functions, were found to have a good correlation with the experimental inhibitory potencies. Based on the binding conformations from molecular docking, it is applicable that the steric and lipophilic interactions play major role to promote cytotoxic activity against U 937 cell lines.

CONCLUSIONS

The cytotoxic activity data against U937 cell lines of all the compounds **6a-60** was correlated with structure based investigations using Docking studies. Compound **6i** has lowest scoring values and higher inhibitory activity than all analogs which are synthesized but the positive control Etoposide has lowest scoring value and higher inhibitory activity than all analogs. The optimum steric, lipophilic and lipophilic-polar and polar-polar interactions are important to fit in the active site of the target. The binding energies estimated by scoring functions, were found to have a good correlation with the experimental inhibitory potencies. Based on the binding conformations from molecular docking, it is concluded that the steric and lipophilic interactions plays major role to promote high activity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Authors are thankful to Dr. Lakshmi Kantam, Director, I.I.C.T., Tarnaka, Hyderabad and the Director Dr. N. V. Naidu, Global Institute of Biotechnology, Himayatnagar, Hyderabad for providing the facilities and Software to complete the work.

REFERENCES

- A.C. Tinker, H.G. Beaton, N.B. Smith, T. R. Cook, S.L. Cooper, L.F. Rae, K. Hallam, P. Hamley, T. McInally, D.J. Nicholls, A. D. Pimm, A.V. Wallace, *J. Med. Chem*, **2003**, 46, 913.
- [2] S.S. Palanki, Moorthy, Suto, J. Mark. Patent No. WO-9901441, Appl No. WO 98 US 13483; CAN 130:125085.
- [3] M. Tobe, Y. Isobe, H.T. M. Matsumoto, F. Obara, Takahiro, Nagasaki, H. Hayashi, *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett*, **2001**, 11, 545.

- G.M. Buckley, N. Davies, H.J Dyke, P.J. Gilbert, D.R. Hannah, A.F. Yaughan, C.A. Hunt, W.R.
 Pitt, R.H. Profit, N.C. Ray, M.D. Richard, A. Sharpe, A. J. Taylor, J.M. Whitworth and S.C.
 Williams, *Bioorg Med. Chem. Lett*, 2005, 15, 751.
- [5] A. Schlapbach, R. Heng, F. D. Padov, *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.*, 2004, 14, 357.
- [6] C.D. Timothy, H. Xiao, Smith, M. Louise, Degraffenreid, R.Michael, Powers, Jay, Tomooka, S. Craig, Clark, D. L. Hao, Xiaolin, J. C. Juan, Labelle, Marc, Walker, P.C. Nigel, Gill, L. Adrian, Talamas, X. Francisco, Labadie, S. Sharada. Patent No. WO 2003048152 Appl. No. WO 2002-US 39134; CAN 139:36536.
- [7] V.D. Piaz, M.P. Giovannoni, Eur. J. Med. Chem., 2000, 35, 463.
- [8] H.B. Cottam, H. Shih, L.R. Tehrani, B.Wasson, D.A. Carson, J. Med. Chem, 1996, 39, 2.
- [9] D. P. Jindal, R. S. Bhatti, S. Ahlawat, R. Gupta, *Eur. J. Med. Chem*, 2002, 37, 419.
- [10] J. C. Sircar, T. Capiris, S. J. Kesten, D. J. Herzig. J. Med. Chem, 1981, 24, 735.
- [11] A.E. Wakeling, S.P. Guy, J.R. Woodburn, S.E. Ashton, B.J. Curry, A.J. Barker, K.H. Gibson, *Cancer Res*, **2002**, 62, 5749.
- [12] S.T.A.Rashood, I.A. Aboldahab, M.N. Nagi, L.A. Abouzeid, A.A.M.A. Aziz, S.G.A. Hamide, K.M.Youssef, A.M.A. Obaid, H.I.E. Subbagh, *Bioorg. and Med. Chem*, **2006**, 14, 8608.
- [13] L.F. Hennequin, J. Allen, J. Breed, J. Curwen, M. Fennell, T.P. Green, C.L. Brempt, R. Morgentin, R.A. Norman, A.Oliver, L. Otterbein, P.A. Ple, N. Warin, G. Costello, *J. Med. Chem*, 2006, 49, 6465.
- F.H. ung, G. Pasquet, C.L. Brempt, J.M. Lohmann, N. Warin, F. Renaud, H. Germain, C.D. Savi, N. Roberts, T. Johnson, C. Dousson, G.B. Hill, A.A. Mortlock, N. Heron, R.W.Wilkinson, S.R. Wedge, S.P.Heaton, S. Brightwell, *J. Med. Chem*, 2006, 49, 955.
- [15] S. Jantova, M. Urbancikova, T. Maliar, M. Mikulasova, P.Ranko, L. Cipak, J. Kubikova, S. Stankovsky, K. Spirkova, *Neoplasma*, 2001, 48, 52.
- [16] A.J. Bridger, H. Zhou, D.R. Cody, G.W. Rewcastle, A.M. Michael, H.D. Showalter, D.W. Fry, A.J. Kraker, W.A. Denny, *J.Med. Chem*, **1996**, 39, 267.
- [17] I.M. Sielecki, T.L. Johnson, J.Liu, J.K. Muckelbauer, R.H. Grafstrom, S. Cox, J. Boylan, C.R. Burton, H. Chen, A. Smallwood, C. Chang, M. Boisclair, P.A. Benfield, G.L. Trainor, S.P. Seitz, *Bioorg. and Med. Chem. Lett*, **2001**, 11, 1157.
- [18] S. Jantova, L. Ruzekova, K. Spirkova, S. Stankovsky, *Biologia, Bratislava*, 1997, 52, 445.
- [19] J. Maroun, Smin. Oncol, **1988**, 15, 17.
- [20] J.T.Lin, A.R. Cashmore, M. Baker, R.N. Dreyer, M. Ernstoff, J.C. Marsh, J.R. Bertino, L.R. Whitfield, R. Delap, A.G. Lopez, *Cancer Res*, **1987**, 47, 609.
- [21] J.A. Kovacs, C.A. Allegra, J.C.Swan, J.C. Drake, J.E. Parillo, B.A. Chabner, H. Masur, *Antimicrob.Agents Chemother*, **1988**, 43, 430.
- [22] A.A. E. Zayat, T.F. Pingree, P.M.Mock, G.M. Clark, R.A. Otto, D.D. Von Hoff, *Cancer J*, **1991**, 4, 375.
- [23] P. Mani Chandrika, T.Yakaiah, A. Raghu Ram Rao, B. Narsaiah, N. Chakra Reddy, V. Sridhar and J. venkateshwara Rao, *Eur. J. Med. Chem*, **2008**, 43, 846.
- [24] P. Mani Chandrika, T. Yakaiah, A. Raghu Ram Rao, B. Narsaiah, V. Sridhar, Gunda, V. G. J. Venkateshwara Rao, K. Pranay Kumar and U. S. N. Murthy, *Indian J. of Chem*, **2009**, 48B, 847.
- [25] P. Mani Chandrika, T. Yakaiah, A. Raghu Ram Rao, B. Narsaiah, G. Gayatri, K. Pranay Kumar and U. S. N. Murthy. *Eur. J. Med. Chem*, **2010**, 45, 78.

- [26] Fred 2.1, Omega 2.0, Open eye Scientific Software, Inc, 3600 Cerrillos Road, Suite 1107, Santa Fe, NM 87507, USA. *www.eyesopen.com*
- [27] M.R. McGann, H.R. Almond, A. Nicholls, J.A. Grant and F.K. Brown, *Biopolymers*, 2003, 68, 76.
- [28] S. M. Rarey, J. Med. Chem, 2001, 44, 1035.
- [29] D.K. Gehlhaar, G.M. Verkhivker, P.A. Rejto, C.J. Sherman, D.B. Fogel, L.J. Fogel, S.T. Freer, *Chem. Biol*, **1995**, 2, 317.
- [30] Jamal. A.A.L. Jabbar, Attawi and suhair Hameed Rasheed Evaluation of Serum glycoprotein, Seromucoid, Total protein and other related biochemical parameters in women with breast cancer, *J.Applicable.Chem*, **2015**, 4(2), 500-504.
- [31] P. Babji, I. Nageswara Rao and S.K.Das Synthesis, Characterization and Antitumor activity of Fe2O3-Ag20-Tio2 Nano Composite on MCF-7 human breast cancer cells, *J.Applicable.Chem*, 2015, 4(2): 550-556.
- [32] Punam, Deepika, Anil Kumar and Sharwan K Dewan, Sodium Chloride Catalysed rapid one pot Synthesis of 1,3,6-Trisubstituted pyrimidine-2,4-diones from urea and Beta-Ketoesters, *J.Applicable.Chem*, **2015**, 4(2): 624-627.

AUTHORS' ADDRESSES

1. Dr P Mani Chandrika

Principal, Bojjam Narasimhulu Pharmacy College for Women, Vinay Nagar, I S sadan X road, Saidabad, Hyderabad Pin: 500059, Telangana. EmailId: principalbnpcw@gmail.com Mob no: 9989777995

2. Dr B. Narsaiah

Scientist G, Fluoro Organic Division Indian Institute of Chemical Technology, Tarnaka, Hyderabad.Pin:500 007, Telangana EmailId: narsaiah@iict.res.in Mob no: 9440802782

3. Prof A Raghu Ram Rao

Professor, Medicinal Chemistry Research Division University College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Kakatiya University, Warangal, Telangana Pin: 506 009

EmailId: raghumed@gmail.com

Mob no: 8790432456

4. Dr T Yakaiah

Fluoro Organic Division Indian Institute of Chemical Technology, Tarnaka, Hyderabad.Pin:500 007, Telangana. EmailId: yakaiah@gmail.com

5. Prof T Parthasarathy

Professor, Department of Chemistry, Nizam college, Opposite LB Stadium, Basheer Bagh, Hyderabad, Telangana 500001

6. S Gururaj

Department of Chemistry, Nizam college,Opposite LB Stadium, Basheer Bagh, Hyderabad, Telangana 500001