

Towards β -selectivity in functional estrogen receptor antagonists†

Jose Juan Rodríguez,^a Kamila Filipiak,^{a,b} Maciej Maslyk,^{a,b} Jakub Ciepielski,^{a,c} Sebastian Demkowicz,^{a,d} Sonia de Pascual-Teresa,^e Sonsoles Martín-Santamaría,^{*a} Beatriz de Pascual-Teresa^a and Ana Ramos^{*a}

Received 1st June 2012, Accepted 11th July 2012

DOI: 10.1039/c2ob26062j

Based on the benzo[*b*]naphtho[1,2-*d*]furan and benzo[*b*]naphtho[1,2-*d*]thiophene frameworks, a series of ligands with different basic side chains (BSCs) has been synthesized and pharmacologically evaluated. Also, their binding modes have been modelled using docking techniques. It was found that the introduction of a BSC in these systems brings about a decrease of affinity for both estrogen receptors α and β in an *in vitro* competitive binding assay. However, two full antagonists of the estrogen receptor β (**9c** and **9f**) have been discovered, with potency in the low micromolar concentration in a cell-based luciferase reporter assay, and completely devoid of activity against the α receptor at the same concentration range. Differences in the ER α /ER β binding modes have also been rationalized with the help of molecular modelling techniques. This interesting functional profile could be used to elucidate the physiological role of each ER subtype.

Introduction

The biological actions of estrogens are manifested through two genetically distinct estrogen receptors (ER α and ER β) that display nonidentical expression patterns in target tissues. Interesting differences have been found in the physiological role of both receptor subtypes. ER α is predominantly involved in the development and function of the mammary gland and uterus, and in the maintenance of metabolic and skeletal homeostasis. ER β has more pronounced effects on the central nervous system and on cellular hyperproliferation.¹

Since the discovery of ER β in 1996, compounds that are selective in activating or inhibiting both ER subtypes are intensively sought after.² The data obtained suggest that the discovery of compounds that selectively bind ER α or ER β is of great interest

for the development of more efficient drugs for the treatment of several disorders, such as cancer, cardiovascular disease, multiple sclerosis and Alzheimer's disease.^{3,4} The use of the ER α selective agonist propylpyrazoletriol (PPT) (Fig. 1) has shown that several classical estrogen-induced tissue responses can be effectively evoked *via* ER α alone.⁵ On the other hand, the design of highly ER β selective ligands has proved to be quite challenging, and several groups have reported attempts to design this kind of compound using different scaffolds. The highly ER β selective agonist ERB-041 (Fig. 1) has been used to demonstrate that this receptor may be a useful target for certain inflammatory diseases. This compound has a dramatic beneficial effect in the HLA-B27 transgenic model of inflammatory bowel disease and the Lewis rat adjuvant-induced arthritis model, while it is inactive in several classic models of estrogen action.⁶ Other non-steroidal scaffolds which have been developed as ER β ligands are diarylpropanenitriles,⁷ 2-phenylnaphthalenes,^{8,9} and phenyl-2*H*-indazoles.¹⁰

Interestingly, some substituted tetrahydrochrysenes such as *cis*-(*R,R*)-diethyl (THC) (Fig. 1) have been described as potent agonists on ER α , but more potent antagonists on ER β ,^{11,12} in contrast with tamoxifen and raloxifene which are partial antagonists on both ER α and ER β (Fig. 1). The structure of these ER β antagonists is also different from the structure of tamoxifen and raloxifene, where the bulky basic side chain (BSC) is responsible for their antagonist activity through the blockage of the ER helix-12 movement by interaction with Asp351 carboxylate (ER α numbering).¹³ Crystallographic structures of the ER α ligand binding domain (LBD) bound to both THC and a fragment of the transcriptional coactivator GRIP1, and ER β LBD bound to THC show that this compound antagonizes ER β through a novel mechanism termed "passive

^aDepartamento de Química, Facultad de Farmacia, Universidad CEU San Pablo, 28668-Boadilla del Monte, Madrid, Spain.

E-mail: aramgon@ceu.es, smsantamaria@ceu.es;

Fax: (+34) 913510496; Tel: (+34) 913724796

^bDepartment of Molecular Biology, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 20-718 Lublin, Poland

^cDepartment of Environmental Biochemistry and Chemistry, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 20-718 Lublin, Poland

^dDepartment of Organic Chemistry, Gdansk University of Technology, 11/12 G. Narutowicza St., 80-233 Gdańsk, Poland

^eInstitute of Food Science, Food Technology and Nutrition (ICTAN), Spanish National Research Council (CSIC), José Antonio Novais 10, 28040-Madrid, Spain

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: δ_H and δ_C NMR spectra of compounds **5b**, **6b**, **7b**, **8a–j**, **9a–j**, **10** and **11**. Data from docking calculations and MD simulations. See DOI: 10.1039/c2ob26062j