Supplementary Information

N-Phenethyl Substitution in 14-Methoxy-*N*-methylmorphinan-6-ones Turns Selective μ Opioid Receptor Ligands into Dual μ/δ Opioid Receptor Agonists

Maria Dumitrascuta,^{1§} Marcel Bermudez,^{2§} Tanila Ben Haddou,¹ Elena Guerrieri,¹ Lea Schläfer,¹ Andreas Ritsch,¹ Sandor Hosztafi,³ Aquilino Lanterro,¹ Christoph Kreutz,⁴ Dominique Massotte,⁵ Helmut Schmidhammer,¹ Gerhard Wolber,² Mariana Spetea^{1*}

 ¹Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Institute of Pharmacy and Center for Molecular Biosciences Innsbruck (CMBI), University of Innsbruck, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria
²Institute of Pharmacy, Freie Universität Berlin, D-14195 Berlin, Germany
³Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Semmelweis University, H-1092, Budapest, Hungary
⁴Institute of Organic Chemistry, Center for Molecular Biosciences Innsbruck (CMBI), University of Innsbruck, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria
⁵Centre de la Recherche Nationale Scientifique, Université de Strasbourg, Institut des Neurosciences Cellulaires et Intégratives, 67000 Strasbourg, France

*Correspondence to: Mariana Spetea E-mail: Mariana.Spetea@uibk.ac.at Phone: +43-512 507 58277

[§]These authors contributed equally.

Table of Contents

- S2: Figure S1
- S3: Figure S2
- S4: Figure S3
- S5: Figure S4
- S6: Figure S5

	1	1a	2	2a	3	3a	4	4a
A117								
D147								
Y148								
M151								
V236								
W293								
1296								
V300								
W318								
1322								
Y326								

Figure S1. Ligand-µOR interaction patterns derived from molecular docking solutions of *N*-methylmorphinans **1-4** and their respective *N*-phenethyl analogues **1a-4a**. Yellow fields indicate lipophilic contacts, red fields represent hydrogen bond acceptors, green fields represent hydrogen bond donors and positively charged centers are shown as blue fields. White fields indicate the absence of an interaction with that residue. Residues which show the same type of interaction for all morphinan ligands are marked in bold.



Figure S2. The phenyl ring system (blue) is embedded in a lipophilic subpocket. While the μ OR (A) and the δ OR (B) have an alanine residue at position 2.53, the κ OR has a value at this position. This reduces the size of the lipophilic subpocket in the κ OR and represent a steric hindrance to optimally host a phenyl ring.



Figure S3. All-atoms MD simulations support the docking results. The binding mode of **4a** in the structural δ OR model (A) is comparable to the μ OR (see Figure 4 in the main text). The results are in accordance with the δ OR crystal structure (PDB ID: 6PT3) The binding location and the major ligand orientation in the binding pocket for compounds **1a**, **2**, **2a**, **3**, **3a**, and **4** in complex with the μ OR (PDB ID: 5C1M) are visualized in panels B-G. All key interactions reported from the docking experiments remain firm over 100 ns of MD simulations for all investigated compounds.



Figure S4. Docking of *N*-methylmorphinans **1-4** (green) and their respective *N*-phenethyl analogues **1a-4a** (gray) to the active structure of μ OR (PDB ID: 5C1M). (A) Overlay of morphine (**1**) and **1a**. (B) Overlay of oxymorphone (**2**) and **2a**. (C) Overlay of 14-OMO (**3**) and **3a**. (D) Overlay of 14-MM (**4**) and **4a**.



Figure S5. A comparison of the μ OR and the δ OR indicates a major difference at the beginning of helix seven at position 7.35. Whereas the tryptophan of the μ OR (A) can form lipophilic contacts with the morphinan ring system of **4a** (blue), the leucine residue of the δ OR cannot directly contribute to ligand binding (B).