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ABSTRACT: Structure-based drug design can potentially accelerate the development of new therapeutics. In this study, a cocrystal structure of the acetylcholine binding protein (AChBP) from Capitella teleta (Ct) in complex with a cyclopropane-containing selective α4β2-nicotinic acetylcholine receptor (nAChR) partial agonist (compound 5) was acquired. The structural determinants required for ligand binding obtained from this AChBP X-ray structure were used to refine a previous model of the human α4β2-nAChR, thus possibly providing a better understanding of the structure of the human receptor. To validate the potential application of the structure of the Ct-AChBP in the engineering of new α4β2-nAChR ligands, homology modeling methods, combined with in silico ADME calculations, were used to design analogues of compound 5. The most promising compound, 12, exhibited an improved metabolic stability in comparison to the parent compound 5 while retaining favorable pharmacological parameters together with appropriate behavioral end points in the rodent studies.

INTRODUCTION

Nicotinic acetylcholine receptors (nAChRs) belong to the Cys-loop superfamily of ligand-gated ion channels (LGICs) that also include 5-HT3, GABA_A, and glycine receptors.1 They are widely distributed in the central and peripheral nervous systems, where they broadly participate in regulating major physiological functions and pathophysiological processes associated with learning and memory, mood, reward, motor control, arousal, analgesia, and inflammation.2,3 Mammalian neuronal nAChRs are homo- or heteromeric pentamers assembled from diverse combinations of subunits (α2–α10 and β2–β4). The variety in subtype stoichiometries results in neuronal nAChRs that exhibit highly variable properties in regard to ligand pharmacology, activation and desensitization kinetics, cation permeability, and subcellular and regional distribution. Each nAChR subunit consists of a large amino-terminal extracellular domain (ECD), a transmembrane domain comprising four α-helices (M1–M4), and a variable cytoplasmic domain between M3 and M4. Acetylcholine (ACh) binding sites are thought to be formed between the subunit interfaces of the ECD that involve so-called loops A–C on the principal face of an α-type subunit and the adjacent complementary face of the neighboring subunit involving loops D–F. Known heteromeric pentamers have a minimum of two α-type subunits, whereas homopentamers have five, resulting in two
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to five ACh-binding sites within the ECD, the occupancy of which by ACh or other agonists leads to global allosteric transitions of the receptor protein that mediate channel opening.\(^4\) The diversity of nAChR subtypes and their putative distinctive roles in different functions provides an opportunity, in principle, to produce subtype-specific ligands that may serve to treat a variety of conditions. However, to date, the high sequence homology across individual subtypes provides a substantial challenge for the development of subtype-selective nicotinic drugs. Nicotinic ligands lacking sufficient subtype selectivity may cause adverse side effects. For instance, nicotine (1) has well-known and epibatidine (2) has potential therapeutic benefits for a number of nervous system disorders (Figure 1). However, the therapeutic potential of these two natural products is compromised by their unacceptable side effects arising from their affinity to almost all subtypes of nAChRs, albeit with different potencies. Furthermore, although varenicline (3) has been launched and marketed as an \(\alpha 4/2\)-nAChR partial agonist for the indication of tobacco addiction, peripheral and central side effects, such as nausea, gastrointestinal symptoms, and changes in mood, have been observed in some patients.\(^4,5\) Compound 3 also functions as a full agonist at \(\alpha 7\)- and \(\alpha 3/4^*\)-nAChRs (the asterisk denotes the possible integration of other subunits into the pentamer) and also as a \(5\)-HT\(_3\) agonist.\(^6\)

Thus, understanding the detailed atomic structure remains crucial to the design of novel nicotinic agents with minimum side effects that selectively target designated receptor subtypes and thus the related nervous system pathologies to which they are linked. High-resolution crystal structures of integral membrane protein mammalian nAChRs are not yet available. Nevertheless, the invertebrate pentameric acetylcholine binding proteins (AChBPs), which are structural and functional surrogates for the N-terminal, extracellular ligand-binding domain (LBD) of nAChRs, are more readily crystallized, and they provide well-studied structural models that provide insights into ligand recognition sites and other elements of nAChR ECDs.\(^7,8\) To date, AChBPs from several different snail species have been identified, and more than 50 different ligand-bound cocystal structures have been determined, facilitating both mechanistic studies and nicotinic drug development. The majority of these structures have been obtained with AChBP from *Aplysia californica* (Ac) or *Lymnaea stagnalis* (Ls), which exhibit substantial differences in affinities for nicotinic ligands and thereby mimic distinct subtypes of nAChR.\(^9,10\) Recently, a novel AChBP has been identified from the marine anemoid *Capitella teleta* (Ct), which more closely mimics \(\alpha 4/2\)-nAChRs and their high-affinity binding of several ligands, including compound 3, thus providing a potentially useful model to study structural determinants of ligand recognition at this receptor subtype.\(^11,12\)

Accumulating evidence suggests that drugs targeting \(\alpha 4/2^*\)-nAChRs, which are the predominant subtype of neuronal nAChRs, may prove to be useful in the management of major depression.\(^13,14\) In pursuit of antidepressants that exhibit fewer side effects and act pharmacologically in novel ways, we recently reported the introduction of a chiral cyclopropane ring in place of the acetylene bond in saxetidine-A (4) that furnished a series of cyclopropane-containing ligands selective for \(\alpha 4/2\)-nAChRs.\(^15,16\) Their superior subtype selectivity makes these compounds stand out among all of the other \(\alpha 4/2\)-nAChR agonists reported to date, including the marketed drug 3. One of the most promising compounds, 5, displays subnanomolar binding affinity at \(\alpha 4/2\)-nAChRs and excellent subtype selectivity over \(\alpha 3/4^*\)- and \(\alpha 7\)-nAChRs while acting as a potent \(\alpha 4/2\)-nAChR partial agonist. Its favorable antidepressant-like effect was demonstrated in the mouse forced-swim test, suggesting that compound 5 represents a promising lead for the treatment of depression and a good progenitor to other potential candidates to advance through the drug discovery pipeline. To provide insight into the structural determinants of compound 5 that confer its remarkable nAChR subtype selectivity, partial agonism, and antidepressant-like properties, both structural studies and the comprehensive pharmacological analysis of compound 5 were carried out.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

First, we determined binding affinities (\(K_c\)) of selected cyclopropane ligands for Ac- and Ct-AChBP using \(^{[3]}\)H-epibatidine binding competition assays to evaluate the validity of using these proteins as models for high-affinity binding at \(\alpha 4/2\)-nAChRs. These binding data (Table 1) reveal high affinities of the two cyclopropane ligands for the Ct-AChBP, which are approximately 80-fold higher than those for the Ac-AChBP. Moreover, the \(K_c\) values of compound 5 are about 2-fold lower than those of compound 6 for both Ac- and Ct-AChBP, which is in agreement with the previously observed binding data\(^16\) for these two compounds at heterologously expressed \(\alpha 4/2\)-nAChRs or rat forebrain \(\alpha 4/2^*\)-nAChRs. Taken together, these data demonstrate that compounds 5 and 6 bind with higher affinity to Ct-AChBP than to Ac-AChBP, indicating that Ct-AChBP is more suitable for structural studies of ligand recognition using X-ray crystallography.

The X-ray crystal structure of Ct-AChBP in complex with compound 5 (Figure 2) was determined at a resolution of 2.3 Å (Supporting Information, Table S1). Figure 2a shows a cartoon representation of Ct-AChBP along the 5-fold symmetry axis with the C-terminus of the protein pointing toward the viewer.

![Figure 1. Selected examples of nAChR ligands.](image-url)
Difference electron density in all five ligand binding sites of the pentamer unambiguously revealed the occupancy of compound 5 (shown in sphere representation in Figure 2a). Figure 2b shows a magnified stereoview of compound 5 as well as two interacting water molecules (w1 and w2) built into 2Fo−Fc electron density (gray mesh, contoured at 1.2σ). Similar to other nicotinic ligands, compound 5 is bound at the interface between two subunits, where it forms interactions with amino acids of loops A, B, and C on the principal subunit and loops D, E, and F on the complementary subunit (in Figure 2c, principal and complementary subunits are shown in white and blue, respectively). The azetidinyl moiety of the compound (shown in yellow) protrudes deep inside the binding pocket, whereas the hydroxyethyl group attached to the cyclopropane ring points outward. The nitrogen atom of the azetidinyl moiety forms hydrogen bonds with the carbonyl oxygen of W153 (loop B) and an ordered water molecule (w2), which forms part of a chain of water molecules (w2−w5) extending into the core of the β-sandwich. In addition, the azetidinyl nitrogen forms cation−π interactions with W153 (loop B) and Y201 (loop C). Hydrophobic interactions are formed with the side chains of V154 (loop B) and Y194, Y201 (loop C) and the vicinal disulfide bond between C196 and C197 (loop C). The nitrogen atom of the pyridine ring is involved in a hydrogen bond with a water molecule (w1), which forms a bridge to interact with the peptide backbone atoms of Q116 and I1128 (loop E) on the complementary face of the binding pocket. Hydrophobic interactions are formed with the side chains of I118 and F128 (loop E). These interactions are remarkably similar to those observed in the structure of Ct-AChBP in complex with compound 3 (Figure 2d), which also binds with high affinity to Ct-AChBP and acts as a partial agonist at the α4β2-nAChRs. In the compound 3-bound structure, the ligand interactions also include water molecules that occupy nearly identical positions and bridge interactions within the complementary (w1) and principal (w2−w5) binding sites (Figure 2d). In addition, compounds 3 and 5 stabilize loop C in similarly identical conformation, which is intermediate between the contracted and extended conformation observed with most agonists and antagonists, respectively. A notable difference between the two structures is the different side-chain orientation of F102 (loop A), namely, a g- versus t-rotamer in the compound 5- and compound 3-bound structures, respectively. Such rotamer differences of the loop A aromatic residue have also been observed in crystal structures of Ac-AChBP (Y91) and Ls-AChBP (Y89). Remarkably, a superposition of the compound 3- and compound 5-bound structures (Figure 2e) demonstrates that both ligands adopt overlapping binding poses and that the two nitrogen atoms involved in water molecule interactions (w1 and w2, respectively) are in nearly identical locations. This result indicates that compounds with distinct chemical structures can
engage in similar interactions, which critically rely on the presence of two cationic centers spaced \( \sim 5.8 \) Å from each other (cationic centers are indicated with arrows in Figure 2e). Together, the results from our Ct-AChBP crystal structures reveal a common mode of interaction for compounds 5 and 3, which both act as partial agonists at \( \alpha_4 \beta_2 \)-nAChRs.

With the resolved Ct-AChBP structure in hand, and given the greater similarity between human receptor and Ct-AChBP binding data, a computational study was undertaken to generate a Ct-AChBP-based homology model for the ligand binding domain of the human \( \alpha_4 \beta_2 \)-nAChR. The use of the Ct-AChBP structure as the template is also justified by its high homology with the human \( \alpha_4 \beta_2 \) receptor (as computed by ClustalX: \( \alpha_4/ \text{Ct-AChBP} = 64.6\% \) and \( \beta_2/ \text{Ct-AChBP} = 62.1\% \)) as well as by the acceptable conservation of the key residues involved in ligand recognition (Supporting Information, Figure S1). Figure 3 reveals a ribbon structure for the ECD of the modeled, human \( \alpha_4 \beta_2 \) dimer (Figure 3A), which superimposes well on the structure of the Ct-AChBP (Figure 3B). Each monomer shows the typical, 10-stranded \( \beta \)-sandwich capped by an N-terminal \( \alpha \)-helix. The two modeled \( \beta \)-sandwich cores can be nicely superimposed on those of Ct-AChBP, whereas some divergence is observed in the superimposition of their peripheral loops, likely due to differences between their sequences and lengths.

The \( \alpha_4 \beta_2 \)-nAChR ligand binding site is located at the dimer interface and is lined by residues from loops A–C from the \( \alpha_4 \) subunit and loops D–E from the \( \beta_2 \) subunit, including Y98 (loop A), W154 (loop B), and Y195 and Y202 (loop C) as well as W57 (loop D) and V111 and L121 (loop E). As depicted in Figure S1 of the Supporting Information, the key residues are well conserved in the Ct-AChBP apart from W57, which is replaced by I64 in the Ct-AChBP, and this induces a deeper arrangement of the W153 side chain in the Ct-AChBP structure compared to that of the homologue W154 residue due to reduced steric hindrance of I64 compared to W57. As documented by Figure S2 of the Supporting Information, the key residues involved in ligand recognition show similar spatial
arrangements between Ct-AChBP and human α4β2-nAChR, thus suggesting a generally conserved architecture of the binding sites which reflects on superimposable poses of the docked and resolved compound 5 (see below).

The reliability of the generated model and its interaction properties were then analyzed by docking a set of reported compound 4 derivatives (as compiled in the Supporting Information, Table S2), including compound 5, which was cocry stallized with the Ct-AChBP. The best complex obtained for compound 5 within the binding cavity of the human α4β2 model is in encouraging agreement with the X-ray structure (Figure 4A and Figure S2 of the Supporting Information). Indeed, the azetidine ring protrudes deep inside the binding pocket, where it can stabilize pivotal H-bonds with the backbone carbonyl group of S153 and W154 (loop B). The main difference between the computed complex and the resolved one concerns F102 of the Ct-AChBP, which is replaced by Y98 (loop A) in the α4β2-nAChR model, the hydroxyl group of which is involved in a clear H-bond with the charged nitrogen atom and may replace the ordered water molecule (w2) as seen in the Ct-AChBP complex. Again, the charged ring stabilizes a set of cation−π interactions (plus various hydrophobic interactions) with the already mentioned Y98 and W153 as well as with W57 (loop D), Y92 (loop A), and Y195 and Y202 (loop C). The nitrogen atom of the pyridine ring is involved in an H-bond with the backbone atoms of L121 (loop E), and considering the distance between them (3.3 Å), it might occur both directly and through a bridging water as seen in the Ct-AChBP structure. Finally, the hydroxethyl group attached to the cyclopropane ring shows an arrangement remarkably similar to that observed in the X-ray complex because it points outward without stabilizing significant polar interactions. In detail, the cyclopropane ring elicits apolar contacts with V111, F119 (loop E), and A199 (loop C), whereas the hydroxyl group approaches loop C but does not stabilize significant polar interactions apart from a weak H-bond with the backbone atoms of A199. Such a pose confirms that the region at the interface between α4 and β2 subunits can accommodate quite large moieties, and this is in agreement with the recent human α4β2 models proposed by Li and co-workers, who indeed postulated the existence of a negative allosteric site in this region.19

When analyzing the best complexes as generated for the set of docked compound 4 congeners, one may note that most compounds assume a binding mode superimposable to that of compound 5, because in all monitored complexes, the moieties corresponding to the cyclopropane tail are unable to elicit significant polar interactions with the β2 subunit and remain in the subpocket flanked by loop C. Even the compounds bearing large moieties (as seen for some carbamate derivatives, such as compound 6) show similar binding modes, although these moieties cannot be completely harbored below loop C and thus partially protrude toward the β2 subunit without stabilizing polar contacts. Indeed, the cyclopropane tail remains in a region around loop C that, as evidenced by Figure S3 in the Supporting Information for the human model, is surrounded by apolar residues only without contacting polar residues of both α4 and β2 subunits. This suggests that the hydroxethyl group attached to the cyclopropane ring can be modified by more hydrophobic moieties without producing steric hindrance.

Rational Design and Synthesis of Fluorine-Containing Cyclopropane nAChR Ligands. On the basis of our analysis of the Ct-AChBP−compound 5 cocrystal structure together with the molecular docking studies, it is apparent that no strong hydrogen bonding interactions are observed for the hydroxyl group at the terminus of the right-hand side chain, suggesting that this hydroxyl group does not constitute an essential pharmacophoric element for receptor recognition and may therefore be further modified using other functional groups. Moreover, the free hydroxyl group in compound 5 represents a possible metabolic liability due to the potential for oxidation, glucuronidation, sulfation, and other bioconjugations.20 Consequently, small and hydrophobic functional groups might be able to replace the polar and hydrophilic hydroxyl group, thus yielding new cyclopropane ligands with improved drug-like properties. In the field of medicinal chemistry, aside from the introduction or presence of nitrogen atoms in the drug scaffolds, the incorporation of fluorne atoms likely constitutes the second most favored heteroatom that has been incorporated into biologically active molecules. The unique nature of fluorine, including its small size, high electronegativity, and high energy of bond formation to carbon, imparts a variety of advantages to fluorine-containing drugs. These advantages include properties such as enhanced binding interactions, improved metabolic stability, lack of alkylating activity (in contrast to chlorides or bromides), changes in physicochemical properties, and possibly enhanced subtype selectivity. It is not surprising that about 20% of all drugs currently on the market contain at least one fluorine atom, with many more to come.21,22 The length of the C−F bond (1.41 Å) is similar to that of the C−O bond (1.43 Å), suggesting that these atoms are biosoesters. In addition, it is well accepted that the C−F unit may participate in electrostatic interactions responsible for strengthening ligand-protein binding interactions.23 With these considerations in mind, we designed analogues of compound 5 in which the hydroxyl group is substituted with either hydrogen or fluorine atoms (compounds 10, 12, and 13). As shown in Table S3 of the Supporting Information, the blood−brain barrier (BBB) permeability of these new analogues, as estimated by their calculated logBB values, increases from −0.5 to about −0.1, which is similar to the logBB of compound 3. Drug permeability across the BBB is, of course, essential to obtaining therapeutic drug levels in the brain, as this is where the targeted α4β2-nAChRs are expressed.24 These numbers suggest a beneficial effect of the replacement of the hydroxyl group with either hydrogen or fluorine atoms on BBB penetration and subsequent bioavailability.

Docking simulations of the three proposed compounds confirm the reliability of such modifications because all derivatives assume poses almost superimposable to that of compound 5 and stabilize reinforced hydrophobic interactions with the region surrounding loop C. Thus, Figure 4B illustrates the best complex for compound 12, showing that it stabilizes the same interaction pattern already observed for compound 5 involving the azetidine and the pyridine rings. Notably, Figure 4B shows that the fluorine atom is inserted in a markedly hydrophobic niche lined by V111, F119, and the characteristic disulfide bridge of loop C (C197−C198), thus confirming the relevance of the apolar contacts elicited by this moiety. The synthesis of compounds 10, 12, and 13 is described in Scheme 1. For the terminal methyl compound, the optically pure alcohol 716 was acylated with isobutyric anhydride and the benzyl group was removed by hydrogenolysis, followed by installation of the azetidine moiety by a modified Mitsunobu reaction to obtain the intermediate 8. After removal of the isobutyryl group, the alcohol intermediate was subjected to
Scheme 1. Synthesis of Compounds 10, 12, and 13\textsuperscript{a}

\begin{align*}
\text{Scheme 1. Synthesis of Compounds 10, 12, and 13}\textsuperscript{a}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{a}Conditions: (a) isobutyric anhydride, cat. DMAP, Et3N, CH2Cl2, 0 °C to rt; (b) 10% Pd/C, H2, EtOAc/MeOH, rt; (c) 1-(tert-butoxycarbonyl)-2(3S)-azetidinymethylamol, azodicarboxyldiisopiperidide (ADDP), Ph3P·BF4·H2O, THF, 0 °C to rt; (i) (COCl)\textsubscript{2}, DMSO, Et3N, CH2Cl2, -78 °C; (ii) Ph3P=CH2, THF, 0 °C to rt; (iii) n-Bu4NF, THF, rt; (iv) i (COCl)\textsubscript{2}, DMSO, Et3N, CH2Cl2, 0 °C to rt; (v) XtalFluor-E, Et3N·3HF, CH2Cl2, rt.

standard Swern oxidation and Wittig reaction to furnish the olefin 9. Successive hydrogenation of the terminal double bond and removal of the Boc group smoothly gave the target compound 10 as its trifluoroacetate salt. For the fluorine-containing analogues, the starting alcohol 11\textsuperscript{16} was tosylated followed by reaction with \textit{n}-tetrabutylammonium fluoride. Boc protection of the resulting fluoride yielded compound 12 as its trifluoroacetate salt. Similarly, the aldehyde prepared from the same alcohol by Swern oxidation was converted to gem-difluoro using the stable and mild reagent (diethylamino)-difluorosulphonium tetrafluoroborate (XtalFluor-E), in conjunction with Et3N·3HF as a promoter. After removal of the Boc group, the resulting gem-difluoro 13 was obtained as its trifluoroacetate salt.

**In Vitro Radioligand Binding and Functional Studies.** The \(K_i\) values of all of the synthesized cyclopropane compounds, 10, 12, and 13, were evaluated by [\(3\text{H}\)]nicotinate binding competition assays at seven heterologously expressed rat nAChR subtypes. As shown in Table 2, compounds 10, 12, and 13 exhibited subnanomolar or low nanomolar binding affinities for both the \(\alpha4/\beta2\) and \(\alpha4/\beta2\)-nAChRs, which are comparable to those of compound 5. This confirms that the interactions elicited by the cyclopropyl tail are restricted to apolar contacts only and that the hydroxyl group does not take part in the binding process. All three of these compounds demonstrated good selectivity for nAChRs containing \(\beta2\) subunits (\(\alpha2/\beta2\), \(\alpha3/\beta2\), \(\alpha4/\beta2\), and \(\alpha4/\beta2\)-nAChRs) over \(\beta4\) subunits (\(\alpha3/\beta4\), \(\alpha2/\beta4\), and \(\alpha4/\beta4\)-nAChRs). As it is known that \(\alpha3/\beta4\)-nAChRs mediate autonomic nicotinic signaling, interaction with these receptors is likely to contribute to adverse side effects.\textsuperscript{1,2,6} With the exception of compound 10, the selectivity for \(\alpha4/\beta2\) over \(\alpha3/\beta4\)-nAChRs of compounds 12 and 13 is >16000-fold, suggesting that few if any peripheral side effects should be observed.

Next, the functional activity of compounds 10, 12, and 13 at the human \(\alpha4/\beta2\), \(\alpha3/\beta4\)-, and \(\alpha1/\beta1/\gamma\delta\)-nAChRs was determined using the \(86\text{Rb}^+\) ion flux assays and SH-EP1, SH-SYSY, and TE671/RD cells, respectively (Table 3; Supporting Information, Figure S4).\textsuperscript{23} All three of these ligands were found to be highly potent, partial agonists at the mixture of high sensitivity (HS) and low sensitivity (LS) \(\alpha4/\beta2\)-nAChRs having weak if any agonist activity at \(\alpha3/\beta4\)- or \(\alpha1/\beta1/\gamma\delta\)-nAChRs (Supporting Information, Figure S4). Their efficacies ranged from 68 to 76% of the response to a maximally efficacious concentration of the full agonist, carbamylcholine, for actions at HS \(\alpha4/\beta2\)-nAChRs. At LS \(\alpha4/\beta2\)-nAChRs, these ligands had no measurable efficacy as agonists. Their inactivation of nAChR function (following 10 min of pre-exposure; blockade of carbamylcholine stimulation) was most potent for \(\alpha4/\beta2\)-nAChRs and weak or absent out to 3 μM for actions at \(\alpha3/\beta4\)- or \(\alpha1/\beta1/\gamma\delta\)-nAChRs, respectively. Consistent with the binding data, the fluorine-containing compounds 12 and 13 were about 2-fold more potent than compound 10, in both agonism and functional inactivation at \(\alpha4/\beta2\)-nAChRs, which is similar to that seen for parent compound 5. The absence or weakness of agonist or antagonist activity at ganglionic \(\beta2\)-, or muscle-type \(\alpha1/\beta1/\gamma\delta\)-nAChRs indicates that the occurrence of peripheral side effects is unlikely. When all of the present data are taken into account, the presence of a fluorine-containing compound-treated mice are captured by digital video and analyzed with computer algorithms. We compared the behaviors of compound-treated mice to a database of behaviors relevant to psychiatric and antidepressant effects of a test compound can be predicted by similarity to major classes of compounds, such as antipsychotics, anxiolytics, and antidepressants. As shown in Figure S5, all of the selected nicotinic ligands produced, in most cases, dose-dependent effects on the behavioral signature of a test compound to a database of peripheral side effects relevant to psychiatric disease, we used SmartCube,\textsuperscript{31} an automated system in which the behavioral signature of a test compound to a database of effects relevant to psychiatric disease, we used SmartCube,\textsuperscript{31} an automated system in which

### Table 2. Binding Affinities of Cyclopropane Ligands and Nicotine at Seven nAChR Subtypes\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>compd</th>
<th>(\alpha2/\beta2)</th>
<th>(\alpha2/\beta4)</th>
<th>(\alpha3/\beta2)</th>
<th>(\alpha3/\beta4)</th>
<th>(\alpha4/\beta2)</th>
<th>(\alpha4/\beta2)</th>
<th>(\alpha4/\beta4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6520</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>41.8 ± 0.9</td>
<td>10.3 ± 1.8</td>
<td>852.1</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.2</td>
<td>14.8 ± 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>137.6</td>
<td>6.1 ± 1.9</td>
<td>3224</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.1</td>
<td>39.1 ± 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>85.4 ± 15.1</td>
<td>6.9 ± 1</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>23 ± 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}For experimental procedures see PDSP Assay Protocol Book (http://pdsp.med.unc.edu/). \(\alpha4/\beta2\)-nAChRs were prepared from rat forebrain. The binding data for compounds 1 and 5 were obtained from ref 16. SEM values are not provided for \(K_i\) values >100 nM.
The efficacy of agonism for compound 1 was available only for a mixed population of HS and LS α4β2-nAChRs. The efficacy of agonism for all other compounds at LS α4β2-nAChRs was approximately zero.

### Table 3. Potencies and Efficacies of Ligand Agonism and Inactivation at α4β2-nAChRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>compd</th>
<th>EC50 (nM)</th>
<th>efficacy at HS (%)</th>
<th>Hill slope</th>
<th>IC50 (nM)</th>
<th>efficacy (%)</th>
<th>Hill slope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2 ×± 1.7</td>
<td>92 ± 6</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.4</td>
<td>9.4 ×± 1.1</td>
<td>62 ± 1</td>
<td>−1.4 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.1 ×± 1.2</td>
<td>68 ± 4</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>22.2 ×± 1.4</td>
<td>87 ± 4</td>
<td>−1.1 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.3 ×± 1.4</td>
<td>76 ± 6</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>10.2 ×± 1.3</td>
<td>81 ± 4</td>
<td>−1.2 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.8 ×± 1.2</td>
<td>75 ± 7</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.4</td>
<td>8.6 ×± 1.3</td>
<td>86 ± 4</td>
<td>−1.1 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>290 ×± 1.1</td>
<td>88 ± 2</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>430 ×± 1.1</td>
<td>92 ± 2</td>
<td>−0.8 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“For experimental procedures see ref 16. Potencies (EC50 or IC50 values) and inactivation efficacies were measured for actions at a mixture of high-sensitivity (HS) and low-sensitivity (LS) α4β2-nAChRs. Due to the semilogarithmic nonlinear regression analysis, the SEM for EC50 or IC50 values is not symmetric in linear space. EC50 or IC50 values are therefore reported with a multiplying/dividing factor. Agonism efficacies were extrapolated using sazeidine-A defined as a full agonist at the HS α4β2-nAChR (see the Supporting Information for details). Results for compounds 1 and 5 were obtained from ref 16. The efficacy of agonism for compound 1 was available only for a mixed population of HS and LS α4β2-nAChRs. The efficacy of agonism for all other compounds at LS α4β2-nAChRs was approximately zero.

### Figure 5.
All of the cyclopropane-containing α4β2-nAChRs partial agonists 5, 6, 10, 12, and 13 produced a signature of activity suggesting a potential antidepressant-like effect. The drug was injected ip, 15 min before testing.

### Figure 6.
Mouse forced-swim data for compound 12. The selective serotonin re-uptake inhibitor, sertraline, produced the expected decrease in immobility. (ANOVA: F (3,36) = 12.38, p < 0.001 (left); F (4,44) = 38.97, p < 0.001 (right). (⁎) Fisher’s PLSD post hoc test: ps < 0.05 vs vehicle.) n = 9—10/group.

Behavioral signatures that are quite different from those of the vehicle and contained an antidepressant—anxiolytic component and other therapeutic signatures. All of the compounds showed no or only a minor profile of side effects.

Next, the antidepressant-like properties of compounds 10, 12, and 13 were further demonstrated in the classical mouse forced-swim test, an assay in which mice are placed into a beaker of water and the time the mouse spends passively floating in the water (immobility) is recorded. Most traditional antidepressants decrease the amount of time the mouse spends immobile. Mice were administered compound 10, 12, or 13 or the selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor sertraline, as a positive control (20 mg/kg). Compounds 10 and 13, the least potent and the most potent ligands in vitro, respectively, had no significant effect in the forced-swim test when administered intraperitoneally at a dose of 3 or 10 mg/kg. In contrast, compound 12 exhibited an antidepressant-like effect when administered intraperitoneally or orally, with a significant reduction in immobility at the minimal dose of 3 mg/kg (Figure 6).

Additionally, we note that the carbamate derivative 6 reported in our previous publication was metabolically more stable than the hydroxyl compound 5 in the microsomal stability assays (98 vs 80% of the tested compound remained unchanged after 1 h of incubation with a starting concentration of 1 μM). In this context, the fluorinated compound 12 is likely to possess enhanced metabolic stability compared to the hydroxyl compound 5, as the hydroxyl group of the latter compound is likely to undergo oxidation and/or bioconjugation reactions. Incubation with mouse, rat, dog, and human liver microsomes demonstrated that no less than 98% of compound 12 remained unchanged after 1 h of incubation at...
a starting concentration of 2 μM, thereby supporting the greater metabolic stability of the fluorinated compound 12 relative to its parent compound 5.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Herein we have used the X-ray structure of the α4β2-nAChR partial agonist 5 in complex with Ct-AChBP to refine our homology model of the human α4β2-nAChR. By combining homology modeling methods with in silico ADME calculations, we in turn designed and synthesized several new analogues of compound 5. The in vitro binding and functional data as well as the in vivo behavioral efficacy obtained for the fluorinated compound 12 were found to be comparable to the same parameters obtained for the parent hydroxyl-containing compound 5. Additionally, as expected on the basis of the time-tested principles of medicinal chemistry, the metabolic stability of analogue 12 is better than that of 5. The more limited metabolic stability of 5, which is subject to both oxidation and bioconjugation reactions, conspires to make this compound a suboptimal drug-like molecule. Of greatest significance is the structural information gleaned from the cocrystal structure of compound 5 in complex with Ct-AChBP. This particular structure has enabled us to refine our homology model of the human α4β2-nAChR, and as such we anticipate that we will be able to design other chemical scaffolds with which to interrogate these important brain receptors, thus providing the opportunity to create improved therapeutics for a host of pathophysiological mechanisms.

**EXPERIMENTAL SECTION**

**General Procedures for SmartCube.** Drugs were injected 15 min before the test, during which multiple challenges were presented over the course of the test session. At least 12 mice were used in each treatment group. Digital videos of the subjects were processed with computer vision algorithms to extract over 2000 dependent measures including frequency and duration of behavioral states such as grooming and rearing and many other features obtained during the test session. These data were compared against a standard database of therapeutic class signatures obtained with the same experimental protocol. The database comprises 14 classes of drugs with some of the major classes, such as the antidepressant class, comprising several subclasses with representatives of most of the drugs on the market. Using machine learning techniques, the reference database was combed to find reference drug class signatures. The best performing techniques were chosen from our evaluation tests and used to build classifiers that capture the therapeutic class signatures. The behavioral signatures of the test compound were then assessed quantitatively with these classifiers to predict total and specific potential therapeutic utility.

We present the major signatures in four general groups: antidepressants and anxiolytics, other therapeutic effects, side effects, and signatures not recognized by the classifiers, and similarity to vehicle (inactivity).

**General Chemistry.** All chemicals were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich or Chem-Impex, and solvents were used as obtained from Fisher Scientific or Sigma-Aldrich without further purification. Anhydrous THF and CH2Cl2 were obtained by distillation over sodium wire or CaH2, respectively. All nonaqueous reactions were run under an argon atmosphere with exclusion of moisture from reagents, and all reaction vessels were oven-dried. The progress of reactions was monitored by TLC on SiO2. Spots were visualized by their quenching of the fluorescence of an indicator admixed to the SiO2 layer or by dipping into 1/1SiO2 mixture. Products were purified by column chromatography on 230–400 mesh SiO2. Proton and carbon NMR spectra were recorded at spectrometer frequencies of 400 and 100 MHz, respectively. NMR chemical shifts were reported in δ (ppm) using the δ 7.26 signal of CHCl3 (1H NMR), the δ 4.80 signal of DDO (1H NMR), and the δ 77.23 signal of CDCl3 (13C NMR) as internal standards. 13C NMR spectra in D2O were not adjusted. Optical rotation was detected on an Autopol IV automatic polarimeter. Mass spectra were measured in the ESI mode at an ionization potential of 70 eV with an LC-MS MSD (Hewlett-Packard). The final compounds were purified by preparative HPLC, which was carried out on an ACE 5 Å column (150 × 20 mm), with detection at 254 and 280 nm on a Shimadzu SPD-10A VP detector, flow rate = 17.0 mL/min, with a gradient of 0–50% methanol in water (both containing 0.05 vol % of CF3,COOH) in 30 min. Purities of final compounds (>98%) were established by both elemental analysis and analytical HPLC, which was carried out on an Agilent 1100 HPLC system with a Synergy 4 μm Hydro-RP 80A column, with detection at 254 or 280 nm on a variable wavelength detector G1314A, flow rate = 1.4 mL/min, with a gradient of 0–100% methanol in water (both containing 0.05 vol % of CF3,COOH) in 18 min.

3-[2-(2-Furoacetate)-5-[(2R)-2-(2-pyridinyl)ethyl]-2-(2-fluoroethyl)cyclopropyl]pyridine trifluoroacetate (10): 1H NMR (CDCl3) δ 8.20 (s, 1H), 8.19 (s, 1H), 7.81 (s, 1H), 4.95 (m, 1H), 4.50 (d, J = 4.0 Hz, 2H), 4.17–4.02 (m, 2H), 2.68 (q, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 1.88 (m, 1H), 1.48–1.35 (m, 2H), 1.25 (m, 1H), 1.08 (m, 2H), 0.95 (t, J = 7.2 Hz, 3H). 13C NMR (CDCl3) δ 162.6 (TFA), 156.2, 147.3, 132.2, 125.4, 116.5 (TFA), 67.5, 58.6, 43.6, 27.6, 26.3, 20.2, 19.9, 17.1, 12.4; [α]20 = +32.7 (c 0.22, MeOH); HPLC purity = 99.2%; tR = 11.9 min. Anal. Calcd for C19H14F2N2O·CF3COOH·0.4H2O: C, 44.79; H, 4.68; F, 25.79; N, 5.65. Found: C, 44.67; H, 4.53; F, 25.79; N, 5.62.

3-[2-(2-Furoacetate)-5-[(2R)-2-(2-pyridinyl)ethyl]-2-(2-fluoroethyl)cyclopropyl]pyridine trifluoroacetate (12): 1H NMR (CDCl3) δ 8.32 (s, 1H), 8.22 (s, 1H), 7.85 (s, 1H), 4.95 (m, 1H), 4.66 (t, J = 6.0 Hz, 1H), 4.55–4.50 (m, 3H), 4.10 (m, 2H), 2.68 (q, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 1.99 (m, 1H), 1.82 (m, 2H), 1.37 (m, 1H), 1.17 (m, 2H). 13C NMR (CDCl3) δ 162.1 (TFA), 155.8, 146.0, 132.0, 128.1, 125.4, 115.8 (TFA), 84.3 (d, JCF = 157.7 Hz), 67.1, 58.2, 43.2, 33.2 (d, JCF = 18.9 Hz), 21.1, 19.4, 19.2, 15.8; [α]20 = −25.0 (c 0.26, MeOH); HPLC purity = 99.4%; tR = 6.4 min. Anal. Calcd for C19H14F2N2O·2CF3COOH·0.8H2O: C, 43.87; H, 4.62; F, 26.99; N, 5.68. Found: C, 43.51; H, 4.23; F, 26.80; N, 5.58.

3-[2-(2-Furoacetate)-5-[(2R)-2-(2-pyridinyl)ethyl]-2-(2-fluoroethyl)cyclopropyl]pyridine trifluoroacetate (13): 1H NMR (CDCl3) δ 8.34 (s, 1H), 8.25 (s, 1H), 7.87 (s, 1H), 6.04 (t, JCF = 56.4 Hz, JCF = 4.0 Hz, 1H), 4.97 (m, 1H), 4.51 (d, J = 4.0 Hz, 2H), 4.10 (m, 2H), 2.68 (t, JCF = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 2.09–1.92 (m, 3H), 1.38 (m, 1H), 1.22 (m, 2H); 13C NMR (CDCl3) δ 162.2 (TFA), 155.9, 145.3, 132.2, 128.3, 125.7, 117.1 (t, JCF = 235.9 Hz), 115.8 (TFA), 67.1, 58.2, 43.2, 36.5 (d, JCF = 18.9 Hz), 19.8, 19.0, 17.2 (t, JCF = 7.4 Hz), 15.0; [α]20 (MeOH) δ −75.8, −116.5; [α]20 = +25.0 (c 0.2 MeOH); HPLC purity = 99.3%; tR = 6.3 min. Anal. Calcd for C19H14F2N2O·2CF3COOH·1.2H2O: C, 38.98; H, 3.89; F, 32.10; N, 4.69. Found: C, 38.91; H, 3.58; F, 31.81; N, 4.65.
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