

NIH Public Access

Author Manuscript

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 September 01

Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. 2013 September 1; 23(17): . doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2013.06.065.

Truncation of the peptide sequence in bifunctional ligands with mu and delta opioid receptor agonist and neurokinin 1 receptor antagonist activities

Padma Nair^{a,b}, Takashi Yamamoto^{a,c}, Tally M. Largent-Milnes^{d,e}, Scott Cowell^a, Vinod Kulkarni^a, Sharif Moye^d, Edita Navratilova^d, Peg Davis^d, Shou-Wu Ma^d, Todd W. Vanderah^d, Josephine Lai^d, Frank Porreca^d, and Victor J. Hruby^{a,*}

^aDepartment of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Arizona, 1306 East University Boulevard, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

^dDepartment of Pharmacology, University of Arizona, 1501 North Campbell Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85724, USA

Abstract

The optimization and truncation of our lead peptide-derived ligand TY005 possessing eight amino-acid residues was performed. Among the synthesized derivatives, NP30 (Tyr¹-*D*Ala²-Gly³-Phe⁴-Gly⁵-Trp⁶-O-[3,5-Bzl(CF₃)₂]) showed balanced and potent opioid agonist as well as substance P antagonist activities in isolated tissue-based assays, together with significant antinociceptive and antiallodynic activities *in vivo*.

Keywords

bifunctional compounds; opioid receptor agonists; neutokinin-1 receptor antagonists; Truncation of peptide sequence; NMR structure

The clinical treatment of pain, especially prolonged and neuropathic pain is still a major challenge. Current analgesic drugs, such as opioid drugs are widely used following major surgery and controlling the pain of terminal diseases such as cancer, but their use is limited by several undesired side effects, including the development of tolerance and physical dependence. The mechanisms for these side effects are still largely unclear, but it is clear that prolonged pain as well as sustained opioid administration develops neuroplastic changes in the central nerve system (CNS) in which pain-enhancing neurotransmitters, such as substance P, and their corresponding receptors are up-regulated to lead to more pain and tolerance¹⁻³. Current treatment of prolonged and/or neuropathic pain generally can only modulate pain, and cannot counteract against these induced neuroplastic changes. Thus, it is

²⁰⁰⁹ Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Corresponding author. Phone: (520)-621-6332. Fax: (520)-621-8407. hruby@email.arizona.edu.

^bCurrent Address: Instructional Faculty, Pima Community College-West Campus, 2202 W. Anklam Rd, Tucson, AZ 85709, USA. ^cCurrent Address: Exploratory Research Laboratories, Ajinomoto Pharmaceuticals Co. Ltd., 1-1 Suzuki-cho, Kawasaki-ku, Kawasaki-shi 210-8681, Japan.

^eCurrent Address: Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Oregon Health Sciences University, L334 3181 SW Sam Jackson Parkway Portland, OR 97239, USA.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

not surprising that current analgesic drugs do not work well in these pathological conditions. $^{\rm 1}$

In order to address these problems, we are working at a new approach in which the opioid agonist and neurokinin 1 (NK1) antagonist activities were combined into one ligand, to neutralize the induced neuroplastic changes. The desirable pharmacological activities of our ligand would include potent analgesic affects in both acute pain and in neuropathic pain states without the development of tolerance. In fact, our lead compound TY005 (1: Tyr¹-DAla²-Gly³-Phe⁴-Met⁵-Pro⁶-Leu⁷-Trp⁸-O-[3, 5-Bzl(CF₃)₂]) has been shown to reverse neuropathic pain in a rodent model, no sign of opioid-induce tolerance, and no development of reward liability, validating our hypothesis that a single compound possessing opioid agonist/NK1 antagonist activities could be an effective treatment against neuropathic pain.^{2a} The designed multivalent chimeric molecules also have simple metabolic and pharmacokinetic properties compared to a cocktail of individual drugs for easy administration, a simple ADME property and no drug-drug interaction.

As previously reported, our drug-design strategy is based on the overlapping pharmacophores concept, in which the opioid agonist pharmacophore is incorporated at the N-terminus and the NK1 antagonist pharmacophore locates at the C-terminus of a single peptide-derived molecule (Fig 1). ³ The opioid pharmacophore of these chimeric peptides were designed based on the sequence of biphalin and DADLE,^{3,4} while the structures from 3 ,5 -(bistrifluoromethyl)-benzyl ester of N-acylated tryptophans was modified into the NK1 antagonist pharmacophore⁵. These two pharmacophores could be divided into "address" and "message" regions. Based on the previous structure-activity relationship (SAR) studies in our bifunctional ligands,³ opioid agonist pharmacophore works as a message region for NK1 antagonist activity, and vise versa, implying that **1** has four-residues (Met-Pro-Leu-Trp-O-[3 ,5 -Bzl(CF₃)₂]) message region for opioid activity and seven-residues (Tyr-*D*Ala-Gly-Phe-Met-Pro-Leu) message sequence for NK1 pharmacophore with Met⁵-Pro⁶-Leu⁷ overlapping for both of them (Fig. 1).

In this article, the contraction of the peptide sequence of **1** in its address regions was examined. The changes in their activities and selectivities were observed and discussed, and analgesic activity of a contracted peptide derivative was confirmed *in vivo*. It should be stressed that the contracted peptides have several advantages over longer peptides for easier synthesis, lower preparative cost, and being a better template to be orally-available as small molecule peptide mimetics.^{3e,6}

We initiated this research with the optimization of **1** in the Met⁵-Pro⁶-Leu⁷ sequence, which is the address region for both pharmacophores. Since the importance of Met⁵ and Leu⁷ were already validated especially for opioid activities,³ the Pro⁶ was modified into Ala (2) (Table 1). The ligand 2 showed reduced affinities at both human delta opioid receptor (DOR) and rat mu opioid receptor (MOR), and its functional activities as a mu opioid agonist were also reduced compared to those of 1 (EC₅₀ in GTP S binding assay, 72 nM; IC₅₀ in GPI assay, 1200 nM). The binding affinity of 2 at the rat NK1 receptor (rNK1) was also reduced. 3, 4 and 5, possessing CLeu, Aib and DPro at the sixth position, respectively, have the same trend in the binding affinities and functional activities: lower binding affinities at DOR, MOR and rNK1 receptors, and decreased functional activity in MVD and GPI assays, compared to those in 1. These results combined with our previous SAR clearly suggested that the Met⁵-Pro⁶-Leu⁷ is a crucial sequence for both opioid and NK1 activities in **1**. In fact, ligand 6, which possesses a seven aminoacid sequence with only a missing Met⁵ compared to the sequence of 1, displayed reduced binding affinities for DOR and MOR, as well as for all the functional activities in the GTP S binding and the isolated tissue-based assays.

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 September 01.

However, the opioid affinities and activities were rather improved in ligands with six aminoacid residues. Interestingly, compound 7 with Met in between the two message regions showed higher affinities for both DOR and MOR than those in 1 (IC₅₀ = 2.9 and 23, respectively). The EC_{50} values of 7 in the GTP S binding assays were 4.8 and 14 nM at DOR and MOR, respectively, consistent with its binding affinities. The delta opioid agonist activity in the MVD assay was at the similar level compared to 1 (26 nM), while its mu opioid agonist activity was improved (IC₅₀ value in GPI assay was 45 nM). The binding affinities of 7 at the human and rNK1 receptors were nearly equivalent to those of 1.8 has Leu in its fifth position and showed superior affinities in the radioligand binding assays and functional activities in the GTP S binding assays at both DOR and MOR. 8 also showed two-fold higher IC₅₀ value in the MVD assay, but the IC₅₀ value in the GPI assay for mu opioid agonist activity was comparable to that of **1**. The binding affinities and substance P antagonist activity in the GPI assay were improved from those of 1. While ligand 9 possessing Pro⁶ showed lower binding affinities and functional activities for delta opioid agonist (IC₅₀ = 5.7 nM, EC₅₀ = 76 nM, IC₅₀ = 85 nM for radioligand binding assay, GTP S binding assay and MVD assay, respectively). The IC₅₀ value of 9 at hNK1 was nearly equivalent to that of $\mathbf{1}$, but its K_i value for rNK1 was 5-fold decreased from $\mathbf{1}$.

It should be noted that these three contracted chimeric peptides **7-9** displayed delta selectivity (2.6 to 55-fold) in their opioid agonist activities, but compound **10** with Gly⁶ showed 16 fold selectivity for the mu receptor opioid. This mu-selectivity of **10** was maintained in the GTP S binding assays, but the isolated tissue-based assays displayed negligible selectivity. The higher E_{max} value at DOR (87%) than at MOR (36%) could have some effect on this shift in the delta/mu opioid selectivity. **10** showed 14-fold higher K_i value at hNK1 receptor than that of **1**, but its K_i value at the rNK1 was decreased. The IC₅₀ value in the GPI assay against substance P stimulation was 59 nM, which is within three-fold difference from the IC₅₀ values in MVD and GPI assays for opioid agonist activities. These results in the isolated tissue-based assays imply that ligand **10** could work as a well-balanced and potent delta and mu opioid agonist as well as a substance P antagonist *in vivo*. This potent and balanced trio of activities motivated us to perform *in vivo* animal studies using compound **10**, to confirm its *in vivo* analgesic efficacy.

Compound **10** was evaluated for *in vivo* antinociceptive activity in non-injured rats following spinal administration. Rats treated with **10** ($10\mu g/5\mu L$) withdrew the hind paw from a radiant heat source (Hargreaves) at significantly longer latencies than those treated with vehicle 15 min after compound injection (p<0.05) (Fig. 2). Vehicle was 10% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) in 90% distilled water. Next, **10** was evaluated for antiallodynic activity (von Frey) after spinal administration in spinal nerve ligated (SNL) rats. Following intrathecal injection, **10** induced significant attenuation of SNL induced tactile allodynia at 3, 30, and $30\mu g/5\mu L$ when compared to vehicle (p < 0.05). The duration of action of compound **10** was dose-dependent. However, no significant reversal of SNL induced tactile or thermal hypersensitivity was observed following oral administration of **10** compared to vehicle, indicating its limited oral bioavailability (data not shown). These *in vivo* experiments were performed as previously reported.^{2a}

In this report, we performed optimization for truncation of our lead peptide-derived ligand **1** in Met⁵-Pro⁶-Leu⁷, which is a address sequence for both opioid agonist and NK1 antagonist pharmacophores. Among the synthesized derivatives, **10**, contracted to six amino acid residues, showed mu-selective opioid and effective NK1 antagonist affinities, together with balanced and potent opioid agonist as well as substance P antagonist activities in isolated tissue-based assays. Moreover, **10** showed significant antinociceptive and antiallodynic activities *in vivo*. Since the truncated peptide is a good template to design novel peptidemimetic small molecules, these results indicate that compound **10** could be considered as an

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 September 01.

important research tool to develop a novel analgesic drugs, possibly with oral bioavailability.

Acknowledgments

The work was supported by grants from the USDHS, National Institute on Drug Abuse, DA-13449 and DA-06284. We thank Dr. Yeon Sun Lee and Dr. Eva Varga for scientific discussion, and Ms. Magdalena Kaczmarska for culturing cells.

References and notes

- (a) Mantyh PW, Allen CJ, Ghilardi JR, Rogers SD, Mantyh CR, Liu H, Basbaum AI, Vigna SR, Maggio JE. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1995; 92:2622. [PubMed: 7535928] (b) Kalso E. Eur J Pain. 2005; 9:131. [PubMed: 15737801] (c) King T, Ossipov MH, Vanderah TW, Porreca F, Lai J. Neurosignals. 2005; 14:194. [PubMed: 16215302]
- (a) Largent-Milnes TM, Yamamoto T, Nair P, Moulton JW, Hruby VJ, Lai J, Porreca F, Vanderah TW. Br J Pharmacol. 2010; 161(5):986. [PubMed: 20977451] (b) Hruby VJ. J Org Chem. 2009; 74:9245. [PubMed: 20000552]
- 3. (a) Yamamoto T, Nair P, Davis P, Ma SW, Navratilova E, Moye M, Tumati S, Vanderah TW, Lai J, Porreca F, Yamamura HI, Hruby VJ. J Med Chem. 2007; 50:2779. [PubMed: 17516639] (b) Yamamoto T, Nair P, Vagner J, Davis P, Ma SW, Navratilova E, Moye M, Tumati S, Vanderah TW, Lai J, Porreca F, Yamamura HI, Hruby VJ. J Med Chem. 2008; 51:1369. [PubMed: 18266313] (c) Yamamoto T, Nair P, Jacobsen NE, Davis P, Ma SW, Navratilova E, Lai J, Yamamura HI, Vanderah TW, Porreca F, Hruby VJ. J Med Chem. 2008; 51:6334. [PubMed: 18821747] (d) Yamamoto T, Nair P, Jacobsen NE, Vagner J, Kulkarni V, Davis P, Ma SW, Navratilova E, Yamamura HI, Vanderah TW, Porreca F, Lai J, Hruby VJ. J Med Chem. 2009; 52:5164. [PubMed: 20560643] (e) Nair P, Yamamoto T, Kulkarni V, Moye S, Navratilova E, Davis P, Largent T, Ma SW, Yamamura HI, Vanderah T, Lai J, Porreca F, Hruby VJ. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2009; 611:537. [PubMed: 19400302] (f) Yamamoto T, Nair P, Ma SW, Davis P, Yamamura HI, Vanderah TW, Porreca F, Lai J, Hruby VJ. Bioorg Med Chem. 2009; 17(20):7337. [PubMed: 19762245] (g) Yamamoto T, Nair P, Jacobsen NE, Vagner J, Kulkarni V, Davis P, Ma SW, Navratilova E, Yamamura HI, Vanderah TW, Porreca F, Lai J, Hruby VJ. J Med Chem. 2009; 52(16):5164. [PubMed: 20560643] (h) Yamamoto T, Nair P, Jacobsen NE, Kulkarni V, Davis P, Ma SW, Navratilova E, Yamamura HI, Vanderah TW, Porreca F, Lai J, Hruby VJ. J Med Chem. 2010; 53(15):5491. [PubMed: 20617791] (i) Yamamoto T, Nair P, Largent-Milnes TM, Jacobsen NE, Davis P, Ma SW, Yamamura HI, Vanderah TW, Porreca F, Lai J, Hruby VJ. J Med Chem. 2011; 54(7):2029. [PubMed: 21366266]
- Horan PJ, Mattia A, Bilsky EJ, Weber S, Davis TP, Yamamura HI, Malatynska E, Appleyard SM, Slaninova J, Misicka A, Lipowski AW, Hruby VJ, Porreca F. J Pharmacol Exp Ther. 1993; 265:1446. [PubMed: 8389867]
- (a) Cascieri MA, Macleod AM, Underwood D, Shiao LL, Ber E, Sadowski S, Yu H, Merchant KJ, Swain CJ, Strader CD, Fong TM. J Biol Chem. 1994; 269:6587. [PubMed: 7509807] (b) MacLeod AM, Merchant KJ, Cascieri MA, Sadowski S, Ber E, Swain CJ, Baker R. J Med Chem. 1993; 36:2044. [PubMed: 8393115] (c) Millet R, Goossens L, Goossens JF, Chavatte P, Bertrand-Caumont K, Houssin R, Henichart JP. J Pept Sci. 2001; 7:323. [PubMed: 11461046]
- 6. (a) Hruby, VJ.; Nair, P.; Yamamoto, T. U.S. Patent 8026218. 2007. (b) Ballet S, Feytens D, Buysse K, Chung NN, Lemieux C, Tumati S, Keresztes A, Van Duppen J, Lai J, Varga E, Porreca F, Schiller PW, Vanden Broeck J, Tourwé D. J Med Chem. 2011; 54(7):467.
- Lipkowski AW, Misicka A, Davis P, Stropova D, Janders J, Lachwa M, Porreca F, Yamamura HI, Hruby VJ. Bioorg Med Chem Lett. 1999; 9:2763. [PubMed: 10509931]

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 September 01.

Nair et al.



Figure 1. Sequences of bifunctional ligands **1-10**.

Nair et al.



Figure 2.

Antinociceptive (top) and antiallodynic (bottom) effect of bifunctional peptide derivative **10** after intrathecal injection. Arrow indicated the time of injection. PBL means post-spinal nerve ligated baseline.

<u>t</u>
_
-
0
-
-
<
_
വ
=
<u> </u>
-
<u> </u>
S
õ
C)
_
<u> </u>
ਰਾਂ
ਰੂੰ
đ
<u>p</u> t
<u>p</u> t
īpt
īpt
īpt
ipt
īpt
ipt

NIH-PA Au

Binding affinities and functional activities of bifunctional peptide derivatives at /µ opioid receptors and NK1 receptors

Table 1

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Imagin Indicating Indicati	Indificant biling accord FSI FTP 5 Indiana FSI FTP 5 FSI FTP 5 India Indian Indiana<					Opioid	agonist £	activities					NK	1 antagonist a	leti vities
	ImportedImport		radioliga	nd binding	assays	[³⁵ S] G	S dL	binding	assays	() MVD()	GPI (µ)	radioli	gand bindi	ng assays	GPI
	model Ki Model		hDOR ^{a,b}	rMOR ^{a,c}	(11) <u>A</u>	ОДЧ	ıR ^a	rMO	R ^a	Opioi	d agonist	hNK1 ^{d,e}	rNK1 ^{df}		Substance P antagonist
I_1 28 36 13 29 45 32 42 22 360 0082 0.29 3.5 25 3 50 110 22 026 41 54 51 12 0066 78 118 20 4 3.1 63 20 5.5 28 100 27 69 4.566 11 32 380 320 <	1 2.8 36 13 29 45 32 42 23 360 0.083 3.5 25 25 26 72 31 32 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 36 35 36 35 36 <t< th=""><th>ŋ</th><th>K_i (nM)^g</th><th>K_i (nM)<i>g</i></th><th></th><th>EC₅₀ (nM)^h</th><th>$\mathbf{E}_{\max}^{}$</th><th>EC₅₀ (nM)^h</th><th>$\mathbf{E}_{\max}^{}$</th><th>IC₅₀ (nM)</th><th>IC₅₀ (nM)^j</th><th>K_i (nM)^g</th><th>K_i (nM)g</th><th>Ki(rNK1) /Ki(rNK1)</th><th>$\mathop{\mathrm{Ke}}_{(\mathrm{nM})k}$</th></t<>	ŋ	K _i (nM) ^g	K _i (nM) <i>g</i>		EC ₅₀ (nM) ^h	$\mathbf{E}_{\max}^{}$	EC ₅₀ (nM) ^h	$\mathbf{E}_{\max}^{}$	IC ₅₀ (nM)	IC ₅₀ (nM) ^j	K _i (nM) ^g	K _i (nM)g	Ki(rNK1) /Ki(rNK1)	$\mathop{\mathrm{Ke}}_{(\mathrm{nM})k}$
2 25 150 60 2.5 26 72 51 120 0034 11 32 380 3 5.0 110 22 0.26 41 54 52 51 68%@1M 0.066 7.8 118 2.0 4 3.1 63 20 6.1 5.4 52 51 6.8%@1M 0.06 7.8 118 2.0 6 3.1 6.3 20 2.5 28 100 27 6.9 42%@1M 0.16 7.8 12 20 6 3.1 6.3 16 14 26 40 5.9 16 3.6 3.6 7 2.9 18 60 14 54 26 0.02 3.2 0.2 3.6 6 3.6 11 36 24 26 4.9 5.9 0.00 0.00 3.2 0.6 3.6 3.6 7 2.9	2 5 150 60 25 26 72 51 1200 0034 11 32 380 3 50 110 22 0.26 41 54 50 118 20 4 31 63 20 53 120 25 63 44 50 13 50 11 20 20 6m 30 13 76 53 10 25 54% 100 0103 16 10 20 6m 30 13 16 14 54 10 25 55% 100 0103 16 17 20 6m 30 13 14 54 20 20 32 Notested 6m 47 03 20 000 0037 16 36 36 6m 47 15 26 14 86 36 36 10 11 26 14 87 260 009 93 20 37 <td< td=""><td>1/</td><td>2.8</td><td>36</td><td>13</td><td>2.9</td><td>45</td><td>32</td><td>42</td><td>22</td><td>360</td><td>0.082</td><td>0.29</td><td>3.5</td><td>25</td></td<>	1/	2.8	36	13	2.9	45	32	42	22	360	0.082	0.29	3.5	25
3 50 10 22 0.26 41 54 52 51 68% © [M] 0.066 78 118 20 4 3.1 63 20 5.5 28 100 27 6.9 42% © [M] 0.056 78 118 20 6 13 76 58 190 25 120 30 85 25% © [M] 0.05 98 36 41 29 6 70 50 180 3.6 14 56 400 500 0.0023 16 41 29 6 33 55 1.1 36 91 50 32 50 32 36<	3 50 110 22 0.26 41 54 51 6.8% ⊕ IJM 0.066 7.8 118 20 4 31 63 20 55 28 100 27 69 42% ⊕ IJM 0.056 7.8 118 20 5 13 76 58 190 25 120 35 120 35 120 35 35 35 35 35 35 35 36 35 36	7	25	150	6.0	2.5	26	72	51	12	1200	0.034	1.1	32	380
4 3.1 63 20 5.5 28 100 27 6.9 4% 0.12 9.8 82 12 6 13 76 5.8 190 25 120 30 8.5 5% 4.1 29 3.6 4.1 29 6 50 180 3.6 35 16 140 26 450 0.023 1.6 696 3.6 7 2.9 2.3 7.9 4.8 60 14 54 26 45 0.09 0.29 3.2 0.0 8 0.6 33 55 1.1 36 20	4 3.1 63 20 5.5 28 100 27 6.9 42% @1µM 0.12 9.8 3.6 4.1 29 6m 30 3.6 13 3.6 14 0.83 3.6 4.1 29 7 2.9 180 3.6 14 24 20 0.023 1.6 696 3.6 7 2.9 7.9 18 60 14 54 26 45 0.09 0.29 3.2 9.6 8 0.6 33 55 1.1 36 47 8.8 3.6 4.1 29 20 9 5.7 15 2.6 37 47 82 1.6 1.8 20 9 5.7 15 2.6 37 47 85 260 0.097 1.6 1.8 9 1.4 87 10 36 21 27 8.4 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	e	5.0	110	22	0.26	41	54	52	5.1	6.8% @ 1µM	0.066	7.8	118	2.0
\mathbf{f} 13 76 5.8 190 25 12 25% 16 0.88 3.6 4.1 29 $\boldsymbol{6}$ 50 180 3.6 140 25 400 520 0.0023 1.6 696 3.6 $\boldsymbol{7}$ 2.9 2.3 7.9 4.8 60 140 52 0.0023 1.6 696 3.6 $\boldsymbol{7}$ 2.9 2.3 7.9 4.8 60 14 54 26 0.09 0.29 3.2 Nottested $\boldsymbol{9}$ 5.7 15 2.6 7.9 4.7 8.9 2.60 0.099 0.39 3.2 1.8 $\boldsymbol{10}$ 4.7 8.7 2.1 3.9 0.099 0.099 9.9 2.0 0.095 0.32 0.0 1.8 $\boldsymbol{10}$ 4.7 8.7 2.6 0.097 1.6 7.3 7.3 7.3 $\boldsymbol{10}$ 1.1 8.3 2.1 2	5 13 76 5.8 190 25 120 8.5 25%@1µM 0.88 3.6 4.1 29 6 ^m 50 180 3.6 3.7 16 140 250 0.0023 1.6 696 3.6 7 2.9 7.9 4.8 60 14 54 26 45 0.09 0.29 32 Nottested 8 0.6 33 55 1.1 36 37 47 89 0.09 0.09 99 90 20 9 5.7 15 2.6 37 4.7 85 50 91 59 10 4.7 0.29 0.06 3.6 3.2 0.09 0.09 3.2 50 18 10 4.7 0.29 0.66 3.6 0.09 0.09 4.2 737 59 10 10 3 1.1 83 . 1.27 3.3 <	4	3.1	63	20	5.5	28	100	27	6.9	42% @1µM	0.12	9.8	82	12
$\boldsymbol{\theta}$ 50 180 3.6 14 26 400 520 0.0023 1.6 696 3.6 7 2.9 23 7.9 4.8 60 14 54 26 47 0.09 0.29 3.2 Notested 8 0.6 33 55 1.1 36 810 910 0.090 0.099 9.9 20 9 5.7 15 2.6 37 47 85 260 0.097 1.6 1.8 10 4.7 0.29 0.76 37 47 85 260 0.007 4.2 737 59 10 4.7 0.29 0.76 1.6 8.6 1.8 2.6 1.6 1.6 1.8 2.9 10 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 2.6 2.00 2.0 2.0 </td <td>6^m 50 180 3.5 16 140 50 400 500 10 696 3.6 7 2.9 2.3 7.9 4.8 60 14 54 26 47 0.00 0.009 3.2 Notested 9 5.7 15 2.6 7.9 8.7 4.7 85 260 0.009 0.099 9.9 9.0 20 10 4.7 0.29 0.7 8.7 16 16 1.8 2.0 10 4.7 0.29 0.06 2.7 8.7 2.6 1.0 3.6 1.18 13 2.6 1.4 8.3 2.7 8.8 2.7 3.7 3.7 DAMGO 2.6 1.4 8.3 3.6 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 DAMGO 2.6 1.4 8.3 2.7 8.8 2.3 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0</td> <td>Ś</td> <td>13</td> <td>76</td> <td>5.8</td> <td>190</td> <td>25</td> <td>120</td> <td>30</td> <td>8.5</td> <td>25%@1µM</td> <td>0.88</td> <td>3.6</td> <td>4.1</td> <td>29</td>	6 ^m 50 180 3.5 16 140 50 400 500 10 696 3.6 7 2.9 2.3 7.9 4.8 60 14 54 26 47 0.00 0.009 3.2 Notested 9 5.7 15 2.6 7.9 8.7 4.7 85 260 0.009 0.099 9.9 9.0 20 10 4.7 0.29 0.7 8.7 16 16 1.8 2.0 10 4.7 0.29 0.06 2.7 8.7 2.6 1.0 3.6 1.18 13 2.6 1.4 8.3 2.7 8.8 2.7 3.7 3.7 DAMGO 2.6 1.4 8.3 3.6 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 DAMGO 2.6 1.4 8.3 2.7 8.8 2.3 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0	Ś	13	76	5.8	190	25	120	30	8.5	25%@1µM	0.88	3.6	4.1	29
7 2.9 2.3 7.9 4.8 60 14 54 26 45 0.09 0.29 3.2 Not tested 8 0.6 3.3 55 1.1 36 0.80 51 9.1 390 0.090 0.099 9.9 2.0 9 5.7 15 2.6 76 56 3.7 47 85 260 0.097 1.6 1.8 10 4.7 0.29 0.062 27 87 26 0.0057 4.2 737 59 Biphain 2.6 1.4 8.6 2.7 8.8 -7.37 59 59 DAMGO 1.4 0.54 1.1 8.3 -7.37 8.8 -7.37 59 59 L-732.138 1.4 0.54 1.5 1.50 1.6 1.6 50 50.37 1.6 59 59 Biphain 2.6 1.4 8.8 -7.5 8.8 -7.5	7 29 23 79 48 60 14 54 56 45 00 03 32 Notested 8 0.6 33 55 1.1 36 0.80 51 16 16 16 16 13 9 5.7 15 2.6 71 36 37 47 85 260 0.090 0.89 99 2.0 10 4.7 0.29 0.66 1.1 83 2.7 88 2.7 737 59 10 4.7 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 3.7 4.2 737 59 10 4.7 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 2.6 0.0057 4.2 737 59 10 2.6 1.4 8.3 2.7 8.8 2.7 9.73 130 180 2.0 10 2.6 1.4 8.8 2.7 8.8 2.7 9.73 130 2.6 2.0 10 1.1 8.3	6 ^m	50	180	3.6	35	16	140	26	400	520	0.0023	1.6	696	3.6
8 0.6 33 55 1.1 36 0.80 51 9.1 390 0.090 0.089 9.9 2.0 9 5.7 15 2.6 76 56 37 47 85 260 0.097 1.6 16 18 10 4.7 0.29 0.062 27 87 10 36 21 26 0.0057 4.2 737 59 Biphalin 2.6 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 36	8 0.6 33 55 1.1 36 0.80 51 16 16 20 9 5.7 15 2.6 76 87 47 85 260 0.097 1.6 16 1.8 10 4.7 0.29 0.062 27 87 10 36 21 26 0.007 4.2 737 59 Biphalin ⁿ 2.6 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 7.3 737 59 DAMGO 2.6 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 7.7 7	7	2.9	23	7.9	4.8	60	14	54	26	45	0.09	0.29	3.2	Not tested
9 5.7 15 2.6 76 56 37 47 85 260 0.097 1.6 16 18 10 4.7 0.29 0.062 27 87 10 36 21 26 0.0057 4.2 737 59 Biphalin 2.6 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 8.8 DAMGO 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 1.50	0 5.7 15 2.6 76 57 47 85 260 0.097 1.6 1.6 1.8 10 4.7 0.29 0.062 27 87 10 36 1.3 59 Biphalin ⁷ 2.6 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 59 DAMGO 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 2.7 8.8 59 L-732.13 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 2.0 2.73 2.9 2.7 Competition analyses were carried out using membrane preparations from transfected HN9.10 cells that constitutively expressed the DOR and MOR. See reference 3 for detailed pro 13HJDADE; Kd = 0.45 ± 0.1 nM. 1.30 1.80 2.6 2.60 2.6	×	0.6	33	55	1.1	36	0.80	51	9.1	390	0600.0	0.089	9.6	2.0
10 4.7 0.29 0.062 27 87 10 36 21 26 0.0057 4.2 737 59 Biphalin 2.6 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 1 1 8 1	10 4.7 0.29 0.062 27 87 10 36 21 26 1.3 37 59 Biphalin 2.6 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 3.7 59 DAMGO 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 3.7 50 2.6 $L-732.138$ 1.2 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 3.7 1.20 1.80 2.6 $L-732.138$ 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 2.6 $L-732.138$ 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 2.6 $L-732.138$ 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 2.6 $L-732.148$ 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 2.6 $L-732.138$ 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 $L-732.148$ 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 $1.$	6	5.7	15	2.6	76	56	37	47	85	260	0.097	1.6	16	1.8
Biphalin 2.6 1.4 0.54 1.1 83 2.7 8.8 DAMGO 37 150 0.73 130 180 250	Biphalin 2.6 1.4 0.54 1.1 8.3 2.7 8.8 DAMGO 37 150 0.73 130 180 250 L-732.138 $1.732.138$ 0.73 130 180 250 Competition analyses were carried out using membrane preparations from transfected HN9.10 cells that constitutively expressed the DOR and MOR. See reference 3 for detailed proj $^{1}_{1}$ HJDPDE: $K_{d} = 0.45 \pm 0.1$ nM. 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 $^{1}_{2}$ HJDAMGO; $K_{d} = 0.50 \pm 0.1$ nM. 1.1 1.10 1.1 1.1 1.1	10	4.7	0.29	0.062	27	87	10	36	21	26	0.0057	4.2	737	59
DAMGO 37 150 37 250	DAMGO 37 150 L-732,138 0.73 130 180 250 Competition analyses were carried out using membrane preparations from transfected HN9.10 cells that constitutively expressed the DOR and MOR. See reference 3 for detailed pro 1^{2} H]DPDPE; Kd = 0.45 ± 0.1 nM.	Biphalin ¹¹	2.6	1.4	0.54	1.1	83			2.7	8.8				
L-732,138 0.73 130 180 250	L-732.138 0.73 130 180 250 Competition analyses were carried out using membrane preparations from transfected HN9.10 cells that constitutively expressed the DOR and MOR. See reference 3 for detailed pro $[^3H]$ DPDPE; $K_d = 0.45 \pm 0.1$ nM. $[^3H]$ DAMGO; $K_d = 0.50 \pm 0.1$ nM.	DAMGO						37	150						
	^C Competition analyses were carried out using membrane preparations from transfected HN9.10 cells that constitutively expressed the DOR and MOR. See reference 3 for detailed pro $[^{3}_{1}$ H]DPDPE; $K_{d} = 0.45 \pm 0.1 \text{ nM}$.	L-732,138										0.73	130	180	250
	$^{c}l^{3}HJDAMGO; K_{d} = 0.50 \pm 0.1 \text{ nM}.$	^b [³ H]DPDP	E; $Kd = 0.45 \pm$	= 0.1 nM.											
b_{1}^{2} HJDPDFE; Kd = 0.45 ± 0.1 nM.		^{[3} H]DAMC	30; Kd = 0.50	± 0.1 nM.											

Bioorg Med Chem Lett. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 September 01.

 e^{13} H]Substance P; Kd = 0.16 ± 0.03 nM.

 f [3H] Substance P; Kd = 0.40 ± 0.17 nM.

^gThe data were collected from at least two independent experiments performed in duplicate. The Ki values are calculated using the Cheng and Prusoff equation to correct for the concentration of the radioligand used in the assay. See reference 3 for detailed procedures. h. The EC50 values were determined from the non-linear regression analysis of data collected from at least two independent experiments performed in duplicate. See reference 3 for detailed procedures.

Nair et al.

i[Total bound – Basal]/[Basal – Non-specific] × 100.

 $J_{\rm Concentration}$ at 50% inhibition of muscle contraction at electrically stimulated isolated tissues (n = 4).

k Inhibitory activity against the Substance P induced muscle contraction in the presence of 1 µM naloxone, Ke: concentration of antagonist needed to inhibit Substance P to half its activity (n = 4). See reference 3 for detailed procedures.

I Reference 3a. mReference 3b.

ⁿReference 7.