University of Groningen

Drug or tool, design or serendipity?

Verlinde, Christophe L.M.J.; Dijkstra, Bauke W.

Published in:
Nature Structural Biology

DOI:
[10.1038/nsb0695-429](https://doi.org/10.1038/nsb0695-429)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
1995

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Verlinde, C. L. M. J., & Dijkstra, B. W. (1995). Drug or tool, design or serendipity? *Nature Structural Biology*, 2(6). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nsb0695-429>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Drug or tool, design or serendipity?

Christophe L.M.J. Verlinde¹ and Bauke W. Dijkstra²

Iterative protein structure-based ligand design has led to a 'selective' inhibitor of human non-pancreatic secretory phospholipase A₂ which provides a new tool for probing metabolic pathways and may lead to a useful drug.

¹Biomolecular Structure Center, and Department of Biological Structure, University of Washington Box 357420, Seattle, Washington 98195-7420, USA

²Laboratory of Biophysical Chemistry, University of Groningen, Nijenborgh 4, 9747 AG Groningen, The Netherlands

Blocking human non-pancreatic secretory phospholipase A₂ (hnp-PLA₂) may open new doors to the 4.3 billion dollars world market¹ of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs). At least this has been the hope of many pharmaceutical companies for more than twenty years. Thus far, their scramble for this potentially massive financial reward has been in vain². However, in this issue of *Nature Structural Biology* Schevitz *et al.*³, researchers at Eli Lilly, report that they have crafted a potent inhibitor of hnp-PLA₂ that displays 1500-fold selectivity when assayed against pancreatic PLA₂. They have based their strategy on a clever screening assay and a process of it-

erative protein structure-based ligand design. An important lesson of their successful design is that it is rooted in a 'common sense' approach rather than elaborate computational methods. It remains to be seen, however, whether the new inhibitor will ever make it onto the market as a drug. That will depend on pertinent pharmacodynamic properties. Perhaps the biggest significance of the inhibitor is that it will be a new tool for unraveling the pharmacological importance of the biochemical pathways on which PLA₂ operates. The big question remains, though: can the successful rational approach followed by the Eli Lilly researchers be applied to other proteins as well, or

does the process of selective design still involve some considerable amount of luck?

PLA₂ pharmacology

Phospholipase A₂ enzymes hydrolyze the *sn*-2 ester bond of membrane phospholipids, liberating free fatty acids and lysophospholipids. Pharmacological interest in this reaction stems from the belief that PLA₂-catalyzed release of arachidonic acid is the rate-limiting step in the biosynthesis of potent mediators of inflammation and allergy, such as prostaglandins, thromboxanes and leukotrienes² (Fig. 1). Control of PLA₂ activity should translate into diverse medical applications, such as relief for patients with rheumatoid arthritis, and increased survival chances in cases of endotoxic shock or pancreatitis⁴.

Unfortunately, the existence of multiple forms of PLA₂ complicates the understanding of the cellular mechanisms of arachidonic acid production. In humans there are two 14,000 M_r secretory PLA₂s, one produced in the pancreas and the other found in inflammatory cells and exudates, this latter enzyme being referred to as hnp-PLA₂. Both enzymes are not specific for arachidonic acid-containing phospholipids, and their activity is not regulated by allosteric effectors. In contrast, there is a 87,000 M_r cytosolic PLA₂ with a clear preference for arachidonic acid phospholipids⁵, of which the activity is regulated by phosphorylation². Because there are no inhibitors known that selectively block only one of the PLA₂s the implication of hnp-PLA₂ in inflammation is based on circumstantial evidence rather than facts⁶. The selective inhibitor designed by Schevitz *et al.* may resolve this issue.

Fig. 1 Traditional view of the inflammation cascade. Cytokines, such as interleukin-1 or tumour necrosis factor, induce synthesis and secretion of PLA₂. This synthesis can be prevented by the administration of glucocorticosteroids. PLA₂ hydrolyzes membrane phospholipids liberating arachidonic acid. This step can be blocked by the new inhibitor LY311727, designed by Schevitz *et al.*³. Arachidonic acid can be metabolized by cyclo-oxygenases, a step that can be inhibited by aspirin, or by 5-lipoxygenases. This metabolism gives rise to potent mediators of inflammation, such as prostaglandins, thromboxanes and leukotrienes.

Lead discovery

The first step in the precarious undertaking of drug design is to find a good lead molecule. In principle, a lead is a molecule with micromolar affinity, or activity, that lends itself to easy chemical modification. Current approaches to find leads are based on screening of many compounds, usually of the order of 100,000. If the three-dimensional structure of the target protein is known computer-based methods can reduce the screening efforts to about 100 compounds in favourable cases⁷.

The researchers at Eli Lilly eschewed computers and went for the traditional screening method. In two and a half years they screened about 90,000 compounds against hns-PLA₂. Many of the compounds were evaluated in three different assays: a 'quick and dirty' *Escherichia coli* assay, a robust chromogenic assay, and a response test in lung tissue. Great care was taken to evaluate PLA₂ inhibition in an appropriate manner. Because PLA₂ operates at a lipid/water interface this is far from trivial, but the relevant protocols have been established⁸. The tissue assay was crucial to verify that the inhibitors would not be active *in vivo* for the wrong reasons, namely by inhibiting cyclo-oxygenase, an enzyme downstream in the inflammation cascade (Fig. 1). To their surprise, Schevitz *et al.* found a molecule that is very similar to indomethacin, a known NSAID.

Indomethacin is a strong inhibitor of cyclo-oxygenase, but had been shown to weakly block hns-PLA₂ as early as 1978⁹. It is noteworthy that indomethacin was discovered in a serotonin antagonist research program by researchers at Merck in 1963¹⁰. This program had been started in 1957 because of the incorrect belief that serotonin was a mediator of inflammation¹¹. This illustrates that it is not uncommon for drugs to be discovered for the wrong reasons, and that good leads for current drug-design programs may have been around for decades.

Lead optimization

During lead optimization several desirable properties of a lead are improved. The first goal is to in-

Fig. 2 Hns-PLA₂ and porcine pancreatic PLA₂. Ribbon diagram of hns-PLA₂ (red; N and C termini are indicated) with side chains of residues that may explain the discrimination between hns-PLA₂ (black side chains) and porcine pancreatic secretory PLA₂ (green side chains) by LY311727 (molecule in the centre of the figure). The Tyr 69 side chain of the porcine enzyme has to move out of the way in order to accommodate the inhibitor. This postulated conformation (yellow) has in fact been observed for a mutant of the porcine enzyme in the presence of an amide substrate analogue¹⁶. Figure made with the program GRASP²³.

crease the affinity of the molecule because this should guarantee a high degree of selectivity, an adage that is described in an old folktale: only Cinderella's foot is perfectly complementary to the slipper she lost at the ball. Just as a person will avoid an ill-fitting shoe, an enzyme that competes with hns-PLA₂ for inhibitor binding will be a poor competitor if the fit of the ligand is not perfect.

Traditional lead optimization relies on synthesis of large series of derivatives in the hope that a few of them will have increased potency. Rather than take this shot-gun approach, the Eli Lilly researchers determined the crystal structure of the complex between hns-PLA₂ and their lead molecule. This led to two surprises. First, the carboxylic-acid function of the lead makes a direct hydrogen bond to the carboxylate moiety of Asp 49. Docking methods would never have found this binding mode because both chemical

groups would normally be assumed to be negatively charged. Second, there is no Ca²⁺ bound to hns-PLA₂ in this complex despite the fact that the enzyme has a *K_m* of 1.5 mM for Ca²⁺ (ref. 12) and there was 10 mM Ca²⁺ present in the medium. Compared to the unliganded structure^{13,14} several conformational changes of the protein to accommodate the ligand are observed: the side chain of His 6 swings out of the active site, and Leu 2 and Lys 69 create space for the 5-methoxy moiety of the ligand. This clearly illustrates the necessity of solving crystal structures of enzyme-inhibitor complexes as our poor understanding of protein flexibility prevents us from adequately predicting ligand binding modes.

In the process of lead optimization Schevitz *et al.* again made no use of modern computational methods¹⁵ where the addition of thousands of substituents to a lead is evaluated for complementarity to the

Table 1 Residues in contact¹ with LY311727

Residue No.	hnps-PLA ₂	pps-PLA ₂ ²	hps-PLA ₂ ³	Note
2	Leu	Leu	Val	
5	Phe	* ⁴	*	
6	His	Arg	Arg	swings out for inhibitor binding
9	Ile	*	*	
18	Ala	Pro	Pro	
22	Tyr	Phe	Tyr	backbone and CB atoms in contact
23	Gly	Asn	Asn	
28	His	Tyr	Tyr	backbone atoms in contact
29	Cys	*	*	
30	Gly	*	*	
45	Cys	*	*	
48	His	*	*	
49	Asp	*	*	
52	Tyr	*	*	
69	Lys	Tyr	Tyr	
106	Phe	*	*	

¹Contact is defined as the sum of the van der Waals radii plus a tolerance of 1.0 Å;² pps = porcine pancreatic secretory; ³hps = human pancreatic secretory; ⁴* means that the residue is identical to the one in hnps-PLA₂.

target enzyme. As before, they went for a 'common sense' approach by mimicking what was already known about PLA₂ biochemistry. The Eli Lilly researchers successfully pasted onto their lead the two Ca²⁺ ligand moieties of the potent non-selective PLA₂ inhibitor (*R*)-2-dodecanoyl-amino-1-hexanol-phosphoglycol, for which the binding mode is known¹⁶. Again, determining the crystal structure of the complex with the new ligand proved to be extremely informative. For example, the 5-methoxy group of the new inhibitor moved by 5 Å compared to its position in the complex of PLA₂ with the original lead molecule. Such major shifts of lead molecules have now been seen several times by protein crystallographers: similar ligands do not necessarily bind in similar modes^{17,18}.

After four rounds of structure-based ligand design, with a turnaround time per cycle of about three weeks, Schevitz *et al.* obtained a ligand, LY311727, which was 750 times more potent than their lead against hnps-PLA₂.

Selectivity

The Eli Lilly researchers announce that their inhibitor is 1,500 times more potent against hnps-PLA₂ than against porcine pancreatic PLA₂. However, nowhere in their strategy did they take the structure of the pancreatic enzyme into account. The obtained selectivity

seems to be only a consequence of the aim for maximal potency and, therefore, maximal complementarity to hnps-PLA₂. Can we understand the origin of this selectivity?

We docked the selective Eli Lilly inhibitor LY311727 in the structure of hnps-PLA₂, as observed in the presence of a transition state analogue¹⁴, by means of the program BIOGRAF¹⁹. Next, we verified the docking mode by careful visual comparison with the stereo figure in the paper by Schevitz *et al.* (the modelling step was necessary since the coordinates of the Eli Lilly PLA₂ complexes are on hold). Subsequently, the structure of a mutant porcine pancreatic PLA₂, as observed in the presence of an amide substrate analogue¹⁶ and wild-type porcine PLA₂ in the absence of a ligand²⁰ were superimposed on the hnps-PLA₂ structure (Fig. 2). Comparison of residues whose side chains contact the inhibitor does not give a clear-cut reason why the inhibitor should be selective. The Ala 18 residue contacts the benzyl system of LY311727. The equivalent Pro residue of the porcine enzyme is about 1 Å further away, which may lead to poor packing of the benzyl substituent in the molecular complex. Val 31 of hnps-PLA₂ makes hydrophobic interactions with the ring system of the inhibitor. The equivalent Leu of porcine PLA₂ would bump into this ring system and should therefore rotate

away to avoid the clash. This would amount to exposing part of the Leu side chain and part of the ring system of LY311727 to solvent, for which an entropic energy penalty would have to be paid. Tyr 69 of porcine PLA₂ provides the same contacts as Lys 69 of hnps-PLA₂ in the complex structures; at least, in the 'swung out' conformation as observed in the presence of the amide substrate analogue¹⁶. In the absence of a ligand the Tyr side chain is 'swung in'²⁰ and would preclude binding. Since such a conformational change is vital for the functioning of the enzyme it seems likely that the associated energetic cost is minimal. In conclusion, one has to assume that the selectivity factor of 1,500 would have to be ascribed to the differences at residues 18 and 31.

A second question that arises is whether selectivity against the porcine pancreatic enzyme is relevant, because a drug will have to deal with the human pancreatic enzyme. Direct testing against this enzyme is a problem since the enzyme is not readily available. A sequence alignment (Table 1) demonstrates that of the 16 residues that presumably contact the inhibitor one is different between the porcine and human pancreatic enzyme: porcine Leu 2 is a Val in the human PLA₂. Leu 2 makes hydrophobic interactions with both the benzyl system and the indole ring of the inhibitor. Obviously the smaller Val side chain will make less extensive interactions. Therefore, LY311727 should be even more selective when tested against human pancreatic PLA₂.

The road to drug

How far away are the researchers at Eli Lilly from an effective drug? According to Connolly and Robinson²¹ a hnps-PLA₂ inhibitor should:

- possess PLA₂ specificity *in vitro* and the IC₅₀ should be better than 1 μM for enzyme and cellular assays;
- exhibit *in vivo* anti-inflammatory activity in animals sensitive to NSAIDs, 5-lipoxygenase inhibitors or platelet activating factor (PAF) antagonists;
- be orally active with a therapeutically effective dose in 50 % of the subjects (ED₅₀) smaller than 10 mg kg⁻¹;

♦reduce multiple lipid mediators in inflammatory exudates or tissues.

Only the first condition has been demonstrated for LY311727 at present, while there are indications that the last condition is met from lung strips assay³. The second and third factors are strongly related to the pharmacodynamics issues of absorption, distribution in the body, metabolism and excretion. For example, most of the peptidomimetics developed by protein structure-

based design as HIV protease inhibitors have extremely short serum half-lives, less than an hour, and are therefore of no therapeutic use²². Even if there are no problems with the pharmacodynamic properties of a molecule one still does not have a drug. Many promising molecules do not survive the stringent criteria of extensive toxicological testing.

Genesis of a tool

From the work by Schevitz *et al.* it is clear how valuable a cyclical process

of structure-based design is for lead optimization. It also highlights the current problems of purely computational design: a poor understanding of the energetics of molecular interactions, difficulties to handle conformational flexibility, and a lack of predictive tools for pharmacodynamics and toxicology¹⁵. Without any doubt LY311727 is an extremely useful tool to study the role of secretory phospholipases in the inflammation process. Its future as a route to an effective drug is less clear.

1. Cintron, I. *Chemical marketing Reporter* **243** (No.11), 7–10 (1993).
2. Glaser, K.B. *Adv. Pharmacol.* **32**, 31–66 (1995).
3. Schevitz, R.W. *et al. Nature struct. Biology* **2**, 458–465 (1995).
4. Mobilio, D. & Marshall, L.A.A. *Rep. med. Chem.* **24**, 157–166 (1989).
5. Clark, J.D. *et al. Proc. natn. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **88**, 5418–5422 (1991).
6. Vadas, P., Browning, J., Edelson, J. & Pruzanski, W. *J. Lipid Mediators* **8**, 1–30 (1993).
7. Kuntz, I.D. *Science* **257**, 1078–1082 (1992).
8. Gelb, M.H., Jain, M.K. & Berg, O.G. *FASEB J.* **8**, 916–924 (1994).

9. Kaplan, L., Weiss, J. & Elsbach, P. *Proc. Natn. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **75**, 2955–2958 (1978).
10. Shen, T.-Y. *et al. J. Am. chem. Soc.* **85**, 488–489 (1963).
11. Shen, T.-Y. & Winter, C.A. *Adv. drug Res.* **12**, 89–245 (1977).
12. Reynolds, L.J., Hughes, L.L. & Dennis, E.A. *Anal. Biochem.* **204**, 190–197 (1992).
13. Wery, J.-P. *et al. Nature* **352**, 79–82 (1991).
14. Scott, D.L. *et al. Science* **254**, 1007–1010 (1991).
15. Verlinde, C.L.M.J. & Hol, W.G.J. *Structure* **2**, 577–587 (1994).
16. Thunnissen, M.M.G.M. *et al. Nature* **347**, 689–691 (1990).
17. Banner, D. *et al. in Perspectives in Medicinal*

- Chemistry. Proceedings of the XIIIth International Symposium on Medicinal Chemistry*, 22–43 (Verlag Chimica Acta, Basel).
18. Mattos, C., Rasmussen, B., Ding, X., Petsko, G.A. & Ringe, D. *Nature struct. Biol.* **1**, 55–58 (1994).
19. BIOGRAF 3.21, Molecular Simulations, Inc., Burlington, MA, USA.
20. Dijkstra, B.W., Renetseder, R., Kalk, K.H., Hol, W.G.J. & Drenth, J. *J. molec. Biol.* **168**, 163–179 (1983).
21. Connolly, S. & Robinson, D.H. *Curr. Opin. ther. Patents*, 1141–1155 (1993).
22. West, M.L. & Fairlie, D.P. *Trends pharmacol. Sci.* **16**, 67–75 (1995).
23. Nicholls, A. & Honig, B. GRASP, Columbia University, New York.