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Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Background on System $x_c^-$

System $x_c^-$ (Sx$c^-$) is an amino acid transporter that, under physiological conditions, mediates the exchange of extracellular L-cystine (L-Cys$_2$) for intracellular L-glutamate (L-Glu) across the plasma membrane (Bridges et al., 2012b).

As an antiporter, Sx$c^-$ performs a 1:1 exchange of intracellular and extracellular amino acids. The direction of this exchange is mediated by the concentration gradients of substrates across the cell membrane. Early studies with Sx$c^-$ showed that the antiporter acts in a sodium-independent, chloride-dependent, electroneutral manner; it transports L-Cys$_2$ and L-Glu in an anionic form; and that both L-Cys$_2$ and L-Glu are capable of inhibiting the transport of one another. Under normal physiologic conditions the intracellular concentration of L-Glu well exceeds that of L-Cys$_2$ due in part to the uptake of glutamate through excitatory amino acid transporters (EAAT), as well as the rapid reduction of L-Cys$_2$ to L-cysteine (L-CysH) (Bridges et al., 2012b).

Sx$c^-$ has been found to play a role in a variety of cells throughout different organ systems. It has been characterized in cells such as fibroblasts, macrophages, hepatocytes, endothelial cells, and the brush border membranes of renal tubules and the intestine (Bannai, 1986; Burdo et al., 2006; Hosoya et al., 2002; Sasaki et al., 2002; Sato et al., 1999). However, the majority of the focus has been on the localization of Sx$c^-$ within the CNS, including neurons, glial cells, and within the blood-brain barrier (Burdo et al., 2006).

Both sides of the Sx$c^-$ exchange reaction are potentially important in the function of the CNS, as the import L-Cys$_2$ is needed for the synthesis of glutathione and oxidative
protection (Halliwell, 2006), while the exported L-Glu could contribute to neuronal communication, as well as neuronal dysfunction (Bridges et al., 2012a). Once inside the cell, L-Cys$_2$ is rapidly reduced to L-CysH, which then serves as the rate-limiting precursor for glutathione production (Sagara et al., 1993). The efflux of L-CysH and glutathione (through extracellular metabolism by $\gamma$-gluamyl-transpeptidase and aminopeptidase N to form L-CysH) are then available to provide antioxidant precursors to surrounding cells, such as mature neurons, which have little to no Sx$_c$ activity and are therefore dependent on the uptake of L-CysH (Dringen et al., 1999; Sagara et al., 1993). Beyond its antioxidant properties, glutathione has also been implicated in a variety of regulatory pathways including modulating the activity of proteins possessing a critical cysteine-residue; and interacting with receptors to influence signal transduction (Filomeni et al., 2002; Janaky et al., 1999; Seib et al., 2011).

Conversely, excess Sx$_c$ activity can result in elevated synaptic and extrasynaptic concentrations of L-Glu leading to excitotoxicity and cell death, which is seen in glial brain tumors (Ye et al., 1999) and inflammation induced by microglia (Shih et al., 2006). An example of how both of these processes interconnect is in brain tumor cells where increased glutathione synthesis can result in chemoresistance and increased clearance of xenobiotics (Huang et al., 2005), while increased efflux of L-Glu leads to excitotoxicity and cell death (Ye et al., 1999).

The dual nature of Sx$_c$ to maintain glutathione levels and L-Glu homeostasis is both advantageous and deleterious. The protective effects of glutathione are exerted through glutathione-mediated elimination pathways, as well as reduction of oxidative damage to proteins and lipids. The increased antioxidant properties provided by the production of
glutathione provide protection from many potentially toxic insults, including L-Glu itself. The complex balance of these two processes has been implicated in a variety of CNS diseases. A loss of Sx_c- function has been implicated in the etiology of chronic cocaine and nicotine addiction and relapse, as well as psychiatric disorders such as schizophrenia (Baker et al., 2003; Bridges et al., 2012a; Knackstedt et al., 2008; Madayag et al., 2010).

1.2 Structure and Family Class
Sx_c- is a member of the heteromeric amino acid transporter (HAT) family (Broer et al., 2002; Palacin et al., 2005). These transporters are heterodimers composed of an N-glycosylated “heavy chain” (4F2hc, Solute Carrier SLC3 family) covalently linked via a disulphide bond to a non-glycosylated “light chain” (xCT, SLC7A11). For this reason, HATs are also referred to as glycoprotein-associated amino acid transporters. The 4F2hc heavy subunit consists of an intracellular N terminus, a single transmembrane domain, and a large extracellular C terminus. The 4F2hc subunit is thought to be responsible for the trafficking of the light chain (the light subunit cannot reach the cell membrane without interacting with the heavy subunit) and for cell surface expression. The xCT subunit of Sx_c- is thought to be responsible for the transport activity (Broer et al., 2002; Palacin et al., 2005). Structural models of Sx_c- indicate that xCT has 12 transmembrane domains (TMDs), with N and C termini located inside the cell, and a re-entrant loop between TMD 2 and 3 that appears to participate in substrate binding and translocation(Gasol et al., 2004) (See Figure 1.1).
Figure 1.1. A Heteromeric Amino Acid Structure

Showing the heavy-chain subunit (4F2hc) in pink, and the light-chain subunit (xCT) in blue. Palacin et al., 2005, Physiol. 20:112.
1.3 Pharmacology

Early studies with Sx\textsubscript{c} focused on identifying inhibitors to provide insight into the structure activity relationships (SARs) that determine Sx\textsubscript{c} selectivity, and to aid in the development of pharmacophore models.

1.3.1 Substrates/Early Inhibitors:

Initial pharmacological studies on Sx\textsubscript{c} established L-Cys\textsubscript{2} and L-Glu as substrates of the transporter, as well as competitive inhibitors of each other. Structural mimics of these endogenous substrates were then used to further define key features of the transporters specificity. For example, Sx\textsubscript{c} exhibits a stereo-selective preference for L-amino acids. Furthermore, use of acyclic EAA analogues with shorter, “aspartate like” chain lengths demonstrated an inability to bind at Sx\textsubscript{c}, thus distinguishing it from the EAAT transport systems (Patel et al., 2004). Other defining characteristics include: the ability of L-α-aminoacidipate and L-α-aminopimelate to act as inhibitors (demonstrating that longer chain lengths can be tolerated); the inactivity of L-homocystine as an inhibitor (demonstrating the transporters limit to accommodate increasing chain lengths); and that SO\textsubscript{3} and SO\textsubscript{2} groups can replace a distal COO\textsuperscript{−} (inhibition with L-homocysteate, L-serine-O-sulphate, and L-homocysteine sulphinate), but PO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{2−} groups cannot (lack of inhibition with L-serine-O-phosphate) (Bridges et al., 2012b).

1.3.2 Conformationally Constrained Inhibitors

In an attempt to identify more potent inhibitors for Sx\textsubscript{c}, several conformationally constrained analogues of Glu where characterized (Patel et al., 2004). This strategy
restricts bond rotation so the functional groups on the molecule can be locked in a configuration that hypothetically mimics that of the endogenous substrate when it binds the transporter. Past studies have identified four such analogues that inhibit Sx$_c^-$, including quisqualate (QA), 4-S-carboxy-phenylglycine (4-S-CPG), ibotenate (IBO), and (RS)-4-Br-homoibotenate. Of note, each of these compounds is also known for exhibiting activity at other iGluRs and mGluRs. Studies examining substrate activity of these analogues showed IBO to have comparable substrate activity to that of L-Cys$_2$ (Patel et al., 2004). While (RS)-4-Br-homoibotenate and QA also acted as substrates, their ability to be transported was considerably less than that of IBO. The two most potent inhibitors, QA and 4-S-CPG (% of control 1±1 and 3±1, respectively) were the least active as substrates. Therefore demonstrating that the inhibitors with the highest affinities may promote binding, but preclude the translocation of the amino acid (Patel et al., 2004) (refer to Figure 2.1 in chapter 2).

The action of QA as a potent inhibitor at Sx$_c^-$ inspired the idea for the use of isoxazoles as scaffolds for the development of additional inhibitors of the transporter (Patel et al., 2010). Although QA blocked Sx$_c^-$, other closely related iGluR agonists, such as aminomethyl isoxazole propionic acid (AMPA) did not. Further work based on the structure of AMPA led to the development of a series of amino-3-carboxy-5-methylisoxazole propionic acid (ACPA) analogues and non-amino acid biosteres of ACPA, e.g. hydrazone acids (Matti et al., 2013; Patel et al., 2010). It was found that the addition of lipophilic groups to the ACPA template produced inhibitors with affinities comparable to that of L-Cys$_2$. The Sx$_c^-$ structure activity relationship (SAR) studies allowed the distinguishing characteristics between GluR2 and Sx$_c^-$ binding sites to be
delineated, as well as demonstrated the presence of lipophilic binding domains adjacent to the substrate-binding site within the transporter (see Figure 1.2). To further assess the relative position of these lipophilic domains, several 4,5-di-substituted ACPA derivatives were prepared to test whether the aryl groups were interacting with one or two distinct sites (Patel et al., 2010). Although less potent than the mono-substituted isoxazoles, the use of the “hybrid” isoxazoles, which contained lipophilic substituents at both positions 4 and 5, confirmed the presence of two distinct lipophilic domains within the binding pocket. When tested for substrate activity, it was found that these 4,5-di-substituted inhibitors could not act as substrates of Sx_c, suggesting that even though the binding site could accommodate the added steric bulk, the additional lipophilic groups precluded translocation. In addition, extensive kinetic analysis demonstrated that the ACPA analogue, S-2-naphthyl-ethyl-ACPA acted via competitive inhibition (Patel et al., 2010). Along with 4-S-CPG, one of the most potent inhibitors of Sx_c characterized to date is sulfasalazine (SSZ; 6-oxo-3-(2-[4(N-pyridin-2ylsulphamoyl)phenyl]diazenyl-cyclohexa-1,4-dienecarboxylic acid)) (Gout et al., 2001). SSZ is more commonly used for its anti-inflammatory properties in diseases such as Chron’s and Rheumatoid Arthritis. As a prodrug, SSZ is broken down into sulphapyridine and 5-amino salicylic acid to exert its anti-inflammatory effect, but only the prodrug form of SSZ is capable of inhibiting activity at Sx_c. Although SSZ, like many Sx_c inhibitors, contains a benzoic acid moiety, it lacks the prototypical L-α-amino acid head group. However, SSZ maintains potency equal to that of 4-S-CPG, suggesting that portions of SSZ may interact effectively enough with other domains of the Sx_c binding site so that the interactions with an L-α-amino acid head group are no longer required (Bridges et al., 2012b).
**Figure 1.2.** A Ligand-Based Pharmacophore model of Sx\(_{c}^{-}\)

A ligand-based superposition, 3D pharmacophore model for the substrate binding on Sx\(_{c}^{-}\).

A & B, L-Glu in green; L-Cys\(_2\) in yellow; QA in teal; 4-S-CPG in purple; NACPA in red; and TFMIH in orange. F, pharmacophore binding template.
1.4 Kinetics of Transporter Inhibition

1.4.1 Competitive inhibition

One of the most common mechanisms of inhibition of transporters and enzymes is competitive inhibition. In this mechanism, binding of the substrate and inhibitor are mutually exclusive and only one can bind at a time. This most often occurs when the inhibitor is binding to the same site as the substrate. In enzyme kinetics, a competitive inhibitor acts by decreasing the number of free enzyme molecules available to bind substrate, and eventually form product. This process is diagramed in Figure 1.3.

With competitive inhibition, the substrate and inhibitor exert reciprocal effects on the concentration of EI and ES complexes. Therefore, increasing the concentration of substrate decreases the concentration of EI complex and raises the reaction velocity. In other words, by increasing the amount of substrate the inhibitor can be out-competed for the binding site and the transporter can eventually attain its maximum velocity (or $V_{\text{max}}$).

The amount of substrate needed to completely overcome inhibition depends on the concentration of inhibitor present, its affinity for the enzyme ($K_i$), and the $K_m$ for the substrate.
Figure 1.3: Enzyme Kinetics for Competitive Inhibition

Scheme diagramming the enzyme kinetics for competitive inhibition. E, enzyme; I, inhibitor; k, rate constant; $K_i$, inhibitory constant; S, substrate; P, product.
For Sx_c, competitive inhibition is best exemplified with the endogenous substrate L-cystine. Figure 3.1 in the supplemental data shows a graphical presentation of competitive inhibition with L-cystine using three separate kinetic analyses: a Michaelis-Menten plot, a Lineweaver-Burk plot, and an Eadie-Hofstee plot. Since increasing substrate concentration can overcome inhibition with a competitive inhibitor, the maximum transport velocity ($V_{\text{max}}$) remains constant. However, the apparent value of the Michaelis-Menten constant ($K_m$) increases. This is best seen in the Lineweaver-Burk and Eadie-Hofstee plots, where the lines intersecting at the Y-axis represent constant $V_{\text{max}}$ values in both graphs. The $K_i$ value for competitive inhibitors can be determined using replots of the slopes from the Lineweaver-Burk graphs vs. [I]. These replots can also be used to distinguish between competitive and noncompetitive inhibition. The replot of $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ vs. [I] is linear for competitive mechanisms, while the replot of $V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. [I] is linear for noncompetitive mechanisms (Newell et al., 2013; Segel, 1993).

1.4.2 Noncompetitive inhibition

Noncompetitive inhibition occurs when the substrate and inhibitor bind reversibly and independently at different sites, meaning that the substrate can bind both E and EI, and the inhibitor can bind both E and ES complexes. This process is diagramed in Figure 1.4.
**Figure 1.4: Enzyme Kinetics for Noncompetitive Inhibition**

Sheme diagraming the enzyme kinetics for a noncompetitive inhibitor. E, enzyme; I, inhibitor; k, rate constant; $K_i$, inhibitory constant; S, substrate; P, product.
While the enzyme-inhibitor complex (or in the case of Sxc- the transporter-inhibitor complex) can still bind the substrate, its efficiency at transforming/transporting that substrate is decreased; reflected by a decrease in Vmax. However, the apparent Km value remains constant for noncompetitive inhibitors. In other words, in noncompetitive inhibition increasing the amount of substrate will not overcome the binding of the inhibitor. Therefore, the transporter will never reach its maximum velocity (Vmax) as long as there is inhibitor present. For “pure” noncompetitive inhibitors, the E and EI have equal affinity for the substrate, and the EIS complex does not generate product. In more complex types of noncompetitive inhibition, the binding of the inhibitor does affect the apparent affinity of the enzyme for the substrate, causing the lines of the double-reciprocal plot (Lineweaver-Burk plot) to intersect in the third or fourth quadrant (meaning the transporter has less affinity for the substrate, represented by a higher \( K_m^{\text{apparent}} \) value) (Segel, 1993).

These more complex mechanisms of noncompetitive inhibition can also be evaluated by using replots from the Lineweaver-Burk graphs of slope vs. [I] and \( 1/V_{\text{max, apparent}} \) vs. [I]. If both the slope and the \( 1/V_{\text{max, apparent}} \) replots yield similar \( K_i \) values, the analogue is considered to be acting as a “pure” noncompetitive inhibitor (where the binding of the inhibitor does not alter the binding of the substrate); see Figure 3.8 of supplemental data. However, if the \( K_i \) value from the \( 1/V_{\text{max, apparent}} \) vs. [I] is considerably higher than that of the \( K_i \) value from the slope vs. [I], this would suggest that the binding of the inhibitor decreases the affinity with which the transporter binds the substrate; see Figure 3.4 of supplemental data (Segel, 1993).
1.5 Present Work with Sxₐ⁻

Previous studies carried out by our lab have demonstrated that isoxazoles with lipophilic modifications at either the #4 or #5 position of the heterocyclic ACPA base structure exhibit increased inhibitory activity at Sxₐ⁻. In the present work, a novel set of isoxazole compounds containing lipophilic aryl groups at both the #4 and #5 positions were developed and assessed for inhibitory activity at Sxₐ⁻. The development of di-substituted analogues was used to confirm the presence of multiple lipophilic binding pockets within the binding site. These 4,5-di-substituted analogues also underwent extensive kinetic analysis to characterize their mechanism of inhibition. As will be seen in the following chapter, our structure activity studies have led to the identification of both competitive and noncompetitive inhibitors. A select sample of these inhibitors will be presented in Chapter 2, and an expanded library of compounds is presented in Chapter 3.

Demonstration of noncompetitive inhibition is a very interesting discovery since no noncompetitive inhibitors have been developed for this target. This finding could mean the discovery of a new allosteric binding site within the transporter, which could lead to development of a new class of compounds with increased potency and specificity at Sxₐ⁻.
Chapter 2. Neurochemistry International Publication
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ABSTRACT

The System X_C^- antiporter is plasma membrane transporter that mediates the exchange of extracellular L-cystine with intracellular L-glutamate. This exchange is significant within the context of the CNS because the import of L-cystine is required for the synthesis of the antioxidant glutathione, while the efflux of L-glutamate has the potential to contribute to either excitatory signaling or excitotoxic pathology. Changes in the activity of the transport system have been suggested to contribute to the underlying pathological mechanisms of a variety of CNS disorders, one of the most prominent of which is it highly enriched expression glial brain tumors. In an effort to produce more potent System X_C^- blocker, we have been using amino-3-carboxy-5-methylisoxazole propionic acid (ACPA) as a scaffold for inhibitor development. We previously demonstrated that the addition of lipophilic aryl groups to either the #4 or #5 position on the isoxazole ring markedly increased the inhibitory activity at System X_C^-.

In the present work a novel series of analogues has been prepared in which aryl groups have been introduced at both the #4 and #5 positions. In contrast to the competitive action of the mono-substituted analogues, kinetic analyses indicate that the di-substituted isoxazoles block System X_C^- mediated uptake of ³H-L-glutamate into SNB-19 activity by a noncompetitive mechanism. These new analogues appear to be the first noncompetitive inhibitors identified for this transport system, as well as being among the most potent blockers identified to date. These diaryl-isoxazoles should be of value in assessing the physiological roles and molecular structure of System X_C^-.
1. INTRODUCTION

The System $X_c^-$ (Sx$_c^-$) antiporter is a plasma membrane transporter present in multiple cell types that typically mediates the exchange of extracellular L-cystine (L-Cys$_2$) with intracellular L-glutamate (L-Glu) (for review see: (Bridges et al., 2012a; Bridges et al., 2012b; Lewerenz et al., 2013). Functioning as an obligate exchanger, the antiporter utilizes the L-Glu concentration gradient generated by the Na-dependent excitatory amino acid transporters (EAATs) to drive the uptake of L-Cys$_2$. Once inside the cell, the L-Cys$_2$ is rapidly reduced to L-cysteine (L-CysH) where, among many metabolic roles, it serves as a rate-limiting precursor in the synthesis of the glutathione. While studies in most cells have focused on the role of Sx$_c^-$ in glutathione production and antioxidant protection, the requisite efflux of L-Glu through the antiporter carries with it added significance in the CNS, where this L-Glu has the potential to contribute to both excitatory signaling and excitotoxic pathology. When both the import of L-Cys$_2$ and the export of L-Glu are taken into account, the Sx$_c^-$ antiporter has been linked to a very wide array of physiological and pathological processes including: brain tumor growth (Watkins et al., 2012), drug addiction (Madayag et al., 2010; Reissner et al., 2010), chemosensitivity and chemoresistance (Huang et al., 2005), viral pathology (Espey et al., 1998), oxidative protection (Shih et al., 2006), the operation of the blood brain barrier (Hosoya et al., 2002), neurotransmitter release (Baker et al., 2002), and synaptic organization (Augustin et al., 2007). Of particular interest, is the role of Sx$_c^-$ in gliomas, where astrocytoma cells express markedly enriched levels of Sx$_c^-$ and the obligate export of L-Glu that accompanies the import of Cys$_2$ (possibly to meet the increased synthetic demands for GSH) appears large enough to produce an excitotoxic necrosis that may aid
tumor growth, migration and the production of peritumoral seizures (Lyons et al., 2007; Patel et al., 2004; Sontheimer, 2008; Ye et al., 1999). Significantly, the development of more potent and selective blockers of Sx_c^- hold considerable potential to suppress the growth of primary brain tumors (Sontheimer et al., 2012).

Sx_c^- is a eukaryotic Heteromeric Amino acid Transporter (HAT) (aka glycoprotein-associated amino acid exchangers) classified within the Amino acid, Polyamine, and organic Cation (APC) transporter super-family and L-Amino acid Transporter (LAT) family (Palacin et al., 2005; Verrey et al., 2004). As the HAT classification suggests, Sx_c^- is composed of a glycoslated "heavy chain" required for the trafficking and cell surface expression of the dimer (4F2hc aka CD98, SLC3 family) and a "light chain" that mediates transport activity (xCT, SLC7A11). Structural studies on the xCT subunit indicate that it possesses 12 transmembrane domains (TMDs), intracellular N and C termini, and a reentrant loop between TMD 2 and 3 that may participate in substrate binding and translocation (Gasol et al., 2004; Jimenez-Vidal et al., 2004). While physiologically Sx_c^- mediates the exchange of intracellular L-Glu and extracellular L-Cys_2, its activity can be followed by quantifying the uptake of either radiolabeled substrate, with each acting as a competitive inhibitor of the other. When compared to the EAATs, Sx_c^- exhibits a distinct ionic dependency (Cl-dependent, Na-independent) and pharmacological specificity (Bridges et al., 2012b). Unfortunately, many of compounds initially identified as inhibitors of Sx_c^- are also well known for interacting with other components of the EAA system (e.g., quisqualate, ibotenate, serine-O-sulfate and bromo-homo-ibotenate), decreasing their utility for functional studies in more complex
physiological preparations. For these reasons we have been pursuing the development of more potent and selective inhibitors of $\text{Sx}_C^-$. Notwithstanding the issue of cross-reactivity, the actions of the isoxazoles and closely related heterocyclics mentioned above prompted the development of a series of derivatives based upon amino-3-carboxy-5-methylisoxazole propionic acid (ACPA). While ACPA exhibits little or no activity itself, the systematic addition of lipophilic substituents onto its isoxazole ring has yielded a growing library on increasingly potent $\text{Sx}_C^-$ inhibitors (Matti et al., 2013; Patel et al., 2010). The more effective inhibitors within this series included the introduction of benzyl or naphthyl-based aryl groups at two positions on the isoxazole ring: $i$) replacing the methyl moiety at position #4 or, $ii$) via a hydrazone linkage, replacing the ethyl amino acid group at position #5. In all cases kinetically examined in detail, the analogues acted as competitive blockers of the $\text{Sx}_C^-$-mediated uptake of $^3\text{H}$-L-Glu, leading to the conclusion that there were lipophilic domains adjacent to the substrate binding site on the transport protein. To further assess the relative position of these lipophilic domains, several 4,5-di-substituted ACPA derivatives were prepared to test whether the aryl groups were interacting with one or two distinct sites (Patel et al., 2010). While considerably less active as $\text{Sx}_C^-$ inhibitors than a number of the mono-substituted isoxazoles, the results nonetheless were consistent with the presence of two lipophilic "pockets" on the antiporter. In the present work we have continued optimizing aryl group substituents at the 4 and 5 positions of the isoxazole ring of the ACPA template to generate some of the most potent inhibitors of $\text{Sx}_C^-$ yet identified. Further, kinetic analyses indicate that unlike the parent mono-substituted derivatives, these "hybrid" di-substituted isoxazoles act as noncompetitive inhibitors of
Sx\textsubscript{C}\textsuperscript{−}. These findings identify a new pharmacological strategy with which to regulate Sx\textsubscript{C}\textsuperscript{−} activity, as well as raise interesting questions as to the position of the lipophilic domains relative to the substrate binding site on the transporter.

2. METHODS AND MATERIALS

2.1 Chemistry: Synthesis

The novel analogues reported in this study were prepared from the bromo acetal 6 shown in Scheme 2.1 (Nelson et al., 2008). Suzuki-Miyaura palladium (McDaniel et al., 2011) catalyzed coupling with the corresponding arylboronic acids put the C-5 aryl in place, 7-9, hydrolysis of the acetal, hydrazone condensation (Patel et al., 2010), and hydrolysis of the C-3 ester under basic conditions (Matti et al., 2013) to arrive at the products 2-4 was then accomplished as previously described.

2.2 Cell Culture

SNB-19 glioma cells, purchased from American Type Culture Collection (Manassas, VA), were grown in DMEM/F-12 medium (pH 7.4) containing 1 mM pyruvate and 16 mM NaHCO\textsubscript{3} and supplemented with 10% fetal calf serum. The cells were cultured in 150 cm\textsuperscript{2} flasks (Corning) and maintained at 37 °C in a humidified atmosphere of 5% CO\textsubscript{2}. In the [\textsuperscript{3}H]-L-glutamate uptake experiments, cells were seeded in 12 well culture plates (Costar) at a density of 5 x 10\textsuperscript{4} cells/well and maintained for 3 days until 80-90% confluent. Protein concentrations were determined by the bicinchoninic acid (BCA) method (Pierce).
Figure 2.1: Structures of Isoxasole-Based Ligands
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Scheme 2.1: Reagents and Reaction Conditions

Reagents and reaction conditions: a. NBS CCl₄ b. ArB(OH)₂, PdL₄, CsCO₃ c TsOH, Acetone d. Bis-3,5-trifluoromethylphenylhydrazine e. 3N NaOH f. HCl
2.3 Glutamate Uptake Assay

Uptake of $^3$H-L-glutamate into cultured cells was quantified using a modification of the procedure of Martin and Shane as previously described Patel et al., 2010. Briefly, individual wells after removal of culture media, were rinsed three times and pre-incubated in 1 ml Na$^+$-free HEPES buffered (pH 7.4) Hank’s balanced salt solution (HBHS) at 30 °C for 5 min. The Na$^+$-free buffer contained: 137.5 mM choline Cl, 5.36 mM KCl, 0.77 mM KH$_2$PO$_4$, 0.71 mM MgSO$_4$.7H2O, 1.1 mM CaCl$_2$, 10 mM D-glucose, and 10 mM HEPES. Uptake was initiated by aspiration of the pre-incubation buffer and the addition of a 500 ml aliquot of Na$^+$-free transport buffer containing $^3$H-L-glutamate (4–16 mCi/ml) mixed with L-glutamate (10–500 mM, final concentration). In those assays that evaluated inhibitor activity, the 500 ml aliquot of transport buffer contained both the $^3$H-L-glutamate and potential inhibitors to ensure simultaneous addition. Following a 5 min incubation at 30 °C, the assays were terminated by three sequential 1 ml washes with ice cold buffer and then the cells were dissolved in 1 ml of 0.4 M NaOH for 24 h. An aliquot (200 ml) was then transferred into a 5 ml glass scintillation vial and neutralized with the addition of 5 ml glacial acetic acid followed by 3.5 ml Liquiscint® scintillation fluid (National Diagnostics) to each sample. Incorporation of radioactivity was quantified by liquid scintillation counting (LSC, Beckman LS 6500). Values are reported as mean ± S.E.M and are corrected for non-specific uptake (e.g., leakage and binding) by subtracting the amount of $^3$H-L-glutamate accumulation at 4°C.

2.4 Kinetic Analyses

Michaelis-Menten and Lineweaver–Burk plots and associated kinetic parameters ($K_m$ and $V_{max}$) for transport inhibitors were estimated using a non-linear curve fitting analysis.
(KaleidaGraph 3.6.5). Kᵢ determinations from LWB and Eadie-Hofstee replots were calculated using linear-regression analysis (KaleidaGraph 3.6.5).

3. RESULTS

3.1 Inhibition of the $\text{Sx}_c^-$-mediated uptake of $^3\text{H}-\text{L-glutamate}$

The inhibitory activity of the compounds was determined by quantifying the ability of the analogues to reduce the accumulation of $^3\text{H}$-$\text{L}$-$\text{Glu}$ into human SNB-19 glioblastoma cells under Cl-dependent (Na-free) conditions. A number of glioma cell lines, including SNB-19, express markedly higher levels of $\text{Sx}_c^-$ and reduced levels of the sodium-dependent excitatory amino acid transporters (EAATs) than do primary astrocytes, making them well suited for pharmacological assays of the exchanger (Ye et al., 1999). The compounds were initially screened at a single concentration of substrate (100 $\mu$M $^3\text{H}$-$\text{L}$-$\text{Glu}$) and isoxazole (500 $\mu$M) to confirm inhibitory activity. As reported in Table 1, all of the analogues almost completely blocked the uptake of the $^3\text{H}$-$\text{L}$-$\text{Glu}$ into cells. (The data are reported as % of control uptake, thus the smaller the number the greater the level of inhibition.) The activity for 4-bis-TFM-HMICA (Compound #1, Table 1) has been previously reported, although its kinetic mechanism had not been examined in detail (see below). These initial screenings confirmed that the introduction of aryl groups to isoxazole scaffold as both mono-substitutions at the 4 or 5 positions or di-substitutions at both could produce potent inhibitors of $\text{Sx}_c^-$. 

3.2 Competitive Inhibition of the $\text{Sx}_c^-$ by the mono-substituted isoxazoles

The inhibitory action of 4-bis-TFM-HMICA was characterized in greater detail using a standard Michaelis-Menten analysis in which the concentration of both the isoxazole...
derivative and substrate (\(^3\)H-L-Glu) were systematically varied. While the inhibitory activity of 4-bis-TFM-HMICA has been previously reported, that study did not include a characterization of its kinetic mechanism. A representative series of plots from these assays are depicted in Figure 2, which includes both a \(V\) vs. \(S\) plot (Panel A) and a \(1/V\) vs. \(1/S\) Lineweaver-Burk plot (Panel B). The pattern of inhibition displayed by 4-bis-TFM-HMICA is representative of a competitive mechanism and is consistent with the inhibitory action of related isoxazoles that have been modified with aryl groups at the C4 position of the heterocyclic ring (Matti et al., 2013; Patel et al., 2010). A replot of the slopes of the lines from the representative Lineweaver-Burk plot vs. [I] (Figure 2, Panel C) was used to determine \(K_i\). An average of \(n=3\) such analyses yielded a \(K_i\) of \(61 \pm 5 \mu M\) for 4-bis-TFM-HMICA (Table 1). A replot of averaged \(K_{m,\text{apparent}}\) vs. [I] was also linear and yielded a similar \(K_i\) value (\(\approx 80 \mu M\)), as would be expected for a competitive inhibitor (plot not shown) (Segel, 1993).
**Table 2.1: Percent of Control Uptake of $^3$H-L-Glu and $K_i$ Values for Sx$_c^*$**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound (500 µM)</th>
<th>Sx$_c^*$-mediated $^3$H-L-Glu uptake (% of Control)</th>
<th>$K_i$ Value from LWB Slope Replots</th>
<th>Inhibitory Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Chemical Structure" /></td>
<td>14 ± 4 (n=3)</td>
<td>61 ± 5 µM (n=3)</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Chemical Structure" /></td>
<td>6 ± 1 (n=3)</td>
<td>22 ± 2 µM (n=3)</td>
<td>Noncompetitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Chemical Structure" /></td>
<td>14 ± 4 (n=3)</td>
<td>13 ± 1 µM (n=3)</td>
<td>Noncompetitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Chemical Structure" /></td>
<td>6 ± 9 (n=5)</td>
<td>3 ± 1 µM (n=5)</td>
<td>Noncompetitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.2: Representative Kinetic Analyses and \( K_i \) Determination for 4-bis-TFM-HMICA

SNB-19 cells were assayed for \(^3\)H-L-Glutamate uptake under Cl-dependent (Na-free) conditions in the presence of a range of inhibitor concentrations. Data are plotted as pmol/min/mg protein and have been corrected for non-specific uptake and leakage. Panels A and B, \( K_m \) (=150 \( \mu \)M) and \( V_{\text{max}} \) (=1100 pmol/min/mg protein) values were determined by non-linear curve fitting of the saturation curves and linear regression analysis of LWB plots (KaleidaGraph 4.1.3). Panel C, \( K_i \) (70 \( \mu \)M) values were determined by linear regression of LWB slope vs. [I] replot.
Figure 2.3: Representative Kinetic Analysis of 5-4-TFM-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA

Displaying Noncompetitive Inhibition

Panel A, Michaelis-Menten analysis. Panel B, LWB replot. Panel C, LWB slope vs. [I] replot. Panel D, Eadie-Hofstee replot. $K_m (\approx 160 \, \mu M)$, $V_{max} (\approx 1100 \, \text{pmol/min/mg protein})$, and $K_i$ (3 $\mu M$) values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph 4.1.3.
3.3 Noncompetitive Inhibition of the Sx_c^- by di-substituted isoxazoles

The di-substituted isoxazole analogues with aryl groups appended at both the #4 and #5 position were similarly assayed to determine a mechanism of inhibition. Representative plots are shown in Figure 3 for 5-4-TFM-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (Compound #4, Table 1), the most potent of the blockers examined. In contrast to mono-substitutions made at either of these positions, all three di-substituted analogues exhibited a pattern of inhibition consistent with noncompetitive inhibitors. Both the V vs. S and Lineweaver-Burk plots demonstrate that the inhibitors produced a decrease in V_max with little or no change in K_m, as would be expected of noncompetitive inhibition. Again, replots of the slopes from the Lineweaver-Burk graphs were linear and used to determine K_i values (Table 1). A representative slope replot for 5-4-TFM-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA is included in Figure 3, Panel C (average K_i = 3 ± 1 µM, n=5). Competitive and noncompetitive inhibitors can also be distinguished by replots from Lineweaver-Burk graphs of either K_m,apparent vs. [I], linear for competitive mechanisms, or 1/V_max, apparent vs. [I], linear for noncompetitive inhibition (Segel, 1993). In the instance of 5-4-TFM-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA, the replot of 1/V_max, apparent vs. [I] was indeed linear and yielded a K_i of ≈ 8µM (plots not shown). If both the slope replot and the 1/V_max, apparent vs. [I] replot yield similar K_i values, as is the case for 5-4-TFM-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA, the analogue is considered to be acting as a "pure" noncompetitive inhibitor, where the binding of the inhibitor does not alter the binding affinity of the substrate (Segel, 1993). Interestingly, while the K_i values determined by these two replot methods for 5-4-TFM-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA and 5-Naphthyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (Compound #3, Table 1) were not markedly different, the K_i values for 5-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA
(Compound #2, Table 1) generated from the $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. [I] replots was $\approx 60 \, \mu M$ (average n=3), a substantial increase over the $\approx 20 \, \mu M K_i$ determined by the slope replot method (plots not shown). This would suggest that in contrast to the other noncompetitive inhibitors, the binding of 5-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA to Sx$_c^-$ also decreased the affinity with which the transporter binds L-Glu.

As the identification of the di-substituted isoxazoles as noncompetitive inhibitors was unexpected, the kinetic data was also analyzed using the Eadie-Hofstee method as a second graphical approach. As depicted in Figure 3 (Panel D) for 5-4-TFM-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA, the plots of $V$ vs. $V/[S]$ for it and 5-Naphthyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA yielded a series of parallel lines, a pattern indicative of noncompetitive inhibition. The Eadie-Hofstee plot for 5-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA generated non-intersecting lines consistent with mixed inhibition (plot not shown). This pattern of mixed inhibition is consistent with the analysis described above in which the binding of the inhibitor also reduces the ability of the transporter to bind L-Glu as a substrate. When the $K_m/V_{\text{max}}$ (equivalent to a Lineweaver-Burk slope) and $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ values garnered from the Eadie-Hofstee graphs were replotted vs. [I], the resulting $K_i$ values were very similar to those determined from replots of the Lineweaver-Burk graphs (plots not shown).

4. DISCUSSION

To the best of our knowledge, the diaryl-substituted isoxazoles described here represents the first noncompetitive blockers to be indentified for the Sx$_c^-$ transport system. This mechanism of action was not anticipated, as these compounds emerged during the course of structure-activity-relationship (SAR) studies aimed at the optimization of rationally
designed competitive inhibitors. Thus, the isoxazole scaffold was selected for analogue
development because of the previously characterized inhibitory activity of a number of
closely related compounds, including quisqualate, ibotenate, and bromo-homoibotenate
(Bridges et al., 2012b). Employing amino-3-carboxy-5-methylisoxazole (ACPA) as a
starting point, it was found that the inhibitory activity increased as aryl groups were
systematically introduced at either the 5 position on the isoxazole ring (replacing the
methyl group on ACPA) or the 4 position of the isoxazole via a hydrazone linkage
(replacing a-amino acid moiety) (Matti et al., 2013; Patel et al., 2010). Of these
derivatives, S-2-naphthyl-ethyl-ACPA emerged as one of the more potent Sx_c^- inhibitors.
Detailed kinetics analysis similar to those employed in the present study confirmed that it
competitively inhibited the Sx_c^- mediated uptake of ^3H-L-Glu into SNB-19 cells with a
K_i of about 50 µM (Patel et al., 2010). Given the structural similarities between the
anallogues, it was assumed at that time that 4-bis-TFM-HMICA, in which the aryl
substitution was made at the 4 position of the isoxazole ring was also acting as a
competitive manner. That this was indeed the case is confirmed in the present report,
where Michaelis-Menten and Lineweaver-Burk analyses demonstrated it competitively
inhibited the uptake of ^3H-L-Glu into SNB-19 cells with a K_i of about 60 µM. The
results also confirm the utility and potency of 4-substituted aryl isoxazole as inhibitors.
These SAR data were particularly valuable, as the results suggest that there are lipophilic
pockets adjacent to the substrate binding site on Sx_c^- and that the presence of these
domains can be exploited, much in the same manner as has been done with the excitatory
amino transporters (EAATs) (Bridges R, 2009), to develop more potent and specific
inhibitors.
SAR-based comparisons between the 4- and 5-aryl substituted isoxazole raised intriguing questions as to whether the aryl groups were interacting with the same domains on the transporter (necessitating a change in the manner in which the isoxazole ring was accommodated) or that there are two distinct lipophilic domains present on Sx_c. This issue was directly addressed through the synthesis and testing of comparable isoxazoles that were modified at both positions. Although markedly less potent than the mono-substituted isoxazoles, the ability of these first "hybrid" analogues to also block the Sx_c-mediated uptake of 3H-L-Glu into SNB-19 cells supported the conclusion that there were at least two distinct lipophilic domains on the transporters, although the mechanism of inhibition remained to be elucidated (Patel et al., 2010). These results prompted the optimization of the di-substituted isoxazoles and the preparation of the three analogues characterized in the present study. As initial screening assays suggested that these new isoxazoles were among the best inhibitors yet developed for Sx_c (Table 1), kinetic studies were carried out to determine K_i values. Surprisingly, the Michaelis-Menten and Lineweaver-Burk analyses of the concentration dependence with which the di-substituted isoxazoles inhibited the Sx_c-mediated uptake of 3H-L-Glu into SNB-19 cells revealed a noncompetitive mechanism rather than a competitive one. Similarly, when the uptake rates were analyzed using Eadie-Hofstee plots as a second approach, the resulting pattern of lines was again indicative of a noncompetitive inhibitor. The Lineweaver-Burk plots were further analyzed by repotting both the slope and 1/Vmax, apparent (1/V intercept) vs. [I]. If a compound is acting as "pure" noncompetitive inhibitor, then these two replots should both be linear and yield the same value for K_i (i.e., -X intercept). This was the case for 5-4-TFM-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA, where its K_i value of about 5 µM places it among
the most potent Sx_c− inhibitors yet identified (Bridges et al., 2012b). Mechanistically, the data suggest this inhibitor can bind to either the empty or substrate-occupied transporter to produce a "dead end" complex (i.e., an inactive transporter) and that is does so in a manner that does not alter the binding of the substrate (e.g., L-Glu). Among the three isoxazoles examined, only 5-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA exhibited a substantial difference between the two replots methods, yielding a K_i of about 20 µM from the slope replot and 60 µM from the 1/V intercept replot. While there are different types of mixed inhibition involving multiple sites of interaction that could produce such results, the most straightforward interpretation suggests that 5-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA is noncompetitively inhibiting Sx_c− with a K_i of ≈20 µM, but that when it is bound the analogue also reduces the affinity of the transporter for its substrate (Segel, 1993). Such a interpretation is also supported by the fact that the other closely related di-substituted isoxazoles are both more potent and act as "pure" noncompetitive inhibitors.

The switch from a competitive to a noncompetitive mechanism observed with the di-substituted isoxazoles raises intriguing questions as to the molecular relationships between the potential sites of action on Sx_c−. Based upon the competitive action of the mono-substituted isoxazoles, such as 4-bis-TFM-HMICA, it was hypothesized that the isoxazole portion of the molecule was acting as an L-Glu mimic and interacting with substrate binding domains, while the trifluoromethyl-substituted benzyl group was interacting with an adjacent lipophilic domain. As a consequence of occupying some portion of the substrate site, it would competitively block the binding of L-Glu. The 5-monosubstituted isoxazole would be hypothesized to bind in an analogous manner, only it would be interacting with a different lipophilic domain, the presence of which is
supported by the inhibitory action of the di-substituted "hybrid" isoxazoles. If this is occurring, the present demonstration of the noncompetitive action of the di-substituted analogue may reflect the optimal binding of the two aryl groups to their respective lipophilic domains in a manner that still inhibits uptake, but also repositions the isoxazole ring such that it is no longer directly precludes the binding of L-Glu. This, in turn, would lead to the hypothesis that the substrate binding and lipophilic domains are located in close proximity to one another. The competitive action of the other isoxazoles would also be consistent with this model. Further, lipophilic domains have been identified in a number of other transport systems that are in close proximity to the substrate binding domains, including the EAATs and the serotonin transport (SERT) (Bridges R, 2009; Leary et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2009). However, the possibility that the aryl-substituted isoxazole are acting at a site well removed from the substrate binding site cannot be excluded. In such an instance, analogue binding would have to produce conformational changes that inhibited transport activity in a manner that may or may not have also blocks Glu binding, reflecting competitive and noncompetitive mechanisms, respectively. Whichever mechanisms are ultimately resolved, the marked increase in the potency of the present inhibitors, likely also reflect the presence of the trifluoromethyl groups on the aryl substituents. The role of fluorine in enhancing the binding affinity of the ligands likely arises from either the proper filling of apolar pockets, multipolar C–F···H–N, C–F···C=O, and C–F···H–Ca interactions or polar interaction with electropositive side chains (Bissantz et al., 2010; Muller et al., 2007; Zhou et al., 2009; Zurcher et al., 2008). It is entirely plausible that with three trifluoromethyl groups present on the most potent inhibitor, 5-4-TFM-Benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA, that several types of interactions
contribute to the enhanced binding affinity. Future work within this evolving library of compounds will focus on the continued optimization of these aryl group interactions. The protein domains with which these ligands interact have been postulated to represent either intermediate binding sites guiding substrate permeation (e.g., "vestibule sites") or potential allosteric regulatory sites (e.g. "halogen binding pockets") (Singh et al., 2008; Zhou et al., 2009). Ligands occupying these sites may prevent the transporter from accessing one or more conformational states within the alternate access mechanism that is required for substrate translocation. Ironically, this will likely include exploring different linkers between the aryl groups that now, in the face of a noncompetitive mechanism, may no longer require the inclusion of a glutamate (or cystine) mimic.
Chapter 3. Supplemental Data

Using methods described in Chapter 2, extensive pharmacokinetic analysis was performed on potential Sx̂ inhibitors including analogues of sulfasalazine and ACPA. A subset of these compounds have been documented in previous publications by our lab (Newell et al., 2013; Patel et al., 2010). Supplemental data for these compounds will be presented here, along with extensive kinetic data for the remaining compounds within this class. In addition, kinetic data for the endogenous substrate, L-Cys₂ is presented in Figure 3.1 to demonstrate competitive inhibition. Competitive inhibition can also be seen for the susalimod analogue, RB 553 in Figure 3.2. Percent of control for each compound, as well as Kᵢ values for LWB slope replots are presented in Table 3.1 for early inhibitors, and in Table 3.2 for novel susalimod and isoxazole analogues.
Table 3.1: Early Inhibitors of Sx$_{-}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>$Sx_{-}$-mediated $^3$H-L-Glu Uptake (Percent of control)</th>
<th>$K_i$ Values ($\mu$M)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-Glutamate</td>
<td>$26 \pm 3$ (n=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-Cystine</td>
<td>$22 \pm 3$ (n=14)</td>
<td>$29 \pm 10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibotenate</td>
<td>$20 \pm 1$ (6)</td>
<td>$31 \pm 3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RS)-4-Br-Homo-IBO</td>
<td>$7 \pm 1$ (7)</td>
<td>$18 \pm 4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quisqualate</td>
<td>$1 \pm 1$ (n=9)</td>
<td>$5 \pm 3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S)-4-CPG</td>
<td>$3 \pm 1$ (n=3)</td>
<td>$5 \pm 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfasalazine</td>
<td>$0.5 \pm 0.5$ (n=3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPA</td>
<td>$95 \pm 2$ (n=6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPA</td>
<td>$98 \pm 12$ (n=3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1. Legend

For percent of control uptake of $^3$H-L-Glu, SNB-19 cells were assayed for L-$[^3]$H-Glu (100 µM) uptake under Cl-dependent (Na-free) conditions in the presence of inhibitor (500 µM). Values are reported as mean ± SEM of control activity (accumulation in the absence of inhibitors, i.e. 100%). For $K_i$ determination, SNB-19 cells were assayed for L-$[^3]$H-glutamate uptake in the presence of a range of inhibitor concentrations (10-500µM). $K_i$ values were determined directly from a re-plot of Lineweaver-Burk slope vs. [I] values using linear regression fitting. Values are reported as mean ± SEM.

*For $K_i$ values, n ≥ 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Sx&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;-mediated ³H-L-Glu Uptake (Percent of control)</th>
<th>K&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt; from LWB slope replots</th>
<th>Inhibitory Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Susalimod</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.3 (n=4)</td>
<td>3 ± 0.7 µM (n=4)</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> 4-bis-TFM-HMICA</td>
<td>14 ± 4 (n=3)</td>
<td>56 ± 8 µM (n=3)</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> 5-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA</td>
<td>6 ± 1 (n=3)</td>
<td>22 ± 2.5 µM (n=3)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> 5-4-phenylpiperidinyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA</td>
<td>26 ± 4 (n=3)</td>
<td>59 ± 9 µM (n=3)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> 5-4-biphenyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA</td>
<td>49 ± 3 (n=3)</td>
<td>97 ± 9 µM (n=3)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> 5-naphthyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA</td>
<td>13 ± 4 (n=5)</td>
<td>13 ± 1 µM (n=5)</td>
<td>Noncompetitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> 5-4-TFM-benzl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA</td>
<td>6 ± 9 (n=5)</td>
<td>3 ± 1 µM (n=5)</td>
<td>Noncompetitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> 5-4-methoxy-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA</td>
<td>4.7 ± 2.7 (n=3)</td>
<td>13 ± 1.6 µM (n=3)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> 5-3-methoxy-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA</td>
<td>3 ± 1.7 (n=3)</td>
<td>37 ± 12 µM (n=5)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2. Legend

For percent of control uptake of $^3$H-L-Glu, SNB-19 cells were assayed for L-$[^3$H]-Glu (100 µM) uptake under Cl-dependent (Na-free) conditions in the presence of isoxazole-hydrazone derivatives (500 µM). Values are reported as mean ± SEM of control activity (accumulation in the absence of inhibitors, i.e. 100%). For $K_i$ determination, SNB-19 cells were assayed for L-$[^3$H]-glutamate uptake in the presence of a range of inhibitor concentrations (10-500µM). $K_i$ values were determined directly from a re-plot of Lineweaver-Burk slope vs. [I] values using linear regression fitting. Values are reported as mean ± SEM.
Figure 3.1: L-Cystine – Competitive Inhibition
**Figure 3.1. Legend**

Representative kinetic analysis of L-Cystine. *Panel A*, Michaelis-Menten analysis. *Panel B*, Lineweaver-Burk plot. *Panel C*, Eadie-Hofstee plot. *Panel D*, LWB $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ vs. $[I]$ replot. *Panel E*, LWB slope vs. $[I]$ replot. *Panel F*, LWB $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. $[I]$. $K_m \approx 162 \mu M$, $V_{\text{max}} \approx 985 \text{ pmol/min/mg protein}$, and $K_i (29 \mu M)$ values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph (4.1.3). *Panel G*, chemical structure for L-Cystine.

This data is consistent with competitive inhibition as seen by the constant $V_{\text{max}}$ values and increasing $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ values. This is represented by lines intersecting at the Y-axis for both the LWB and Eadie-Hofstee plots. Competitive inhibition is also demonstrated by the linear replot of $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ vs. $[I]$ (*panel D*).
**Figure 3.2:** Susalimod (1)– Competitive Inhibition

- **A:** Graph showing competitive inhibition with different concentrations of L-glutamate (L-glu).
- **B:** Graph depicting the relationship between inhibition and concentration.
- **C:** Graph illustrating the inhibition rate vs. substrate concentration.
- **D:** Graph showing the effect of concentration on inhibition rate.
- **E:** Graph depicting a linear relationship with concentration.
- **F:** Graph showing another linear relationship.
- **G:** Structural formula of Susalimod (1).
Figure 3.2. Legend

Representative kinetic analysis of susalimod (1). Panel A, Michaelis-Menten analysis. Panel B, Lineweaver-Burk plot. Panel C, Eadie-Hofstee plot. Panel D, LWB $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ vs. [I] replot. Panel E, LWB slope vs. [I] replot. Panel F, LWB $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. [I]. $K_m$ (≈205 µM), $V_{\text{max}}$ (≈ 1380 pmol/min/mg protein), and $K_i$ (3 µM) values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph (4.1.3). Panel G, chemical structure of susalimod.

This data is consistent with competitive inhibition as seen by the constant $V_{\text{max}}$ values and increasing $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ values. This is represented by lines intersecting at the Y-axis for both the LWB and Eadie-Hofstee plots. Competitive inhibition is also demonstrated by the linear replot of $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ vs. [I] (panel D).
Figure 3.3: 4-bis-TFM-HMICA (2) – Competitive Inhibition
Figure 3.3. Legend

Representative kinetic analysis of 4-bis-TFM-HMICA (2). Panel A, Michaelis-Menten analysis. Panel B, Lineweaver-Burk plot. Panel C, Eadie-Hofstee plot. Panel D, LWB $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ vs. [$I$] replot. Panel E, LWB slope vs. [$I$] replot. Panel F, LWB $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. [$I$]. $K_m$ (≈ 188 µM), $V_{\text{max}}$ (≈ 1220 pmol/min/mg protein), and $K_i$ (56 µM) values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph (4.1.3). Panel G, chemical structure of 4-bis-TFM-HMICA.

This data is consistent with competitive inhibition as seen by the constant $V_{\text{max}}$ values and increasing $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ values. This is represented by lines intersecting at the Y-axis for both the LWB and Eadie-Hofstee plots. Competitive inhibition is also demonstrated by the linear replot of $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ vs. [$I$] (panel D).
Figure 3.4: 5-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (3) – Mixed Inhibition
**Figure 3.4. Legend**

Representative kinetic analysis of 5-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (3). *Panel A*, Michaelis-Menten analysis. *Panel B*, Lineweaver-Burk plot. *Panel C*, Eadie-Hofstee plot. *Panel D*, LWB $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ vs. [I] replot. *Panel E*, LWB slope vs. [I] replot. *Panel F*, LWB $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. [I]. $K_m (\approx 150 \, \mu\text{M})$, $V_{\text{max}} (\approx 2040 \, \text{pmol/min/mg protein})$, and $K_i (22 \, \mu\text{M})$ values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph (4.1.3). *Panel G*, chemical structure of 5-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA.

These data are very difficult to interpret because it contains elements of both competitive and noncompetitive inhibition. For example, with increasing inhibitor concentrations, there is an increase in the $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ values and a decrease in the $V_{\text{max}}$ values. This can also be seen in the LWB plot where the lines are intersecting between the X- and Y-axes. Therefore, the mechanism of inhibition for this compound is not fully understood. In addition, since the $K_i$ value from the $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. [I] is considerably higher than that of the slope vs. [I] plot, this would suggest there is a decreased affinity for which the transporter binds L-Glu.
Figure 3.5: 5-4-phenylpiperidinyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (4) – Mixed Inhibition
Figure 3.5. Legend

Representative kinetic analysis of 5-4-phenylpiperidinyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (4). Panel A, Michaelis-Menten analysis. Panel B, Lineweaver-Burk plot. Panel C, Eadie-Hofstee plot. Panel D, LWB $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ vs. [I] replot. Panel E, LWB slope vs. [I] replot. Panel F, LWB $1/V_{\max,\text{apparent}}$ vs. [I]. $K_m (= 160 \mu\text{M}), V_{\max} (= 2000 \text{ pmol/min/mg protein}),$ and $K_i (59 \mu\text{M})$ values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph (4.1.3). Panel G, chemical structure of 5-4-phenylpiperidinyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA.

These data are very difficult to interpret because panel A suggests noncompetitive inhibition while panels B and C tend to suggest more competitive inhibition. With increasing inhibitor concentrations there is also an increase in $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ and a decrease in $V_{\max}$ observed for this compound. Therefore, the mechanism of inhibition for this compound is not fully understood. In addition, since the $K_i$ value from the $1/V_{\max,\text{apparent}}$ vs. [I] is considerably higher than that of the slope vs. [I] plot, this would suggest there is a decreased affinity for which the transporter binds L-Glu.
Figure 3.6: 5-4-biphenyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (5) – Mixed Inhibition
Figure 3.6. Legend

Representative kinetic analysis of 5-4-biphenyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (5). Panel A, Michaelis-Menten analysis. Panel B, Lineweaver-Burk plot. Panel C, Eadie-Hofstee plot. Panel D, LWB $K_{m, \text{apparent}}$ vs. [I] replot. Panel E, LWB slope vs. [I] replot. Panel F, LWB $1/V_{max, \text{apparent}}$ vs. [I]. $K_m$ ($\approx 180$ µM), $V_{max}$ ($\approx 1130$ pmol/min/mg protein), and Ki (97 µM) values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph (4.1.3). Panel G, chemical structure of 5-4-biphenyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA.

These data are very difficult to interpret because panels A and B are suggestive of noncompetitive inhibition while panel C has elements of both competitive and noncompetitive since the lines are neither intersecting nor parallel. With increasing inhibitor concentrations there is also an increase in $K_m, \text{apparent}$ and a decrease in $V_{max}$ observed for this compound, which is suggestive of mixed inhibition. Therefore, the mechanism of inhibition for this compound is not fully understood. In addition, since the Ki value from the $1/V_{max, \text{apparent}}$ vs. [I] is considerably higher than that of the slope vs. [I] plot, this would suggest there is a decreased affinity for which the transporter binds L-Glu.
Figure 3.7: 5-naphthyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (6) – Noncompetitive Inhibition
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Figure 3.7. Legend

Representative kinetic analysis of 5-naphthyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (6). Panel A, Michaelis-Menten analysis. Panel B, Lineweaver-Burk plot. Panel C, Eadie-Hofstee plot. Panel D, LWB $K_{\text{m,apparent}}$ vs. [I] replot. Panel E, LWB slope vs. [I] replot. Panel F, LWB $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. [I]. $K_m (\approx 220 \mu\text{M})$, $V_{\text{max}} (\approx 1200 \text{ pmol/min/mg protein})$, and $K_i (13 \mu\text{M})$ values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph (4.1.3). Panel G, chemical structure of 5-naphthyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA.

This data is consistent with noncompetitive inhibition as seen by the constant $K_{\text{m,apparent}}$ values and decreasing $V_{\text{max}}$ values. This can be seen by lines intersecting at the X-axis in the LWP plot, and the parallel lines of the Eadie-Hofstee plot. Noncompetitive inhibition is also demonstrated by the linear $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. [I] plot (panel F).
Figure 3.8: 5-4-TFM-benzl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (7) – Noncompetitive Inhibition
Figure 3.8. Legend

Representative kinetic analysis of 5-4-TFM-benzl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (7). Panel A, Michaelis-Menten analysis. Panel B, Lineweaver-Burk plot. Panel C, Eadie-Hofstee plot. Panel D, LWB $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ vs. [I] replot. Panel E, LWB slope vs. [I] replot. Panel F, LWB $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. [I]. $K_m$ ($\approx 190$ µM), $V_{\text{max}}$ ($\approx 1200$ pmol/min/mg protein), and $K_i$ (3 µM) values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph (4.1.3). Panel G, chemical structure of 5-4-TFM-benzl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA.

This data is consistent with noncompetitive inhibition as seen by the constant $K_{m,\text{apparent}}$ values and decreasing $V_{\text{max}}$ values. This can be seen by lines intersecting at the X-axis in the LWP plot, and the parallel lines of the Eadie-Hofstee plot. Noncompetitive inhibition is also demonstrated by the linear $1/V_{\text{max,apparent}}$ vs. [I] plot (panel F).
Figure 3.9: 5-methoxy-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (8) - Mixed Inhibition
Representative kinetic analysis of 5-4-methoxy-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (8). Panel A, Michaelis-Menten analysis. Panel B, Lineweaver-Burk plot. Panel C, Eadie-Hofstee plot. Panel D, LWB $K_m,_{\text{apparent}}$ vs. [I] replot. Panel E, LWB slope vs. [I] replot. Panel F, LWB $1/V_{\text{max},_{\text{apparent}}}$ vs. [I]. $K_m \approx 230 \, \mu\text{M}$, $V_{\text{max}} \approx 1650 \, \text{pmol/min/mg protein}$, and $K_i \approx 13 \, \mu\text{M}$ values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph (4.1.3). Panel G, chemical structure of 5-4-methoxy-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA.

These data are very difficult to interpret because panels A and C suggest noncompetitive inhibition while panel B suggests neither noncompetitive nor competitive inhibition. With increasing inhibitor concentrations there is also an increase in $K_m,_{\text{apparent}}$ and a decrease in $V_{\text{max}}$ observed for this compound. Therefore, the mechanism of inhibition for this compound is not fully understood. In addition, since the $K_i$ value from the $1/V_{\text{max},_{\text{apparent}}}$ vs. [I] is considerably higher than that of the slope vs. [I] plot, this would suggest there is a decreased affinity for which the transporter binds L-Glu.
Figure 3.10: 5-3-methoxy-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (9) – Mixed Inhibition
**Figure 3.10. Legend**

Representative kinetic analysis of 5-3-methoxy-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA (9). *Panel A*, Michaelis-Menten analysis. *Panel B*, Lineweaver-Burk plot. *Panel C*, Eadie-Hofstee plot. *Panel D*, LWB $K_m,_{apparent}$ vs. $[I]$ replot. *Panel E*, LWB slope vs. $[I]$ replot. *Panel F*, LWB $1/V_{max,apparent}$ vs. $[I]$. $K_m (≈ 140 \mu M)$, $V_{max} (≈ 2000$ pmol/min/mg protein), and $K_i (13\mu M)$ values for plots shown were determined using KaleidaGraph (4.1.3). *Panel G*, chemical structure of 5-3-methoxy-benzyl-4-bis-TFM-HMICA.

These data are very difficult to interpret because panels A and C suggest noncompetitive inhibition while panel B suggests neither noncompetitive nor competitive inhibition. With increasing inhibitor concentrations there is also an increase in $K_m,_{apparent}$ and a decrease in $V_{max}$ observed for this compound. Therefore, the mechanism of inhibition for this compound is not fully understood. In addition, since the $K_i$ value from the $1/V_{max,apparent}$ vs. $[I]$ is considerably higher than that of the slope vs. $[I]$ plot, this would suggest there is a decreased affinity for which the transporter binds L-Glu.
Chapter 4. Future directions

The most interesting aspect of my study was the identification of novel inhibitors of $\text{Sx}_c^-$ that act through competitive and noncompetitive mechanisms of inhibition. The discovery of noncompetitive inhibitors suggests the possibility for an allostERIC binding site on the transporter. Therefore allowing the development of new inhibitors to target a site separate from the substrate binding site. Future development of inhibitors could include a new set of compounds with various alterations to the chemical structure. The development of novel inhibitors containing two lipophilic groups but lacking the L-Glu or L-Cys$_2$ mimic could be used to determine if inhibitory activity remains and to further characterize the lipophilic binding domains. Other possible alterations could be made to the lipophilic domains, the linker group density, or the length of the linker group.

In addition the development of new inhibitors, additional experiments could be done to further characterize the isoxazole hydrazone analogues used in this study. Fluorometric exchange assays could be used to determine substrate activity, to verify the mechanism of inhibition seen using the L-Glu uptake experiments, and to help confirm the presence of a new binding site. Detailed kinetic analysis of early inhibitors (such as 4-S-CPG) could also be done to help delineate the mechanism of inhibition and help to further develop the SAR data at $\text{Sx}_c^-$. In conclusion, the identification of a new binding site is exciting since it provides the opportunity to develop very potent inhibitors for $\text{Sx}_c^-$. These new inhibitors could lead to clinically relevant outcomes in the brain tumor model.
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