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**Abstract**

Gram-negative bacteria are implicated in the causation of life-threatening hospital-acquired infections. They acquire rapid resistance to multiple drugs and available antibiotics. Hence, there is the need to discover new antibacterial agents with novel scaffolds. For the first time, this study explores the 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine and 1,2,4-triazine-2,4-diamine group of compounds as potential inhibitors of *Escherichia coli* DHFR, a pivotal enzyme in the thymidine and purine synthesis pathway. Using differential scanning fluorimetry, DSF, fifteen compounds with various substitutions on either the 3rd or 4th positions on the benzene group of 6,6-dimethyl-1-(benzene)-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine were shown to bind to the enzyme with varying affinities. Then, the dose dependence of inhibition by these compounds was determined. Preliminary quantitative structure—activity relationship analysis and docking studies implicate the alkyl linker group and the sulfonyl fluoride group in increasing the potency of inhibition. 4-[4-[3-(4,6-diamino-2,2-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazin-1-yl)phenyl]butyl]benzenesulfonfyl fluoride (NSC120927), the best hit from the study and a molecule with no reported inhibition of *E. coli* DHFR, potently inhibits the enzyme with a *K*~i~ value of 42.50 ± 5.34 nM, followed by 4-[6-[4-(4,6-diamino-2,2-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazin-1-yl)phenyl]hexyl]benzenesulfonfyl fluoride (NSC132279), with a *K*~i~ value of 100.9 ± 12.7 nM. Detailed kinetic characterization of the inhibition brought about by five small-molecule hits shows that these inhibitors bind to the dihydrofolate binding site with preferential binding to the NADPH-bound binary form of the enzyme. Furthermore, in search of novel diaminotriazine scaffolds, it is shown that lamotrigine, a 1,2,4-triazine-3,5-diamine and a sodium-ion channel blocker class of antiepileptic drug, also inhibits *E. coli* DHFR. This is the first comprehensive study on the binding and inhibition brought about by diaminotriazines of a gram-negative prokaryotic enzyme and provides valuable insights into the SAR as an aid to the discovery of novel antibiotics.

© 2015 Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The emergence and rapid dissemination of drug resistance in disease-causing gram-negative bacteria presents a challenge to the treatment of life-threatening hospital-acquired infections. This also poses a general threat to prevalent healthcare management practices by creating species resistant to all currently available antibacterial agents. There are several mechanisms by which gram negative bacteria acquire resistance to known drugs in the shortest possible time span. Most prominent among these are drug efflux pumps, acquisition of plasmids encoding antibiotic-resistance genes and acquisition of mutations in a biological target making it refractory to the action of the drug [1,2]. In fact, a survey of reported antibiotics of natural origin showed that among those compounds that showed activity against gram-positive bacteria, more than 90% lacked activity at a useful level against *Escherichia*...
coli [3]. Given the alarming rise in instances of hospital-acquired infections by drug-resistant gram-negative bacteria [4–11], it becomes imperative to search for novel antibiotic agents against these organisms.

Dihydrofolate reductase, DHFR, is an important enzyme in the de novo pathway of purine and thymidine synthesis. Small-molecules targeting this enzyme have demonstrated utility as potential antibiotics [12]. However, this enzyme acquires rapid resistance to available antifolates. Several classes of compounds have been explored for their potential anti-folate activity. Predominant classes include diaminooxazolines [13–18], diaminopyrimidine [19–22], diaminopteridine [23] and diaminotriazines [24].

Triazines are organic nitrogen containing heterocycles. They are classified into three different types based on the separation of the nitrogen atoms on the ring: 1,2,3-triazines, 1,2,4-triazines and 1,3,5-triazines. Among the three isomers, 1,3,5-triazine compounds are the best studied and are also known as symmetric triazines or s-triazines while 1,2,3-triazines are the least studied because of their poor stability [25]. 1,2,4-triazines have better solubility than 1,2,3-triazines and are comparatively better known, with the most prominent example being lamotrigine, a sodium-channel blocker class of anti-epileptic drug [26]. 1,2-dihydro-1,3,5-triazine (baker triazines) compounds are by far the best known with several studies exploring the potential of 2,4-diamino-1,3,5-triazines as inhibitors of eukaryotic DHFRs [24]. The most prominent example of the diamino triazine group of compounds as DHFR inhibitors is the inhibition of Plasmodium falciparum DHFR by cycloguanil, a derivative of proguanil [27,28]. Detailed QSAR analysis of diamino triazine derivatives has been carried out on DHFRs from several different organisms [29–39]. Recently, hybrids of triazines have also been demonstrated to show inhibitory activity on DHFRs [40,41].

However, most studies have focused on understanding the inhibitory effect of diamino triazines on DHFRs from eukaryotic sources. Moreover, there is a total lack of kinetic characterization to understand their mechanism of DHFR inhibition. Knowledge of detailed kinetic mechanism is useful for designing effective drugs. One possible reason for the non-exploration of diamino triazines as inhibitors of gram-negative bacterial DHFRs in general, and EcDHFR in particular, might stem from the consistently low affinities and poor inhibition by this class of molecules of prokaryotic DHFRs.

This study is the first attempt at detailed mechanistic characterization of diamino triazine family of compounds by taking recourse to inhibition kinetics to assess their effect on EcDHFR. It also sheds valuable insights into the QSAR of 2,4-diamino-1,3,5-triazine inhibition of E. coli DHFR. Further, macromolecular docking studies provides valuable insights into the physical interactions that are likely responsible for conferring potency and specificity of the small-molecule/protein interaction. For the first time, we report two novel nanomolar inhibitors (NSC120927 and NSC132279) of a gram-negative prokaryotic DHFR from the 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine class of molecules. This, combined with studies on the use of 1,2,4-triazine-3,5-diamine as novel scaffolds for E. coli DHFR inhibitors, opens up the possibility of exploring a new class of molecules that could potentially yield novel antibiotic candidates.

2. Results

2.1. Binding of 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine analogs to EcDHFR

Binding of a small molecule ligand to the protein target of interest is a prerequisite for specific inhibition. Fifteen derivatives of 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine were assessed for their ability to bind to the apo form of EcDHFR (Fig. 1). Differential scanning fluorimetry (DSF), a methodology relying on the increased protein stability conferred by small molecule binding as assessed by the environmentally-sensitive extrinsic fluorophore dye Sypro-Orange, was used to assess binding.

Fig 2 and Table 1 summarize the binding assay results. For ease of comprehension of results, molecules were classified into four different classes based on the chemical nature of substituents on the 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine group. Halide (NSC3074), methyl (NSC212229), methoxy (NSC19732) and ethoxy (NSC19745) substituents gave $\Delta T_m$ values ranging from $-10 \degree C$ to $13 \degree C$ (Fig 2A and Table 1). Nitrile (NSC115928) and dimethylamino (CHEMBL597262) substituents at R1 position and aminomethyl substituents (NSC168184) at the R2 position of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine gave comparable $\Delta T_m$ values ranging from $-9 \degree C$ to $13 \degree C$ (Fig 2B and Table 1). However substitution of the aminomethyl group at the R1 position (NSC211137) drastically reduced binding as assessed by the magnitude of the thermal shift ($-4 \degree C$) (Fig 2B and Table 1). This might be because of unfavorable electrostatic interactions of this ligand with the apo form of the enzyme. Molecules having alkyl benzenesulfonyl fluoride (NSC120927 and NSC1332279), phenoxypyropoxyp phenyl (NSC13071), phenylbutyl (NSC132277) and fluorosulfonylphenylaminocarbonyl (NSC131909) substituents at either R2 or R1 position of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine gave $\Delta T_m$ values ranging from $-11 \degree C$ to $23 \degree C$ (Fig 2C and Table 1). Molecules in this class were by far the best binders as ranked by the apparent dissociation constants for all the ligands assessed in this study. It should be pointed out here that NSC132279 and NSC132277 were assessed at 10 $\mu M$ concentrations rather than 500 $\mu M$, as was done for the other small molecules. However, 2,4-dichlorophenylbutyl (NSC104129) substituent at R1 position gave a poor $\Delta T_m$ value of 5.8 $\degree C$ (Fig 2C and Table 1). NSC117268, a compound containing 4-chlorophenyl and sulfonamide substitution at the R3 and R1 positions of 1,3,5-triazine-4,6-diamine group, gave a reasonable $\Delta T_m$ value of 7.6 $\degree C$ (Fig 2D and Table 1). The results from binding analysis indicates that all 15 diamino triazine small-molecules showed binding to E. coli DHFR to variable extents depending on the nature of the substituents.

2.2. Inhibition of EcDHFR by 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine analogs

To further understand whether binding by these small molecules translates into inhibition, fourteen small molecules were tested for the dose-dependence of inhibition. NSC104129 and CHEMBL597262 were excluded from this analysis due to lack of sufficient quantities for inhibition studies. Fig 3A shows the experimental curves for dose-dependence of inhibition, and Table 1 summarizes the IC_{50} values for the 14 derivatives of 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine tested. The apparent inhibition constants (K_{iapp}) were computed by fitting the curves to Morrison’s quadratic equation (Fig 3B and Table 1). Once again, the values in Table 1 clearly show that derivatives with alkyl benzenesulfonyl fluoride (NSC120927 and NSC133279), phenoxypyropoxyp phenyl (NSC13071) and phenylbutyl (NSC132277) at either the R2 or R1 position of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine are better inhibitors than the other small molecules employed in the study. The best hit was NSC120927 with a butyl benzenesulfonyl fluoride substitution at R2 position on 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine; it inhibited the enzyme with an IC_{50} and K_{iapp} value of $1 \mu M$ and $50 \mu M$, respectively. The second best hit was NSC132279, a hexylbenzenesulfonyl fluoride substituted at R1 position, which showed an IC_{50} and K_{iapp} value of $2 \mu M$ and $93 \mu M$, respectively.

However, the derivative with fluorosulfonylphenylaminocarbonyl substitution (NSC113909), in spite of showing very tight
binding as evident in a \( \Delta T_m \) value of \(-22 \) °C, poorly inhibited the enzyme with an IC\(_{50} \) and \( K_{i,app} \) value of \(-63 \) \( \mu \)M and \(-3 \) \( \mu \)M, respectively (Table 1). This might be because of the planarity of the peptide bond and partial charges introduced by the peptide group as a linker.

It should be noted that lamotrigine, a 1,2,4-triazine-3,5-diamine and a sodium-ion channel blocker class of antiepileptic drug, is also an inhibitor of E. coli DHFR inhibiting the enzyme with an IC\(_{50} \) and \( K_{i,app} \) of 348.9 ± 6.7 \( \mu \)M and 15.24 ± 2.78 \( \mu \)M, respectively (Table 1 and Fig 3). Weak inhibition by this compound could be ascribed to the lack of dimethyl hydrophobic substituents at the 6th position. Lamotrigine is substantially different structurally from the other 6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine derivatives employed in this study (Fig 1) and represents a novel scaffold that could be modified for design of new inhibitor molecules with activity against E. coli DHFR.

An important aspect to note is that the inhibition by this family of compounds does not conform to the slow-onset tight binding mechanism as evident in the linear time-course curves. It should be noted here that most other reported inhibitors of EcDHFR display slow-onset tight binding inhibition.

To further understand the relationship between the binding of these small-molecules to the apo form of the enzyme and inhibition assessed on the holo-enzyme, a scatter plot of 1/IC\(_{50} \) vs. \( \Delta T_m \) was generated (Fig S1A). A Pearson correlation computed between the two parameters gave an R-value of 0.5774 and an \( R^2 \) of 0.33 indicating poor correlation. Lack of strong linear correlation between the magnitude of the thermal shift (hence binding) and the IC\(_{50} \) could be indicative of the complex nature of the binding process for these compounds.
Fig. 2. Differential scanning fluorimetry, DSF, curves and their first derivatives for E. coli DHFR in the presence of 15 analogs of 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine. (A) DSF curves for halide, methyl, methoxy and ethoxy substituents at the R1 position of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine. (B) DSF curves for nitrile, dimethylamino and aminomethyl substituents at either R1 or R2 position of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine. (C) DSF curves for alkyl benzenesulfonyl fluoride, phenoxypropoxyphenyl, phenylbutyl, 2,4-dichlorophenylbutyl and fluorosulfonylaminocarbonyl substituents at either R1 or R2 position of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine. Note that this class of molecules showed the largest thermal shifts. (D) DSF curve for 4-chlorophenyl and sulfonamide substitution at the R1 and R3 position of 1-phenyl-1,3,5-triazine-4,6-diamine. The y-axis in primary unfolding curves represents normalized fluorescence and the x-axis shows the temperature in degrees Celsius. The inhibitors were kept fixed at 500 μM except NSC132277 and NSC132299, which were done at 10 μM concentration. Right panel in each plot shows the Gaussian fit of first-derivative for curves from left panel. Note that the molecules NSC117268, NSC133071, NSC168184, NSC104129, CHEMBL597262 and NSC333873 were also independently picked by the virtual ligand screening algorithm, PoLi.
and inhibition indicates that there might be substantial differences between the mode of binding and inhibition. Moreover, since binding was assessed in the absence of NADPH, it is possible that occupancy of the NADPH binding pocket may change the charge distribution in the diaminotriazine small-molecule binding pocket.

2.3. Quantitative structure–activity relationship analysis and macromolecular docking

To quantitatively understand the inhibition brought about the diaminotriazine series of compounds studied and to increase the predictive value of the current study in its ability to find more potent inhibitors, a QSAR analysis was carried out. Various physicochemical parameters (like hydrogen bond donors, hydrogen bond acceptors, total polar surface area, geometrical shape coefficient etc) of the molecules were computed employing OpenBabel, Joelib and ChemmineR descriptors. Most of the parameters, when individually assessed, showed no correlation with inhibition potency and a representative scatter plot for tPSA depicting this lack of correlation is shown in Fig S1B. However, inhibition by these molecules showed good correlation to both atomistic (LogP) and fragment-based partition coefficient (CLogP) (Fig S1C and S1D), whereby increasing the hydrophobicity of a compound led to increased inhibition. The equations defining the relationship between the partition coefficients of the small-molecules and the respective inhibition constants are shown in the figure along with the regression measure. This result is in broad agreement with already reported QSAR analysis for DHFRs from eukaryotic sources which had indicated that hydrophobic triazines are particularly effective against *Pneumocystis carinii* DHFR [34] and mammalian DHFRs [31]. This similarity in QSAR behavior is in spite of the low sequence similarity shared by the prokaryotic and eukaryotic DHFRs.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chem ID</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Binding and inhibition potency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta T_m$ ($^\circ$C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC120927</td>
<td>R2, R3</td>
<td>, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC132279</td>
<td>R1, R3</td>
<td>, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>23.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC132277f</td>
<td>R2, R3</td>
<td>, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC133071</td>
<td>R1, R2, R3</td>
<td>Cl, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC104129f</td>
<td>R1, R3</td>
<td>, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC115928</td>
<td>R2, R3</td>
<td>N≡C –, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>13.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC3074</td>
<td>R1, R3</td>
<td>–Cl, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC212229</td>
<td>R1, R3</td>
<td>–CH$_2$, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>13.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC19732</td>
<td>R1, R3</td>
<td>–O–CH$_2$, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>10.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEMBL597262f</td>
<td>R1, R3</td>
<td>–N(CH$_3$)$_2$, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC19745</td>
<td>R1, R3</td>
<td>–O–CH$_2$–CH$_3$, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC168184</td>
<td>R2, R3</td>
<td>–CH$_2$–NH$_2$, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC211137</td>
<td>R1, R3</td>
<td>CH$_2$–NH$_2$, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC113909</td>
<td>R2, R3</td>
<td>, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>21.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC117268</td>
<td>R1, R3</td>
<td>, -(CH$_3$)$_2$</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamotrigineb</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The $K_{app}$ values are computed by fitting the dose-dependence inhibition curves to Morrison equation.
b All structures except lamotrigine.
c Thermal shift reported are at 500 µM ligand concentration in the absence of NADPH. The $T_m$ for protein alone curve is 51.9 $^\circ$C.
d Approximate dissociation constant computed from the magnitude of thermal shift.
e No inhibition done.
f No signal seen at 500 µM and hence values reported for 10 µM.
g Values computed by ChemBioDraw 14.0. ND, not determined. NA, not applicable.
To perform a more definitive QSAR, a genetic algorithm (GA)-
based heuristic methodology was employed for selection of sig-
nificant variables that influences inhibition [42]. Genetic algo-
rithms are a subclass of evolutionary algorithms (EA) that are
employed for generating solutions to optimization problems
involving multiple variables employing the principles of natural
evolution like inheritance, mutation, crossover and selection.
The best solution with good statistics of fit is given below

$$\log \frac{1}{K_{\text{app}}} = 0.90(\pm 0.79) - 0.61(\pm 0.22) \text{bonds}$$

$$+ 0.80(\pm 0.40) \text{nF} - 1.2(\pm 0.26) \text{HBD} + 0.6(\pm 0.22) \text{atoms};$$

$$R = 0.922$$

“bonds” indicate the number of single bonds, “nF” indicates the
number of fluorine atoms and “HBD” indicates hydrogen-bonding
donors.

This result, along with the correlation that LogP score showed,
indicates that the number of fluorine atoms, hydrogen bonding
donors and LogPs contribute to better fits. Thus, the presence of an
alkyl benzene group in general, and the alkyl benzenesulfonyl
fluoride group in particular, has a major influence in determining
inhibition potency. This provides vital clues about the type of
modifications that might be desirable on the small-molecules to
increase their potency of inhibition.

To understand the physical basis for inhibitor discrimination,
template-based macromolecular rigid body docking was carried
out. The conformation of folate in complex with DHFR [43] was
used as reference for docking the small molecules inside DHFR’s
binding site. To understand the procedure, it is helpful to describe
the interaction of folate with DHFR in more detail, as shown in
Fig. 4A. The folate molecule can be broken into three fragments
based on the interaction each fragment has with DHFR’s active-site
pocket and the pocket’s neighboring residues: (a) The 2-amino-4-
oxo-1,4-dihydropteridin group interacts with the active-site
pocket residues of DHFR, (b) The methyaminobenzoyl group in
the middle of folate is in contact with four hydrophobic amino
acids (Leu28, Phe31, Ile50 and Leu54) and finally (c) The polar and
negatively charged glutamic acid tail fragment of the folate in-
teracts with the positive triad of Lys32, Arg52 and Arg57 located at
the entrance of the binding site.

After aligning different conformations of the various small
molecules to folate (see Methods section), the best alignment for
each case was chosen based on the highest combined shape and
chemical similarity scores (Table 2) given by LIGSIFT [44]. All five
small-molecules share the diaminotriazine group, which is aligned
to the 2-amino-4-oxo-1,4-dihydropteridin group of folate and ends
up interacting with the binding site amino acids (Fig. 4 B–F).
Therefore, the differential affinity of these molecules could be due
to the dissimilarity in the other regions that we next explain in
more detail. The molecule that shows good binding and most
potent inhibition, NSC120927 (Fig. 4B), shows the best scores for
shape and chemical similarity when compared to the rest of the
molecules, with significant p-values as shown in Table 2. In this
case, the sulfonfyl fluoride group aligns to the tail fragment of folate
allowing it to preserve the favorable interaction with the triad of
positive residues located at the entrance of the binding site. Also,
the central hydrophobic fragment of NSC120927 (two aromatic
rings linked by four carbons) aligns to the middle fragment of folate
and can interact strongly with the hydrophobic patch made of
Leu28, Phe31, Ile50 and Leu54.

The second best molecule, NSC132279 (Fig. 4C), has almost the
same structure as the first with a minor difference. Now, the two
aromatic rings are connected with a longer linker (six carbons)
making it slightly harder for it to fit within the pocket (reflected in
the lower shape and chemical similarity scores in Table 2) and
preserve the interaction with the hydrophobic patch. Therefore, the
strong binding and inhibition by NSC120927 and NSC132279 can be
ascribed to possible charged group interactions formed by the
negative groups on the ligands with the apo protein target as well
as their interaction with the hydrophobic patch. Hydrogen bonding
of the charged moiety is possible; as evident in Fig S2, which shows
that the distances and angles of the charged portion of NSC120927

---

**Fig. 3.** Dose-dependent inhibition of *E. coli* DHFR by analogs of 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine. (A) IC50 determination of 14 compounds. (B) Fit of the experimental dose–response curves to Morrison’s equation to compute the $K_{\text{app}}$ for various inhibitors of *E. coli* DHFR. Curves showing inhibition by derivatives having halide, methyl, methoxy, ethoxy, nitrile, dimethylamino and aminomethyl substituents at either the R1 or R2 position of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine are shown in blue; derivatives having alkyl
benzenesulfonyl fluoride, phenoxypyropargyl and phenylbutyl at either R1 or R2 position of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine are shown in green; derivative having fluoroisoupyrophenylaminocarbonyl at R2 position of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine is shown in gold; derivative having a 4-chlorophenyl and benzene-
sulfonylamide substitution at the R1 and R3 position of 1-phenyl-1,3,5-triazine-4,6-diamine are shown in pink; Lamotrigine, a 6-(2,3-dichlorophenyl)-1,2,4-triazine-3,5-the
diamine is shown in red. All activities are expressed as percentage activity. The numbered notations for the various inhibitor molecules represent NSC numbers. (For interpre-
tation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
are compatible with formation of moderate to strong hydrogen bonds [45,46]. As depicted in the figure, the angles of the predicted hydrogen bonds are between 145 and 160° and the distances are between 1.56 and 2.80 Å. This observation is in agreement with obtained Q SAR results that selected “hydrogen-bonding donor” as a possible variable that determines efficacy of inhibition.

The third molecule, NSC132277 (Fig. 4D), has the same structure as NSC120927 but lacks the sulfonyl fluoride group. Hence, it loses favorable interactions with the positively charged ring, and thus, has lower affinity (Table 1). The next molecule, NSC133071 (Fig. 4E), also lacks the sulfonyl fluoride group of NSC120927. Additionally, chlorine is introduced in one of the aromatic rings, and the chloro-phenoxypropoxy linker between the two rings has two oxygen atoms rather than a phenyl alkyl linker (Fig. 1). The docking pose of NSC133071 shows that the chlorine and one of the two oxygen atoms are in the vicinity of the hydrophobic patch, therefore resulting in unfavorable interactions and lower binding affinity.

NSC113909 is a unique molecule that shows good binding, but poor inhibition of E. coli DHFR. NSC113909 (Fig. 4F) shows higher shape similarity than NSC133071 to folate and the chemical similarity is same as that of the best molecule (NSC120927). The disparity between binding and inhibition could be explained by the fact that the charged interactions made by the sulfonyl fluoride group is preserved while the peptide bond as linker between two aromatic rings is unfavorable for bringing about effective inhibition. We suggest that the peptide bond locks the molecule in fewer conformations and reduces its degrees of freedom, thereby making it harder for it to access the binding site due to steric effects in the NADPH-bound holo enzyme. Moreover, burying the charges on the peptide moiety of NSC113909 in the NADPH-bound holo protein might impose an energetic cost making it a weaker inhibitor.

In summary, preliminary Q SAR and macromolecular rigid-body docking studies indicates that the length of the alkyl linker and the sulfonyl fluoride group play pivotal roles in determining the potency of inhibition.

### 2.4. 1,3,5-Triazine-2,4-diamine analogs as competitive inhibitors of $H_2F$ binding

To further understand the inhibition shown by derivatives of 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamines, we resorted to detailed inhibition kinetics. The top four inhibitors showing the lowest $K_{iapp}$ values, indicating highest affinities, were selected to understand the mechanism of inhibition. To better understand the mechanism, the analysis was split into inhibition brought about by alkyl benzene-sulfonil fluoride substituents at either R2 (NSC120927) or R1 (NSC132279) position of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine ring and those shown by phenoxypropoxyphenyl (NSC133071) and phenylbutyl (NSC132277) substituents.

Substrate dihydrofolate (H$_2$F) was titrated at several fixed concentrations of NSC120927 and NSC132279, and the resulting curves from the experiment were globally fit to models for the various
Fig. 5. Competition experiments of NSC120927, NSC132279, NSC133071 and NSC132277 against substrate H2F for *E. coli* DHFR. The figure shows the fit of the primary data to the competitive inhibition model and double reciprocal Lineweaver–Burk plot for H2F titration at several fixed concentrations of (A) NSC120927, (B) NSC132279, (C) NSC133071 and (D) NSC132277. The y-axis shows the $k_{cat}$ and $k_{cat}/C_0$ value and the x-axis shows the $[H2F]$ and $1/[H2F]$ values for the primary and LB plot, respectively. The experimental data points were fit to the respective models using the non-linear curve-fitting algorithm of GraphPad Prism v 6.0e.
types of inhibition. A sum-of-square F-test was performed to validate the non-linear fits. Both the curves for NSC120927 and NSC132279 showed the best fit to the model for competitive inhibition (Figs. 5A and 5B) yielding a $K_i$, the equilibrium dissociation constant for the competitive inhibitor, of 42.50 ± 5.34 nM and 100.9 ± 12.7 nM, respectively (Table 3). Further, for visual understanding, the data were transformed and plotted as the double-reciprocal Lineweaver–Burk plot, $\frac{1}{V}$ vs $\frac{1}{[S]}$. The right hand panels in Fig. 5A and B show the lines of the LB-plot intersecting on the ordinate. This is further indicative of competitive displacement of substrate dihydrofolate at saturating NADPH by NSC120927 and NSC132279, whereby increasing concentration of the inhibitors decreases the affinity for H$_2$F without unduly affecting the maximal velocity of the reaction. It should be pointed out that for NSC120927 and NSC132279, the $K_i$ values are –27-fold and –18-fold lower than the obtained IC$_{50}$ values for the respective ligands. The above data is conclusive about the inhibitors binding to the same site as the substrate H$_2$F, competing with the substrate for high-affinity interactions with the enzyme. This competitive displacement can be ascribed to the dianminotriazine group that shares substantial structural similarity with the 2-amino-4-oxo-1,4,7,8-ment can be ascribed to the diaminotriazine group that shares substantial structural similarity with the 2-amino-4-oxo-1,4,7,8-menthadiimine group on the substrate and may form the unique behavior of tight-binding and ordered binding event whereby NADPH binding facilitates inhibitor binding.

Further, the substrate dihydrofolate was titrated at several fixed concentrations of NSC133071 and NSC132277. When the resulting experimental curves were fit to the models for various types of inhibition, they showed equally good global fits to both competitive and linear mixed-type inhibition models (Fig. S3A–B). However, based on visual assessment of the double-reciprocal Lineweaver–Burk plots, lines in which were seen intersecting on, or proximal to, the ordinate, the global fits shown are for the competitive displacement model (Fig. S5A and S5B). Further, Dixon analysis also showed that the lines intersect in the second quadrant, reinforcing the suggestion that the inhibition is competitive (data not shown). However, it should be noted that the long phenoxacyl and phenylalkyl substituents on the small molecules might give rise to some interaction with the protein that might lead to a slight perturbation in the maximum velocity observed, apart from its role in competitively displacing the substrate. This may lead to slight perturbation of the $V_{\text{max}}$ giving rise to the observed ambiguity in the non-linear fits. However, conclusive refutation of this model would require further experimentation. Moreover, an exact physical basis for this behavior might require detailed structural studies.

### 2.5. 1,3,5-Triazine-2,4-diamine analogs as uncompetitive inhibitors of NADPH binding

To understand the effect of 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine derivatives on the cofactor NADPH binding, the latter was titrated at several fixed concentrations of the inhibitors. As before, the top four small molecules with the lowest $K_{\text{app}}$ values, i.e., NSC120927, NSC132279, NSC133071 and NSC132277, were selected for this analysis. The resulting curves from the primary plot for all four small molecules, when globally fit to various types of inhibition models, showed the best fit to the model for uncompetitive inhibition (Fig. 6A–D). This yielded $zK_i$, values, the equilibrium dissociation constant for the uncompetitive inhibitor, as specified in Table 3. These higher $zK_i$ values, compared to the $K_i$ values obtained from competition with substrate H$_2$F, show that the inhibitor binding site is fully formed only when the enzyme is bound to NADPH. It is worthwhile to point out that most reported inhibitors of E. coli DHFR show synergy with respect to NADPH binding [47]. However, it is evident from Fig. 6A–B that the fit of the primary curves to the global uncompetitive model deviates substantially from the experimental data points obtained at high inhibitor concentrations. This can be ascribed to the underestimation of inhibition at really high inhibitor concentrations by the model.

2.6. Kinetics of NSC113909, a tight binder with poor inhibition

NSC113909, containing a fluorosulfonylphenylaminocarbonyl substitution at R2 on 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine ring, showed the unique behavior of tight-binding and average inhibition. To understand whether this molecule shows differential kinetics in its inhibition mechanism and the order of addition to the enzyme, detailed inhibition kinetics was carried out with this molecule too. Fig 7A shows the primary curves for H$_2$F titration at several different concentrations of NSC113909, fit to the model for competitive inhibition. Further, Fig 7B shows the double-reciprocal LB plot with lines intersecting on the ordinate. Likewise, Fig 7C shows the primary curves for NADPH titrations at several different concentrations of NSC113909 fit to the model for uncompetitive inhibition, and Fig 7D shows the double reciprocal LB plot, giving parallel lines. These patterns show that NSC113909 occupies the H$_2$F binding site and preferentially binds to the NADPH-bound form of the enzyme, mirroring the behavior shown by the best hits assessed in this study. However, the $K_i$ value of 3.82 ± 0.43 μM for NSC113909 is much higher, indicative of poor inhibition of the enzyme (Table 3). As speculated earlier, this poorer inhibition might be because of two reasons: Partial charges from the carbonyl and amino group introduced as part of the linker might be incompatible with the NADPH-bound holo form of the enzyme or the planarity of the peptide bond due to electron pair delocalization might restrain the available degrees of freedom leading to unfavorable energy of interaction.

### 2.7. Discussion

E. coli DHFR follows a sequential mechanism, whereby product release is conditional upon binding of both substrates. Further, the substrates NADPH and H$_2$F can add to the enzyme randomly to form the Enzyme-NADPH-tertiary complex. Understanding the mechanism of inhibition in a two-substrate reaction is a must for the success of a medicinal chemistry optimization exercise. Lack of understanding of the mechanism of a reaction may render a QSAR based drug-discovery program unproductive. Understanding the
Fig. 6. Competition experiments of NSC120927, NSC132279, NSC133071 and NSC132277 against cofactor NADPH for *E. coli* DHFR. The plots show the fit of the primary data to the uncompetitive inhibition model and double reciprocal Lineweaver-Burk plot for NADPH titration at several fixed concentrations of (A) NSC120927, (B) NSC132279, (C) NSC133071 and (D) NSC132277. The y-axis shows the $k_{cat}$ and $k_{cat}/C_0$ value and the x-axis shows the [NADPH] and $1/[\text{NADPH}]$ values for the primary and LB plot, respectively. The experimental data points were fit to the respective models using the non-linear curve-fitting algorithm of GraphPad Prism v 6.0e.
The relationship between steady-state rate parameters and the specific form of the enzyme to which the inhibitor binds goes a long way towards ensuring the success of a drug-discovery program by narrowing the optimization of the SAR to achieve enrichment in binding/inhibition of the drug to that particular form of enzyme. Detailed mechanistic characterization of the top hits obtained in this study shows that the inhibitor molecules preferentially bind to the NADPH-bound binary form of the enzyme and are mostly competitive with the H$_2$F substrate. As pointed out by us in our previous study [17], it is desirable for an inhibitor to bind to the NADPH-bound form of *E. coli* DHFR given that *E. coli* cytoplasm has equal concentrations of both NADPH and NADP$^+$ and inhibition of the NADPH-bound, catalytically competent form of the enzyme would have maximum effect in enhancing the antibacterial activity of a compound.

The diaminotriazine family of compounds have been predominantly explored as inhibitors of eukaryotic DHFR, with the most notable application being inhibitors of *P. falciparum* DHFR [49,50]. Several studies have reported the application of diaminotriazine derivatives as drugs for wild type and drug-resistant mutants in *P. falciparum* [51–53]. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is a paucity of studies in which diaminotriazine compounds have been explored for their antibacterial activity, especially against gram-negative bacteria. This might be because of the poor inhibition of prokaryotic DHFRs by known diaminotriazine inhibitors. Structural analysis of various DHFR structures suggests that for a small-molecule to be a DHFR potent inhibitor, it must have a protonated N in the heterocyclic ring to enable the formation of a charge-mediated hydrogen bond with the enzyme. Furthermore, partial delocalization of the positive charge on the amino group adjacent to the protonated N contributes to the formation of an additional hydrogen bond, effectively increasing the binding affinity. An additional amino group at the para position relative to the protonated N group leads to additional hydrogen bonding. This in turn acts to increase the strength of protein–ligand interactions. In addition, the presence of hydrophobic substituents perpendicular

---

**Fig. 7.** Inhibition kinetics of NSC113909 for *E. coli* DHFR (A) Fit of the primary data to the competitive inhibition model for H$_2$F titration at several fixed concentrations of NSC113909. (B) Double reciprocal Lineweaver–Burk plot of H$_2$F titration at several fixed concentrations of NSC113909. (C) Fit of the primary data to the uncompetitive inhibition model for NADPH titration at several fixed concentrations of NSC113909. (D) Double reciprocal Lineweaver–Burk plot of NADPH titration at several fixed concentrations of NSC113909.
to the heterocyclic ring enables optimal polar and hydrophobic interactions with the enzyme [54]. The nanomolar inhibition constants of NSC132279 and NSC120927, the best inhibitors from our study against \textit{E. coli} DHFR are encouraging from the perspective of utilizing diazinotriazines, a chemical scaffold that remains relatively unexplored for antibiotic discovery. It shows that, apart from the above-mentioned interactions pivotal for a small-molecule to function as an effective inhibitor, NSC120927 and NSC132279 make additional favorable interactions with the prokaryotic enzyme. Docking studies have indicated that the hydrophobic linker region and the terminal sulfonyl fluoride group makes several favorable interactions with the \textit{E. coli} enzyme that can enable the development of this class of molecules as potent antibacterial agents. It should be pointed out here that nosocomial infections caused by multi-drug resistant \textit{E. coli} are on the rise [35]. This clearly necessitates the discovery of newer scaffolds in antibiotic drug-discovery.

It should also be noted that none of the diazinotriazine compounds studied in this work displayed slow-onset of tight binding behavior. This is irrespective of the fact that two of the most potent hits had low nanomolar inhibition constants comparable to that shown by some of the well-known DHFR inhibitors. This is a unique observation, since it has been reported extensively in the literature that most, if not all, inhibitors of \textit{E. coli} DHFR display slow-onset of tight binding [56]. In a previous study from our lab, we had shown that NSC309401, a 7-[(4-aminophenyl) methyl]-7H-pyrrolo [3,2-f] quinazoline-1,3-diamine, also shows slow-onset of tight inhibition of \textit{E. coli} DHFR [17]. Further, we showed that the parent compound NSC39578, a 7H-pyrrolo [3,2-f] quinazoline-1,3-diamine, does not show slow-onset of inhibition in spite of being a tight binding inhibitor. This caused us to hypothesize that the nature of substitution on inhibitors of \textit{E. coli} DHFR leads to the slow-onset behavior. In this study, none of the molecules showed slow-onset of inhibition irrespective of the nature of substituents. This suggests that the slow-onset of inhibition behavior might be a cooperative outcome of interactions made by the complete inhibitor molecule, rather than being an additive property of individual fragments.

Lamotrigine is a drug of the phenyltriazine class with inhibitory effects on voltage-sensitive sodium channels [57] that has also been shown to weakly inhibit mammalian dihydrofolate reductases [57,58]. It should be pointed out that lamotrigine is a 1,2,4-triazine-3,5-diamine, whereas the other compounds employed in this study are 1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine derivatives. This small-molecule was never explored for its potential as an inhibiting agent of prokaryotic DHFRs. In this study, we show for the first time that lamotrigine binds and inhibits \textit{E. coli} DHFR with IC50 and K\(_{\text{app}}\) Values of ~350 \textmu M and ~15 \textmu M, respectively. This finding opens up a whole new scaffold for antibacterial drug discovery and paves the way for next generation antibiotics to tackle the menace of increasing drug resistance in gram-negative bacteria.

2.8. Conclusions

In summary, this study is the first comprehensive binding and kinetic investigation of various derivatives of 1-phenyl-6,6-dimethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine to understand the effect of substitutions in their binding to and inhibition of \textit{E. coli} DHFR. Further, this study throws light on the mechanism of inhibition by this family of compounds and shows that NSC120927 and NSC132279 are novel compounds with low nM inhibition constants against the \textit{E. coli} DHFR. To the best of our knowledge, these molecules are the first ever nanomolar inhibitors of \textit{E. coli} DHFR from this family of compounds and constitute potential antibiotic candidates.

3. Methods

3.1. Reagents

All reagents and chemicals, unless mentioned otherwise, were of high quality and were procured from Sigma–Aldrich Co., USA, Amresco, or Fisher Scientific. \textit{E. coli} dihydrofolate reductase was provided by Prof. Eugene Shakhnovich, Harvard University. The small molecule NSC120927, NSC132279, NSC132277, NSC133071, NSC104129, NSC115928, NSC3074, NSC212229, NSC19732, NSC19745, NSC168184, NSC211137, NSC113909 and NSC117268 were provided by the Developmental Therapeutics Program (DTP) of the National Cancer Institute (NCI), National Institutes of Health (NIH). The small molecule CHEMBL597262 was kindly provided by Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV) (http://www.mmv.org/malaribiobox). Dihydrofolate reductase assay kit (CS3040) was obtained from Sigma (Sigma–Aldrich, St. Louis, MO). Lamotrigine (L3791) was purchased from Sigma.

3.1.1. Binding studies using differential scanning fluorimetry, DSF

Binding of 16 small molecule compounds to \textit{E. coli} DHFR was tested by differential scanning fluorimetry, DSF. The experiments were carried out following protocols reported in previous communications from our lab [13,17]. Briefly, the reactions were carried out in 20 \textmu l reaction volumes in 96 well plates on the RealPlex quantitative PCR instrument (Eppendorf, NY, USA). The reaction mixture consisted of 100 mM HEPES pH 7.3 and 150 mM NaCl with 5× concentration of the reporter dye Sypro orange. Various compounds were tested for binding at a final concentration of 500 \textmu M with 5 \textmu M of \textit{E. coli} DHFR. Compounds NSC132277 and NSC132279 failed to give signal at 500 \textmu M and hence, the experiments were done at 10 \textmu M.

The first derivatives of the thermal melt curves were fit to a Gaussian equation (Eq. (1)) for estimating the \(T_m\) (melting temperature) from the observed intensity of fluorescence, I.

\[
f(x, \mu, \sigma) = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma}\right)e^{-0.5((x-\mu)/\sigma)^2}
\]

Here, \(\mu\) is the mean of the Gaussian distribution, \(\sigma\) is the standard deviation and \(\sigma^2\) is the variance. Thermodynamic parameters and apparent dissociation constants (K\(_{\text{app}}\)) were estimated as specified in the previous literature [13].

3.1.2. Dihydrofolate reductase assay

DHFR was assayed as previously reported [17]. Briefly, the formation of NADP was monitored by the decrease in absorbance at 340 nm for 100 s. The amount of product formed was computed from the slopes of time-course measurements using a molar extinction coefficient (\(\varepsilon\)) of 6.2 \times 10^3 M^{-1} cm^{-1} for \beta-NADPH at 340 nm [59]. The non-enzymatic hydrolysis of NADPH was normalized. Assays were initiated with the addition of enzyme to the sample cuvette after zeroing the absorbance reading with respect to the reference cuvette. The initial velocities, where product formation was less than 5%, were measured for reaction mixtures containing 100 mM HEPES pH 7.3 at room temperature (~22°C).

All the measurements were performed in duplicate, and the error values indicated are standard errors (S.E.). The concentration of \textit{E. coli} DHFR used was 16.7 nM and was estimated by the method of velocity–titration curves as previously reported [17]. Unless mentioned otherwise, all the data were fit using non-linear curve fitting subroutines of GraphPad Prism, version 4.0 (GraphPad Software, Inc., San Diego, CA).
3.1.3. Inhibition kinetics

14 compounds with varied substitutions of diaminotriazine were assessed for their inhibitory effect on the NADPH oxidizing ability of E. coli DHFR. Both the dose-dependence of inhibition and affinity of the inhibitor for the enzyme were computed by experimental IC50 determination and competition assays to determine its Ki. IC50 determination assays were carried out in 100 mM HEPES pH 7.3, 60 µM NADPH, 50 µM H2F and variable concentration of each inhibitor. The enzyme concentration was as specified above. The curves were fit to equation (2),

\[ y = 100\%/[1 + (I/IC50)] \]  

(2)

where, I is the inhibitor concentration, and y is the percentage of activity.

Furthermore, Kapp values were computed from the IC50 curves by fitting them to the quadratic Morrison equation (3) assuming competitive inhibition.

\[ v_i/v_0 = 1 - \frac{(|E_T| + |I_T| + K_{app})}{\sqrt{(|E_T| + |I_T| + K_{app})^2 - 4|E_T||I_T|}} \]  

\[ /2|E_T| \]  

(3)

where, vi represents velocity in the presence of inhibitor, v0 represents velocity in the absence of inhibitor, [E]T represents total enzyme, [I]T represents total inhibitor and Kapp represents apparent Ki.

Experimental Ki value determinations were carried out by titrating the substrates H2F and NADPH, around their respective Km values at various fixed concentrations of the inhibitors around their Kapp values. The substrate or cofactor that is not varied is kept at a fixed saturating concentration greater than 10 times their respective Km values. The resulting [substrate] vs. velocity curves were fit to models of competitive inhibition (equation (4)), non-competitive inhibition (equation (5)), uncompetitive inhibition (equation (6)) and linear mixed-type inhibition (equation (7)) in order to discriminate between the different types of inhibition and to estimate the various inhibition constants (Ki).

Competitive:

\[ v = V_{max}|S|/\{K_m(1 + |I|/K_i) + |S|\} \]  

(4)

Non-competitive:

\[ v = V_{max}|S|/\{K_m(1 + |I|/K_i) + |S|(1 + |I|/K_i)\} \]  

(5)

Uncompetitive:

\[ v = V_{max}|S|/[K_m + |S|(1 + |I|/K_i)] \]  

(6)

Linear Mixed-type:

\[ v = V_{max,app}|S|/(K_{m,app} + |S|) \]  

(7)

\[ V_{max,app} = V_{max} / (1 + 1/(\alpha K_i)) \]  

(8)

\[ K_{m,app} = K_m(1 + 1/K_i) / (1 + 1/(\alpha K_i)) \]  

(9)

where, v is the velocity of the reaction, Vmax is the maximum velocity, [S] is the substrate concentration, and [I] is the inhibitor concentration. Km is the Michaelis–Menten constant, and Ki is the inhibition constant. Visual assessment of the type of inhibition was undertaken by plotting the double reciprocal Lineweaver–Burk plot from experimental data points constituting the primary plot.

3.1.4. QSAR analysis

The various physicochemical properties of the small molecules employed in this study were computed from ChemMine tools employing OpenBabel descriptors [60] and ChemBioDraw 14.0. Pearson’s correlation analysis was carried out individually on each parameter against the obtained inhibition constants and the equation was derived by linear regression with GraphPad Prism, version 4.0. Genetic algorithm analysis was carried out using the opensource QSAR model development algorithm provided by Nanobridges.

3.1.5. Template based docking of small molecules

In order to find the interacting pose of the predicted small molecules with DHFR, template based docking was performed using the structure of DHFR in complex with folate (PDB_ID: 1RX7) [43] as the template. This was achieved by using the known interacting pose of folate with DHFR as the template and aligning the small molecules to it. To do so, initially we generated 200 different conformers for each of the predicted ligands using the open source cheminformatics software RDKit [61]. Next, LIGSIFT [44] was used to perform a structural alignment of each of the conformers to folate’s structure obtained in its crystal structure with DHFR. Finally, the best conformer for each case with the most significant P-value was chosen and superposed on folate. Both shape and chemical similarities between the two molecules were used to produce the alignments, and in cases where there were no significant alignments, only shape similarity was used to align the two molecules. The initial 3D conformation of each of the predicted ligands was obtained from PubChem [62], and Open Babel [63] was used for converting different file formats (e.g. SDF to MOL2 format).
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