

# Small Molecule DNA and RNA Binders

From Synthesis to Nucleic Acid Complexes

*M. Demeunynck, C. Bailly, W. D. Wilson (Eds.)*

 WILEY-VCH



**Small Molecule DNA and  
RNA Binders**

*M. Demeunynck, C. Bailly,  
W. D. Wilson (Eds.)*

## ***Related Titles from WILEY-VCH***

Anneliese E. Barron (Ed.)

### **DNA Sequencing**

2002, ca. 500 pages.

Hardcover. ISBN 3-527-30599-8

Susanne Brakmann and Kai Johnsson (Eds.)

### **Directed Molecular Evolution of Proteins**

2002, 368 pages.

Hardcover. ISBN 3-527-30423-1

O. Zerbe, R. Mannhold, H. Kubinyi and G. Folkers  
(Eds.)

### **BioNMR in Drug Research**

2002, ca. 350 pages.

Hardcover. ISBN 3-527-30465-7

Douglas T. Gjerde, Christopher P. Hanna and David D.  
Hornby

### **DNA Chromatography**

2002, 243 pages.

Hardcover. ISBN 3-527-30244-1

# Small Molecule DNA and RNA Binders

From Synthesis to Nucleic Acid Complexes

*M. Demeunynck, C. Bailly, W. D. Wilson (Eds.)*

 WILEY-VCH

**Dr. Martine Demeunynck**

Université Joseph Fourier  
BP53  
38041 Grenoble cedex  
France

**Dr. Christian Bailly**

Institut de Recherches sur le Cancer  
INSERM Unité 124  
Place de Verdun  
59045 Lille cedex  
France

**Prof. Dr. W. David Wilson**

Department of Chemistry  
Georgia State University  
University Plaza  
Atlanta GA 30303-3083  
USA

**Cover design**

Christian Coulombeau

■ This book was carefully produced. Nevertheless, editors, authors and publisher do not warrant the information contained therein to be free of errors. Readers are advised to keep in mind that statements, data, illustrations, procedural details or other items may inadvertently be inaccurate.

**Library of Congress Card No.: applied for**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

**Bibliographic information published by  
Die Deutsche Bibliothek**

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

© 2003 WILEY-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

All rights reserved (including those of translation in other languages). No part of this book may be reproduced in any form – by photoprinting, microfilm, or any other means – nor transmitted or translated into machine language without written permission from the publishers. Registered names, trademarks, etc. used in this book, even when not specifically marked as such, are not to be considered unprotected by law.

Printed in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Printed on acid-free paper.

**Typesetting** Asco Typesetters, Hong Kong

**Printing** betz-druck gmbH, Darmstadt

**Bookbinding** Litgas & Dopf Buchbinderei GmbH, Heppenheim

**ISBN** 3-527-30595-5

## Contents

### Volume 1

**Preface** *xix*

**Contributors** *xxi*

- 1 Forty Years On** 1  
*Michael J. Waring and L. P. G. Wakelin*
- 1.1 Early Experiments Prior to Molecular Modeling 1
- 1.2 Formulation of Molecular Models and Mechanisms of Binding to DNA 3
- 1.3 Specificity of Nucleotide Sequence Recognition 4
- 1.4 Details at the Atomic and Molecular Levels 6
- 1.5 Identification of Motifs for Drug Design 9
- 1.6 Actions on Nucleoproteins, Chromatin, and Enzymes 11
- References 12
- 2 Targeting HIV RNA with Small Molecules** 18  
*Nathan W. Luedtke and Yitzhak Tor*
- 2.1 Introduction 18
- 2.1.1 Translation 18
- 2.1.2 RNA Viruses 19
- 2.2 Small Molecules that Modulate RNA Activity 19
- 2.2.1 Magnesium (II) 20
- 2.2.2 Aminoglycosides 21
- 2.2.3 Ligand Specificity 23
- 2.2.4 Goals 23
- 2.3 The RRE and HIV Replication 24
- 2.4 Determination of RRE–Ligand Affinity and Specificity 25
- 2.4.1 Fluorescence Anisotropy 26
- 2.4.2 Solid-phase (Affinity-displacement) Assay 27
- 2.4.3 Ethidium Bromide Displacement 29
- 2.5 New RRE Ligands 29
- 2.5.1 Neomycin–acridine Conjugates 29

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 2.5.2    | Dimeric Aminoglycosides   | 32        |
| 2.5.3    | Guanidinoglycosides   | 32        |
| 2.6      | Conclusions   | 36        |
|          | Acknowledgments   | 37        |
|          | References  | 37        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>RNA Targeting by Bleomycin</b>   | <b>41</b> |
|          | <i>Sidney M. Hecht</i>  |           |
| 3.1      | Activation of Bleomycin for Polynucleotide Degradation                                | 41        |
| 3.2      | Bleomycin-mediated Cleavage of Transfer RNAs and tRNA Precursor Transcripts           | 42        |
| 3.3      | Other RNA Targets for Bleomycin   | 44        |
| 3.4      | Characteristics of RNA Cleavage by Fe·BLM   | 46        |
| 3.5      | Chemistry of Bleomycin-mediated RNA Cleavage  | 50        |
| 3.6      | Significance of RNA as a Target for Bleomycin   | 52        |
|          | Acknowledgments   | 54        |
|          | References  | 54        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Inhibitors of the Tat–TAR Interactions</b>   | <b>58</b> |
|          | <i>Chimmanamada U. Dinesh and Tariq M. Rana</i>                                       |           |
| 4.1      | Introduction  | 58        |
| 4.2      | Mechanism of Transcriptional Activation by Tat  | 59        |
| 4.3      | Tat–TAR Interactions  | 61        |
| 4.4      | RNA as a Small Molecule Drug Target   | 63        |
| 4.5      | Ligands for TAR RNA   | 63        |
| 4.5.1    | TAR RNA Bulge Binders   | 63        |
| 4.5.2    | Targeting Multiple Sites in TAR RNA   | 65        |
| 4.5.3    | Targeting RNA with Peptidomimetic Oligomers   | 66        |
| 4.5.3.1  | Backbone modification   | 66        |
| 4.5.3.2  | D-Peptides  | 68        |
| 4.6      | Combinatorial Library Approach in the Discovery of Small Molecule Drugs Targeting RNA | 69        |
| 4.6.1    | Combinatorial Chemistry   | 69        |
| 4.6.2    | Split Synthesis   | 70        |
| 4.6.3    | Encoding  | 72        |
| 4.6.4    | On-bead Screening and Identification of Structure-specific TAR-Binding ligands        | 73        |
| 4.6.5    | Ligand Sequence Analysis  | 74        |
| 4.6.6    | Heterochiral Small Molecules Target TAR RNA Bulge                                     | 76        |
| 4.6.7    | Inhibition of Tat <i>trans</i> -Activation <i>in vivo</i>                             | 78        |
| 4.7      | Cyclic Structures as RNA-targeting Drugs  | 78        |
| 4.8      | Summary and Perspective   | 80        |
|          | Acknowledgments   | 80        |
|          | References  | 81        |



|          |  |            |
|----------|--|------------|
| <b>5</b> | <b>DNA and RNA Recognition and Modification by Gly-Gly-His-Derived Metallopeptides</b> | <b>88</b>  |
|          | <i>Eric C. Long and Craig A. Claussen</i>  |            |
| 5.1      | Introduction   | 88         |
| 5.1.1    | General Considerations   | 88         |
| 5.1.2    | Metallopeptides in the Study of Nucleic Acid Recognition                               | 89         |
| 5.2      | Interactions of Gly-Gly-His-Derived Metallopeptides with DNA                           | 89         |
| 5.2.1    | Natural Occurrence and Metal-binding Properties  | 89         |
| 5.2.2    | Development as a DNA-Cleavage Agent  | 90         |
| 5.2.3    | DNA Binding and Modification by Ni(II)-Xaa-Xaa-His Metallopeptides                     | 92         |
| 5.2.3.1  | Selective minor groove recognition and binding   | 92         |
| 5.2.3.2  | Minor groove-directed deoxyribose oxidation  | 99         |
| 5.2.3.3  | Nature of the intermediate involved in deoxyribose oxidation                           | 102        |
| 5.2.3.4  | Generation of minor groove binding combinatorial libraries                             | 104        |
| 5.2.3.5  | Guanine nucleobase modification/oxidation  | 108        |
| 5.2.4    | DNA Strand Scission by Co-Xaa-Xaa-His Metallopeptides                                  | 111        |
| 5.2.4.1  | Activation via ambient O <sub>2</sub> and light  | 111        |
| 5.2.4.2  | Highly selective DNA cleavage via ambient O <sub>2</sub> activation                    | 112        |
| 5.3      | Recognition and Cleavage of RNA by Ni(II)-Xaa-Xaa-His Metallopeptides                  | 116        |
| 5.4      | Summary  | 118        |
|          | Acknowledgements   | 118        |
|          | References   | 118        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Salen–Metal Complexes</b>   | <b>126</b> |
|          | <i>S. E. Rokita and C. J. Burrows</i>  |            |
| 6.1      | Introduction   | 126        |
| 6.2      | Reversible Binding of Simple Metal–Salen Complexes                                     | 127        |
| 6.3      | Nucleic Acid Strand Scission Induced by Simple Metal–Salen Complexes                   | 129        |
| 6.3.1    | Metal–Salens Activated by Reductants for Strand Scission                               | 130        |
| 6.3.2    | Metal–Salens Activated by Peracids for Strand Scission                                 | 131        |
| 6.3.3    | Metal Salens Activated by Hydrogen Peroxide for Strand Scission                        | 134        |
| 6.3.4    | Metal–Salens Activated by Molecular Oxygen for Strand Scission                         | 134        |
| 6.4      | Covalent Coupling between Simple Nickel–Salen Complexes and Nucleic Acids              | 136        |
| 6.5      | Chimeric Metal–Salen Complexes   | 139        |
| 6.6      | Conclusion   | 140        |
|          | References   | 141        |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Charge Transport in DNA</b>   | <b>146</b> |
|          | <i>Tashica T. Williams and Jacqueline K. Barton</i>                                    |            |
| 7.1      | Introduction   | 146        |

|          |   |            |
|----------|---|------------|
| 7.2      | DNA Metallointercalators  | 147        |
| 7.2.1    | Phenanthrenequinone Diimine Complexes of Rhodium                        | 148        |
| 7.2.2    | Dipyridophenazine Complexes of Ruthenium                                | 148        |
| 7.3      | Photophysical Studies of Electron Transport in DNA                      | 150        |
| 7.3.1    | Electron Transport between Ethidium and a Rhodium Intercalator          | 150        |
| 7.3.2    | Ultrafast Charge Transport in DNA: Ethidium and 7-Deazaguanine          | 151        |
| 7.3.3    | Base–Base Charge Transport  | 152        |
| 7.4      | DNA-mediated Electron Transport on Surfaces                             | 153        |
| 7.4.1    | Characterization of DNA-modified Surfaces                               | 153        |
| 7.4.2    | Electrochemical Probe of Redox Reactions of Intercalators               | 154        |
| 7.4.3    | Sensing Mismatches in DNA   | 155        |
| 7.5      | Long-range Oxidative Damage to DNA                                      | 156        |
| 7.5.1    | Long-range Oxidative Damage at 5'-GG-3' Sites by a Rhodium Intercalator | 156        |
| 7.5.2    | Models for Long-range DNA Charge Transport                              | 158        |
| 7.5.3    | Sequence Dependence of DNA Charge Transport                             | 159        |
| 7.5.4    | The Effects of Ion Distribution on Long-range Charge Transport          | 160        |
| 7.5.5    | Mismatch Influence on Long-range Oxidative Damage to DNA                | 162        |
| 7.6      | Using Charge Transport to Probe DNA–Protein Interactions and DNA Repair | 163        |
| 7.6.1    | DNA-Binding Proteins as Modulators of Oxidative Damage from a Distance  | 163        |
| 7.6.2    | Detection of Transient Radicals in Protein/DNA Charge Transport         | 164        |
| 7.6.3    | Electrical Detection of DNA–Protein Interactions                        | 165        |
| 7.6.4    | Repair of Thymine Dimers  | 167        |
| 7.6.5    | Oxidative Damage to DNA in Nucleosomes                                  | 169        |
| 7.6.6    | DNA Charge Transport within the Nucleus                                 | 170        |
| 7.7      | Conclusions   | 171        |
|          | Acknowledgements  | 172        |
|          | References  | 172        |
| <b>8</b> | <b>DNA Interactions of Novel Platinum Anticancer Drugs</b>              | <b>178</b> |
|          | <i>Viktor Brabec and Jana Kasparkova</i>                                |            |
| 8.1      | Introduction  | 178        |
| 8.2      | Modifications by Cisplatin  | 178        |
| 8.2.1    | Adducts and Conformational Distortions                                  | 178        |
| 8.2.2    | Effects on DNA Replication and Transcription                            | 181        |
| 8.2.3    | Cellular Resistance, Repair   | 182        |
| 8.2.4    | Recognition of the Lesions by Cellular Proteins                         | 184        |
| 8.2.4.1  | HMG-domain proteins   | 184        |
| 8.2.4.2  | Proteins without an HMG domain  | 185        |
| 8.2.5    | Mechanism of Action of Cisplatin  | 188        |
| 8.3      | Modifications by Antitumor Analogs of Cisplatin                         | 189        |
| 8.3.1    | Carboplatin   | 189        |

|           |   |            |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 8.3.2     | Oxaliplatin   | 190        |
| 8.3.3     | Other Analogs   | 194        |
| 8.3.3.1   | Bidentate analogs   | 194        |
| 8.3.3.2   | Monodentate analogs   | 196        |
| 8.4       | Modification by Antitumor Analogs of Clinically Ineffective Transplatin                           | 197        |
| 8.4.1     | Modifications by Transplatin  | 199        |
| 8.4.2     | Analogs Containing Iminoether Groups  | 199        |
| 8.4.3     | Analogs Containing Planar Amine Ligand  | 201        |
| 8.4.4     | Other Analogs   | 203        |
| 8.5       | Modifications by Polynuclear Platinum Antitumor Drugs   | 204        |
| 8.5.1     | Dinuclear Compounds   | 205        |
| 8.5.2     | Trinuclear Compound   | 209        |
| 8.6       | Concluding Remarks  | 211        |
|           | Acknowledgments   | 212        |
|           | References  | 212        |
| <b>9</b>  | <b>Electrochemical Detection of DNA with Small Molecules</b>                                      | <b>224</b> |
|           | <i>Shigeori Takenaka</i>  |            |
| 9.1       | Introduction  | 224        |
| 9.2       | Electrochemistry of Nucleic Acids   | 224        |
| 9.3       | DNA Labeling Through a Covalent Bond  | 227        |
| 9.4       | Electrochemistry of Metal Complexes Bound to DNA  | 227        |
| 9.5       | Electrochemistry of DNA-binding Small Molecules   | 231        |
| 9.6       | DNA Sensor Based on an Electrochemically Active DNA-binding Molecule as a Hybridization Indicator | 233        |
| 9.7       | Mismatched DNA Detection by Hybridization Indicator   | 236        |
| 9.8       | DNA-detecting System using Hybridization Indicator as a Mediator                                  | 239        |
| 9.9       | Application to DNA Microarray   | 239        |
| 9.10      | Conclusion  | 240        |
| 9.11      | Summary   | 241        |
|           | Acknowledgments   | 241        |
|           | References  | 241        |
| <b>10</b> | <b>Design and Studies of Abasic Site Targeting Drugs: New Strategies for Cancer Chemotherapy</b>  | <b>247</b> |
|           | <i>Jean-Francois Constant and Martine Demeunynck</i>  |            |
| 10.1      | Introduction  | 247        |
| 10.1.1    | Importance of Abasic Sites in Cells   | 247        |
| 10.1.2    | Structure of Abasic DNA   | 249        |
| 10.1.3    | Abasic Site Reactivity  | 251        |
| 10.1.4    | Enzymology Of the Abasic Site   | 252        |
| 10.2      | Drug Design   | 252        |
| 10.2.1    | Introduction  | 252        |

|           |  |            |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 10.2.2    | Synthesis of the Heterodimers  | 256        |
| 10.2.3    | Nuclease Properties  | 259        |
| 10.2.4    | Molecules Inducing Multiple DNA Damage   | 262        |
| 10.2.5    | Drug–DNA Interaction   | 264        |
| 10.2.6    | Enzyme Inhibition  | 267        |
| 10.3      | Pharmacological Data   | 269        |
|           | Dedication   | 272        |
|           | Acknowledgments  | 272        |
|           | References   | 272        |
| <b>11</b> | <b>Interactions of Macrocyclic Compounds with Nucleic Acids</b>  | <b>278</b> |
|           | <i>Marie-Paule Teulade-Fichou and Jean-Pierre Vigneron</i>   |            |
| 11.1      | Introduction   | 278        |
| 11.2      | Nucleotide Complexation  | 279        |
| 11.2.1    | Macrocyclic Polyamines   | 279        |
| 11.2.2    | Azoniacyclophanes  | 280        |
| 11.2.3    | Cyclobisintercalands   | 282        |
| 11.2.3.1  | Acridinium derivatives   | 282        |
| 11.2.3.2  | Phenanthridinium derivatives   | 283        |
| 11.2.3.3  | Polyamino naphthalenophanes and acridinophanes   | 284        |
| 11.3      | Nucleic Acids Complexation   | 288        |
| 11.3.1    | Azoniacyclophanes  | 288        |
| 11.3.2    | Porphyrin Derivatives  | 289        |
| 11.3.3    | Phenanthridinium Derivatives   | 291        |
| 11.3.4    | Acridinium Derivatives   | 291        |
| 11.3.4.1  | SDM Macrocycle   | 292        |
| 11.3.4.2  | BisA Macrocycle  | 294        |
| 11.3.5    | Miscellaneous  | 306        |
| 11.3.5.1  | Naphthalene diimide derivatives  | 306        |
| 11.3.5.2  | Phenazine derivatives  | 309        |
| 11.3.5.3  | Aminocalixarenes and aminocyclodextrins  | 309        |
| 11.4      | Conclusion and Perspectives  | 310        |
|           | Acknowledgements   | 311        |
|           | References   | 311        |
| <b>12</b> | <b>Triplex- versus Quadruplex-specific Ligands and Telomerase Inhibition</b>   | <b>315</b> |
|           | <i>Patrizia Alberti, Magali Hoarau, Lionel Guittat, Masashi Takasugi, Paola B. Arimondo, Laurent Lacroix, Martin Mills, Marie-Paule Teulade-Fichou, Jean-Pierre Vigneron, Jean-Marie Lehn, Patrick Mailliet, and Jean-Louis Mergny</i> |            |
| 12.1      | Introduction   | 315        |
| 12.2      | Nucleic Acids Samples  | 317        |
| 12.3      | Dialysis Results   | 322        |
| 12.4      | Induction of Quadruplex Structures   | 327        |
| 12.5      | Triplex versus Quadruplex Stabilization  | 328        |
| 12.6      | Conclusion and Further Developments  | 332        |

- 12.7 Summary 332
- Acknowledgments 333
- References 333

## Volume 2

- 13 Design and Analysis of G4 Recognition Compounds 337**  
*Shozeb Haider, Gary N. Parkinson, Martin A. Read, and Stephen Neidle*
- 13.1 Introduction 337
- 13.2 Telomeric DNA 340
- 13.3 Crystal Structures of G-quadruplexes 342
- 13.3.1 The d(TG<sub>4</sub>T) Quadruplex 342
- 13.3.2 The Na<sup>+</sup> form of d(G<sub>4</sub>T<sub>4</sub>G<sub>4</sub>) *Oxytricha nova* telomeric DNA 343
- 13.3.3 The K<sup>+</sup> form of d(G<sub>4</sub>T<sub>4</sub>G<sub>4</sub>) *Oxytricha nova* Telomeric DNA 344
- 13.3.4 The Crystal Structure of the Human Telomere G-quadruplex 345
- 13.3.5 The r(UG<sub>4</sub>U) RNA Quadruplex 347
- 13.4 NMR Studies of Quadruplexes 347
- 13.5 Quadruplex-binding Ligands 348
- 13.6 NMR and Modeling Studies of Quadruplex–Ligand Complexes 349
- Appendix. Methodology for Ligand Quadruplex Modeling 351
- References 355
  
- 14 Triple Helix-specific Ligands 360**  
*Keith R. Fox and Richard A. J. Darby*
- 14.1 Introduction 360
- 14.2 Triplex-binding Ligands 362
- 14.2.1 Benzopyridoindole Derivatives 362
- 14.2.2 Coralyne 365
- 14.2.3 Naphthylquinolines 366
- 14.2.4 Bis-amidoanthraquinones 367
- 14.2.5 Aminoglycosides 369
- 14.2.6 Other Ligands 369
- 14.3 Sequence and Structural Selectivity of Triplex-specific Ligands 370
- 14.3.1 Sequence Selectivity 370
- 14.3.2 Binding to Different Motifs 370
- 14.4 Interaction of Duplex-specific Ligands with Triple Helical Nucleic Acids 371
- 14.4.1 Intercalators 371
- 14.4.2 Minor Groove Binders 371
- 14.5 Tethered DNA-binding Agents 373
- 14.5.1 Tethered Triplex-binding Ligands 373
- 14.5.2 Tethered Intercalators 374
- 14.5.3 Other Tethered DNA-binding Agents 374
- 14.6 Other Uses of Triplex-binding Ligands 375
- 14.6.1 Relaxing the specificity of triplex formation 375

- 14.6.2 Triplex Cleaving Agents 375
- 14.6.3 Antigene Activity 376
- Acknowledgments 376
- References 376
  
- 15 Polyamide Dimer Stacking in the DNA Minor Groove and Recognition of T-G Mismatched Base Pairs in DNA 384**  
*Eilyn R. Lacy, Erik M. Madsen, Moses Lee, and W. David Wilson*
- 15.1 Introduction: Sequence-specific Recognition of DNA by Synthetic Molecules 384
- 15.1.1 DNA Sequence Recognition 384
- 15.1.2 Stacking Behavior of Polyamides and DNA Recognition 386
- 15.2 T-G Mismatched DNA Base Pairs and their Biological Relevance 389
- 15.3 Potential Applications for Recognition of Mismatched Base Pairs 390
- 15.4 Structure of T-G Mismatched Base Pairs 390
- 15.5 Binding of Imidazole-containing Polyamide Analogs to T-G Mismatches through a Dimeric Binding Motif – Structural Studies 391
- 15.6 Binding of Imidazole-containing Polyamides to T-G Mismatches through a Dimeric Binding Motif: Thermodynamic and Kinetic Studies 395
- 15.6.1 Stoichiometry of Complexes 395
- 15.6.2 Binding Constants and Cooperativity 398
- 15.6.3 Kinetic Studies 400
- 15.7 Developing Molecules Capable of Recognizing Mismatches in DNA 404
- 15.8 Use of the T-G Recognition Motif by Im/Im Pairs to Probe the Effects of the Terminal Head Group on the Stacking of Polyamides 405
- 15.9 Future Directions 407
- 15.9.1 Polyamide–DNA Complexes 407
- 15.9.2 Mismatched Base Pair Recognition 408
- Acknowledgments 408
- Dedication of this Chapter to Professor J. William Lown on the Occasion of his Retirement 409
- References 409
  
- 16 Dicationic DNA Minor Groove Binders as Antimicrobial Agents 414**  
*Richard R. Tidwell and David W. Boykin*
- 16.1 Introduction 414
- 16.1.1 Intercalation 415
- 16.1.2 Minor Groove Binding 416
- 16.1.3 Netropsin 417
- 16.1.4 DAPI 419
- 16.1.5 Berenil 420
- 16.1.6 Pentamidine 421
- 16.2 Dicationic Carbazoles and Analogs 422
- 16.2.1 Introduction 422
- 16.2.2 DNA Binding of Dicationic Carbazoles and Analogs 423

|           |  |            |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 16.2.3    | Antimicrobial Activity of Carbazoles and Related Analogs                               | 427        |
| 16.2.4    | Pro-drugs of Carbazoles and Related Analogs  | 429        |
| 16.2.5    | Synthesis of Carbazoles and Related Analogs  | 431        |
| 16.3      | Dicationic Furans  | 433        |
| 16.3.1    | Introduction   | 433        |
| 16.3.2    | DNA Binding of Furamidine and Analogs  | 434        |
| 16.3.3    | Antimicrobial Activity of Furamidine and Analogs                                       | 436        |
| 16.3.4    | Pro-drug Approaches for Furamidine   | 444        |
| 16.3.5    | Synthetic Approaches for Furamidine and Analogs  | 446        |
| 16.4      | Conclusions  | 451        |
|           | Acknowledgments  | 452        |
|           | References   | 452        |
| <b>17</b> | <b>Energetics of Anthracycline–DNA Interactions</b>                                    | <b>461</b> |
|           | <i>Jonathan B. Chaires</i>   |            |
| 17.1      | Introduction   | 461        |
| 17.2      | Binding Free Energy  | 463        |
| 17.3      | Salt Dependency of Daunorubicin Binding to DNA   | 465        |
| 17.4      | Binding Enthalpy and the Temperature Dependence of Binding                             | 468        |
| 17.5      | Thermodynamic Profile for Daunorubicin Binding to Calf-Thymus DNA                      | 471        |
| 17.6      | Hydration Changes  | 472        |
| 17.7      | Substituent Contributions  | 475        |
| 17.8      | Isostructural is not Isoenergetic  | 476        |
| 17.9      | Parsing the Binding Free Energy  | 477        |
| 17.10     | Summary  | 478        |
|           | Acknowledgements   | 479        |
|           | References   | 479        |
| <b>18</b> | <b>Acridine-4-carboxamides and the Concept of Minimal DNA Intercalators</b>            | <b>482</b> |
|           | <i>William A. Denny</i>  |            |
| 18.1      | DNA Intercalation  | 482        |
| 18.1.1    | Definition   | 482        |
| 18.1.2    | Effect of Chromophore Size   | 482        |
| 18.1.3    | Effect of Chromophore Cross-sectional Thickness  | 484        |
| 18.2      | Intercalative Binding and Cytotoxicity   | 484        |
| 18.2.1    | Correlation of Cytotoxicity with Mode, Strength and Kinetics of Binding                | 484        |
| 18.2.2    | The Drive For Tight Binders; Chromophore and/or Side Chain Modulation                  | 486        |
| 18.2.3    | Mechanism of Cytotoxicity of DNA Intercalators: Topoisomerase Poisoning                | 486        |
| 18.2.4    | Pharmacological Drawbacks of Tight DNA Binding: the Concept of “Minimal Intercalators” | 487        |
| 18.3      | Classes of “Minimal Intercalators”   | 487        |

|           |  |            |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 18.3.1    | Styrylquinolines   | 487        |
| 18.3.2    | 2-Phenylquinolines   | 488        |
| 18.3.3    | Phenylbenzimidazoles   | 489        |
| 18.3.5    | Phenazines   | 490        |
| 18.3.4    | Dibenzodioxins   | 491        |
| 18.4      | Acridinecarboxamides: the Development of DACA                                  | 491        |
| 18.4.1    | 9-Aminoacridine-4-carboxamides   | 491        |
| 18.4.2    | DACA and Other Acridine-4-carboxamides   | 493        |
| 18.4.2.1  | Introduction   | 493        |
| 18.4.2.2  | Interaction of DACA with topoisomerase   | 494        |
| 18.4.2.3  | Cellular studies with DACA   | 495        |
| 18.4.2.4  | Metabolism and pharmacology of DACA  | 495        |
| 18.4.2.5  | Clinical studies with DACA   | 496        |
| 18.5      | Conclusions  | 496        |
|           | References   | 497        |
| <b>19</b> | <b>DNA Topoisomerase-targeted Drugs</b>  | <b>503</b> |
|           | <i>M. Palumbo, B. Gatto, and C. Sissi</i>                                      |            |
| 19.1      | Introduction   | 503        |
| 19.2      | Structure and Functions of DNA Topoisomerases                                  | 503        |
| 19.2.1    | Type I Topoisomerases  | 504        |
| 19.2.1.1  | Structural features  | 504        |
| 19.2.1.2  | Catalytic process  | 505        |
| 19.2.2    | Type II DNA Topoisomerases   | 506        |
| 19.2.2.1  | Structural features  | 507        |
| 19.2.2.2  | Catalytic process  | 508        |
| 19.3      | Drug Targeted at Topoisomerases  | 509        |
| 19.3.1    | Top Poisons  | 510        |
| 19.3.1.1  | Top1 poisons   | 510        |
| 19.3.1.2  | Top2 poisons   | 515        |
| 19.3.1.3  | Sequence specificity of top poisoning  | 524        |
| 19.3.2    | Top Inhibitors   | 525        |
| 19.3.2.1  | Human top2 inhibitors  | 525        |
| 19.3.2.2  | Bacterial top2 inhibitors  | 525        |
| 19.3.3    | Mixed Top1/2 Poisons or Inhibitors   | 527        |
| 19.4      | Conclusions  | 529        |
|           | References   | 530        |
| <b>20</b> | <b>Targeting DNA and Topoisomerase I with Indolocarbazole Antitumor Agents</b> | <b>538</b> |
|           | <i>Christian Bailly</i>  |            |
| 20.1      | Introduction   | 538        |
| 20.2      | Naturally Occurring Indolocarbazoles   | 540        |
| 20.2.1    | Staurosporine and Analogs with a Pyranose Sugar Moiety                         | 540        |
| 20.2.2    | K252a and Analogs with a Furanose Sugar Moiety                                 | 542        |



|           |  |            |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 20.2.3    | Rebeccamycin   | 543        |
| 20.2.4    | AT2433   | 545        |
| 20.3      | Synthetic Indolocarbazole Derivatives Targeting DNA and Topoisomerase I  | 545        |
| 20.3.1    | Influence of Chloro and Bromo Substituents on the IND Chromophore  | 546        |
| 20.3.2    | Modification of the Imide Heterocycle  | 548        |
| 20.3.3    | Halogenoacetyl Derivatives   | 549        |
| 20.3.4    | Glucose and Galactose Derivatives: Stereospecific DNA Recognition  | 549        |
| 20.3.5    | From Rebeccamycin to Staurosporine-type Analogs  | 551        |
| 20.3.6    | Amino Sugar Derivatives  | 553        |
| 20.3.7    | Methylation of the Indole Nitrogen   | 553        |
| 20.3.8    | Indolo[2,3- <i>c</i> ]carbazole  | 555        |
| 20.3.9    | Rebeccamycin Dimers and Conjugates   | 556        |
| 20.4      | Design of a tumor-active compound: NB-506  | 557        |
| 20.4.1    | From BE13793C to ED-110 and NB-506   | 557        |
| 20.4.2    | DNA Binding and Topoisomerase I Inhibition   | 559        |
| 20.4.3    | Cytotoxicity and Apoptosis   | 559        |
| 20.4.4    | NB-506-resistant Cell Lines  | 561        |
| 20.4.5    | Antitumor Activity   | 562        |
| 20.4.6    | Inhibition of the Topoisomerase I Kinase Activity  | 562        |
| 20.4.7    | A Novel Clinical Candidate: J-107088   | 564        |
| 20.4.8    | Biosynthesis   | 566        |
| 20.5      | Conclusion   | 567        |
|           | Acknowledgments  | 567        |
|           | References   | 567        |
| <b>21</b> | <b>Defining the Molecular Interactions that are Important for the Poisoning of Human Topoisomerase I by Benzimidazoles and Terbenzimidazoles</b>     | <b>576</b> |
|           | <i>Daniel S. Pilch, Hsing-Yin Liu, Tsai-Kun Li, Edmond J. LaVoie, and Christopher M. Barbieri</i>  |            |
| 21.1      | Human DNA Topoisomerase Type I   | 576        |
| 21.2      | Topoisomerase I as a Target for Anticancer Drugs   | 577        |
| 21.3      | Benzimidazoles   | 577        |
| 21.3.1    | The Extent to which Benzimidazoles Stimulate hTOP1-mediated DNA Cleavage Depends on their Structure  | 577        |
| 21.3.2    | Identification of hTOP1 as the Specific Cytotoxic Target of 5N2pMPBZ   | 579        |
| 21.3.3    | Viscometric Measurements Reveal that 56MD2pMPBZ Binding Unwinds Negative Supercoils in pUC19, Consistent with an Intercalative Mode of Interaction   | 580        |
| 21.3.4    | The Affinity of Benzimidazoles for Duplex DNA is Modulated by the Structure and Electronic Properties of the Substituents on the Benzimidazole Rings | 583        |

- 21.3.5 Benzimidazole Binding to Duplex DNA Requires the Ligand to be in its Fully Protonated Cationic State 585
- 21.3.6 DNA Binding Alone is not Sufficient to Impart Benzimidazoles with the Ability to Trap and Stabilize the Cleavable TOP1–DNA Complex 587
- 21.3.7 A Structural Model for the Ternary hTOP1–5N2pHPBZ–DNA Cleavable Complex that is Consistent with the Current Structure–Activity Database 587
- 21.4 Terbenzimidazoles 590
  - 21.4.1 The Pattern of hTOP1-mediated DNA Cleavage Induced by Terbenzimidazoles is Distinct from that Induced by CPT 590
  - 21.4.2 TOP1 Poisoning by Terbenzimidazoles is not the Result of Ligand-induced DNA Unwinding 592
  - 21.4.3 TB Derivatives Exhibit Linear Dichroism Properties Characteristic of Minor Groove-directed DNA Binding 593
  - 21.4.4 The Relative DNA-binding Affinities of the Terbenzimidazoles is Correlated with their Relative TOP1-poisoning Activities 594
  - 21.4.5 A Potential Role for Ligand Interactions with the DNA Minor Groove in Stabilization of the TOP1–DNA Cleavable Complex 596
    - 21.4.5.1 5PTB preferentially binds and stabilizes bent versus normal duplex DNA 598
    - 21.4.5.2 5PTB binding does not remove helical bends from kinetoplast DNA 599
- Acknowledgments 600
- References 601

## 22 Binding and Reaction of Calicheamicin and Other Eneidyne Antibiotics with DNA 609

*Joseph P. Cosgrove and Peter C. Dedon*

- 22.1 Introduction 609
- 22.2 Sources, Biosynthesis, and Structural Conservation 609
- 22.3 Mechanisms of Target Recognition 612
  - 22.3.1 Overall Scheme for Binding and Activation 612
  - 22.3.2 Structure of the Calicheamicin–DNA Complex 613
  - 22.3.3 Esperamicin Structure and Function 615
  - 22.3.4 Structure and Dynamics of Calicheamicin Binding Sites 616
  - 22.3.5 Neocarzinostatin Recognition of Bulged DNA Structures 618
- 22.4 Products of Eneidyne-induced DNA Damage 620
  - 22.4.1 Proportions of Single- and Double-stranded DNA Lesions Produced by Eneidyne 620
  - 22.4.2 Oxidation of the 1'-Position of Deoxyribose and the Biochemistry of the Deoxyribonolactone Abasic Site 622
  - 22.4.3 Oxidation of the 4'-Position of Deoxyribose and the Chemistry of Base Propenal 623
  - 22.4.4 Oxidation of the 5'-Position of Deoxyribose and the Chemistry of Butenedialdehyde 624

- 22.4.5 Covalent Adducts of Eneidyne with Deoxyribose 624
- 22.5 Eneidyne-induced DNA Damage in Cells 626
- 22.5.1 Eneidyne Target Recognition in Chromatin and Cells 626
- 22.5.2 Molecular and Genomics Approaches to Understanding Cellular Responses to Eneidyne 628
- 22.6 Summary 630
- Acknowledgments 631
- References 631
  
- 23 Devising a Structural Basis for the Potent Cytotoxic Effects of Ecteinasidin 743 643**  
*Federico Gago and Laurence H. Hurley*
- 23.1 Introduction 643
- 23.2 Biological Activity and Characterization of the Active Compounds 643
- 23.3 Structural Characterization and Synthesis of Ecteinasidins 646
- 23.4 Structure–Activity Relationships 651
- 23.5 Structural Characterization of Et 743–DNA Adducts 652
- 23.6 Structural Studies of Ecteinasidin–DNA Complexes 654
- 23.7 Molecular Basis for Covalent Reactivity and Sequence Selectivity 660
- 23.8 The Rate of Reversal of Et 743 from Drug-Modified 5'-AGT is Faster than that from Drug-modified 5'-AGC Sequences 660
- 23.9 Et 743 can Reverse from its Initial Covalent Adduct Site and Bond to an Unmodified Target Sequence 661
- 23.10 The Kinetics of the Covalent Modification of 5'-AGC and 5'-AGT Sequences by Et 743 are Similar 662
- 23.11 The Differences in the Rate of the Reverse Reaction May Be Derived from Structural Differences between Et 743–DNA Adducts at the 5'-AGC and 5'-AGT Sequences 664
- 23.12 Molecular Targets for Et 743 664
- 23.12.1 Involvement of Transcription-coupled Nucleotide Excision Repair in Mediating the Cytotoxic Effects of Et 743 665
- 23.12.2 Suppression of MDR1 Transcription by Et 743 666
- 23.13 Relationship of Structural Consequences of DNA Modification by Et 743 to Biological Effects 667
- 23.14 Conclusions 671
- Acknowledgments 672
- References 672
  
- 24 The Azinomycins. Discovery, Synthesis, and DNA-binding Studies 676**  
*Maxwell Casely-Hayford and Mark Searcey*
- 24.1 Introduction 676
- 24.2 Isolation of the Azinomycins 1–3 677
- 24.3 Studies of the Truncated Analog 3 678
- 24.3.1 Stereoselective Synthesis of the Truncated Azinomycin 3 678

|           |   |            |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 24.3.2    | DNA-binding and Biological Activity Studies of the Truncated Fragment and Synthetic Analogs   | 681        |
| 24.4      | Studies on the Total Synthesis of the Azinomycin A  | 683        |
| 24.4.1    | Synthesis of the 1-Azabicyclo[3.1.0]hex-2-ylidene Dehydroamino Acid Subunit   | 683        |
| 24.4.1.1  | Synthesis of the aldehyde unit  | 684        |
| 24.4.1.2  | Wadsworth–Horner–Emmons reaction, bromination, and ring closure   | 684        |
| 24.4.2    | The Total Synthesis of Azinomycin A   | 686        |
| 24.5      | Computational Studies of DNA Binding of the Azinomycins   | 689        |
| 24.6      | Experimental DNA-binding Studies and Antitumor Activities of the Full Azinomycin Structures – Is Crosslinking Required for Biological Activity? | 690        |
| 24.7      | Conclusions   | 691        |
|           | Acknowledgments   | 694        |
|           | References  | 694        |
| <b>25</b> | <b>The Generation and DNA-Interaction of PBD and CBI Libraries</b>  | <b>697</b> |
|           | <i>Alison Hardy, Jane M. Berry, Natalie Brooks-Turner, Philip W. Howard, John. A. Hartley, and David. E. Thurston</i>                           |            |
| 25.1      | Introduction  | 697        |
| 25.2      | Synthesis of Tethered PBD and CBI Constructs  | 699        |
| 25.2.1    | Synthesis of Capping Units  | 699        |
| 25.2.2    | Attachment of PBD and CBI Capping Units to Solid Support  | 700        |
| 25.3      | On-bead DNA Interaction   | 701        |
| 25.3.1    | Interaction of Double-stranded DNA to PBDs and CBIs On-bead   | 701        |
| 25.3.2    | On-bead DNA Sequence Selectivity  | 703        |
| 25.4      | Library Synthesis   | 704        |
| 25.4.1    | Library Screening   | 706        |
| 25.5      | Conclusion  | 709        |
|           | Acknowledgments   | 709        |
|           | References  | 709        |
|           | <b>Index</b>  | <b>711</b> |

## Preface

The ultimate goal of most organic-medicinal chemists is to see the small molecule that they have synthesized become a useful drug for the treatment of human diseases. Unfortunately, even with modern technology this is an extremely rare event. In most cases, the compounds designed and synthesized (generally with pain and passion) have a brief existence that does not exceed the first biological activity assay. The valley between chemistry and therapeutics is deep and difficult to cross but nevertheless the two disciplines are intimately associated. It is our goal to help construct a bridge between the makers of the small molecules and the users. Over the past two decades, a relatively large number of useful anticancer and anti-parasitic drugs have been discovered or rationally designed based on the principle of nucleic acids recognition. A better understanding of the molecular rules that govern interactions between small molecules and the many sequences and structures of DNA and RNA is pivotal to the development of novel drug candidates. How does the drug adapt to the nucleic acid target (and *vice versa*)? How do nucleic acid structures affect ligand binding? How do small molecules read the genetic information? These types of questions continue to excite our scientific curiosity and the quest for better DNA/RNA binders drives modern researchers much as the search for the Holy Grail did the ancients.

Design and development of nucleic acid targeted drugs is a challenging enterprise but real breakthroughs have been made in recent years and many are reported here. This volume is intended to give the reader an up-to-date view of the current status and expected developments in research involving ligand-nucleic acid recognition. This book was built on a discussion among the three of us on how chemistry, biophysical chemistry and pharmacology serve our field to help design new drugs. Our different but complementary view angles on the subject prompted us to edit this volume focussed on DNA/RNA recognition by a variety of small molecules: peptides, intercalators, groove binders, metal complexes. The various DNA structures that can be targeted by drugs are also considered and the field of natural products is partially covered. Altogether, the 25 chapters of this volume survey most of the drug categories that bind, bond or cleave nucleic acids. The reader will notice the diversity of small molecules mentioned here, from marine products to platinum complexes, from G4-binders to RNA cleaving agents, from abasic site selective agents to aptamers, as well as the panel of biophysical and

biochemical approaches routinely used to investigate the structures and dynamics of drug-nucleic acids complexes. The portraits of specific drug families (anthracyclines, indolocarbazoles, bleomycins, ...) are also thoroughly presented. The amalgam was deliberately chosen to cross ideas of organic chemists and biophysicists and those more interested in the therapeutic end point of the research.

The volume starts with a general introduction (magisterially presented in a British style) and then it flies over the world, from several countries in Europe (Spain, Italy, France, Czech Republic, UK) to the USA, via Japan and New Zealand, illustrating the essential international character of the research (and the friendly atmosphere of the edition). Inevitably we have neglected (mostly for consideration of space) a number of interesting areas that should have been cited here, such as clinical applications. But the gallery of molecules presented in this volume must be considered as a live exhibit to explore and to use for further drug design. Come on in, and like us, become fascinated by the "small molecules" that bind or bite the genetic material in its many forms. We hope you will also find examining this volume an enriching experience.

The enterprise was very exciting and proceeded smoothly (with no delay!) thanks to the enthusiastic contribution of all the authors. We are grateful to everyone for delivering their manuscript on time (and in some cases even well before the deadline!) and for making our task as editors such a memorable one. We also thank our "artist" Christian Coulombeau who kindly drew the front cover, sort of a railway to the future. Finally, we shall dedicate this volume to our colleagues who left the world too quickly to contribute (Marc Leng, David S. Sigman, and Peter A. Kollman in particular).

M.D., C.B., W.D.W.  
Grenoble, Lille and Atlanta  
September 2002

## Contributors

Dr. Christian Bailly  
Institut de Recherches sur le Cancer de Lille  
INSERM U-524  
Place de Verdun  
59045 Lille Cedex  
France

Prof. Dr Jacqueline K. Barton  
Division of Chemistry and Chemical  
Engineering  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, CA 91125  
USA

Dr. David W. Boykin  
Department of Chemistry  
Georgia State University  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303  
USA

Dr. Viktor Brabec  
Institute of Biophysics  
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic  
Kralovopolska 135  
61265 Brno  
Czech Republic

Dr. Jonathan B. Chaires  
Department of Biochemistry  
University of Mississippi Medical Center  
2500 North State Street  
Jackson, Mississippi 39216-4505  
USA

Dr. Jean-François Constant  
LEDSS  
Université Joseph Fourier  
BP 53  
38041 Grenoble cedex 9  
France

Dr. Peter C. Dedon  
Division of Bioengineering and Environmental  
Health  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
USA

Dr. William A. Denny  
Auckland Cancer Society Research Centre  
Faculty of Medicine and Health Science  
The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019  
Auckland

Prof. Dr. Keith R. Fox  
Division of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology  
School of Biological Sciences  
University of Southampton  
Bassett Crescent East  
Southampton SO16 7PX  
UK

Prof. Dr. Sidney M. Hecht  
Department of Chemistry  
University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901  
USA

Dr. Laurence H. Hurley  
Howard J. Schaeffer Endowed Chair in  
Pharmaceutical Sciences  
Arizona Cancer Center  
1515 N. Campbell Ave.  
Room 4949  
Tucson, AZ 85724  
USA

Dr. Moses Lee  
Department of Chemistry  
Furman University  
Greenville, SC 29613  
USA

Dr. Eric Long  
Department of Chemistry  
Indiana University/Purdue University  
Indianapolis, IN 46202-3274  
USA

Dr. Jean-Louis Mergny  
Laboratoire de Biophysique  
Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle  
INSERM U 201 CNRS UMR 8646  
43 rue Cuvier  
75231 Paris cedex 05  
France

Prof. Dr. Stephen Neidle  
Cancer Research UK Biomolecular Structure  
Group  
The School of Pharmacy  
University of London, 29–39  
Brunswick Square  
London WC1N 1AX  
UK

Dr. Manlio Palumbo  
Professor of Medicinal Chemistry  
Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences  
Via Marzolo, 5  
35131 Padova  
Italy

Dr. Laurence H. Patterson  
Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological  
Chemistry  
School of Pharmacy  
University of London  
Brunswick Square  
London, WC1N 1AX  
UK

Dr. Daniel Pilch  
Department of Pharmacology  
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New  
Jersey-Robert Wood Johnson Medical School  
Piscataway, NJ 08854  
USA

Dr. Tariq M. Rana  
Department of Pharmacology  
Robert Wood Johnson Medical School  
675 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, NJ 08854  
USA

Dr. Steve Rokita  
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland 20742  
USA

Dr. Mark Searcey  
Department of Pharmaceutical and Biological  
Chemistry  
The School of Pharmacy  
University of London  
29/39 Brunswick Square  
London WC1N 1AX  
UK

Dr. Shigeori Takenaka  
Department of Applied Chemistry  
Faculty of Engineering  
Kyushu University  
Fukuoka 812-8581  
Japan

Dr. David E. Thurston  
Professor of Anticancer Drug Design  
The School of Pharmacy  
University of London  
Brunswick Square  
London  
UK

Prof. Dr. Yitzhak Tor  
Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry  
University of California, San Diego  
9500 Gilman Drive  
San Diego, CA 92093-0358  
USA

Dr. Jean-Pierre Vigneron  
Collège de France, Chimie des interactions  
moléculaires  
11 pl Marcelin Berthelot  
75231 Paris cedex 5  
France

Prof. M.J. Waring  
Department of Pharmacology  
University of Cambridge  
Tennis Court Road  
Cambridge CB2 1QJ  
UK

Prof. Dr. W. David Wilson  
Department of Chemistry  
Georgia State University  
University Plaza  
Atlanta, GA 30303-3083  
USA



## 1

**Forty Years On**

*Michael J. Waring and L. P. G. Wakelin*

## 1.1

**Early Experiments Prior to Molecular Modeling**

The quest to understand specific interactions between drugs and nucleic acids dates back a long time – more than 40 years. Even though the concept of gene targeting could not be explicitly formulated until much later, there were early realizations that DNA could provide a fine receptor for drugs. A major turning point in the history of drug binding to DNA, the publication in 1961 of the intercalation hypothesis by Leonard Lerman [1], in many people's estimation represents the true birth of the subject, but it would be wrong to neglect mention of the contributions of earlier workers. These workers knew they were dealing with drug–nucleic acid interactions and must have had some inkling of the future importance of the topic. Among them were the histologists who employed dyes such as aminoacridines to stain cells and tissue sections, particularly the fluorescent dye acridine orange, whose capacity to cause nuclei to fluoresce bright green while the cytoplasm fluoresced red was a valuable tool in histology and cell biology. Indeed in the researches of these pioneers can be found the first evidence that particular dyes can react differently with different kinds of nucleic acid-containing structures and therefore that the small molecules must be capable of some form of discrimination based upon what we would today call molecular recognition. From the variable and sometimes capricious performance of substances such as acridines employed as stains it could also be surmised that depending upon the solvent conditions a given dye might react in more than one way with its 'receptor,' foreshadowing the concept of heterogeneity in binding that was later to occupy the attention of biophysicists.

At the same time, thanks to the seminal work of Paul Ehrlich half a century earlier, the usefulness of dyes – particularly aminoacridines – as antiseptics and antimalarials was widely recognized so that the connection between cell staining and useful biological activity was more than implicit. Thus it happened at a critical moment that the potency of proflavine as a mutagen was recognized. This led to the brilliant experimental work of Crick, Brenner and colleagues [2] showing that exposure of bacteriophage-infected bacteria to proflavine produced frameshift mutations – a phenomenon that enabled them to deduce the triplet nature of the

genetic code. Meanwhile, the careful experiments of Peacocke and Skerrett [3] on the interaction of proflavine with purified DNA were under way and the first truly quantitative measurements of a reversible drug–DNA binding reaction became available, complete with a proper description of the metachromatic shift in the absorption spectrum, application of spectrophotometry and equilibrium dialysis to determine genuine binding constants, and clear evidence of the occurrence of secondary binding after saturation of the strong primary binding sites had been accomplished.

Now all the elements were in place for Lerman, at that time working in the Cambridge MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology with Crick and Brenner, to get to work on the intercalation hypothesis. Stone and Bradley [4] disposed of the secondary interaction of acridine orange with nucleic acids by attributing it to the formation of stacked aggregates of dye bound externally to the polyanion.

Two other pre-intercalation areas of endeavor must be mentioned, the first of which is the action of the antibiotic actinomycin D. Actinomycin had been discovered in the 1940s and was the first antibiotic found to be highly active against certain tumors – indeed, through the 1950s and early 1960s it was reckoned to be the most potent anticancer agent available in the arsenal of chemotherapy. The antibiotic was known to be capable of inhibiting nucleic acid synthesis in susceptible cells, a process that was consequently identified as a prime target for anti-cancer chemotherapy. The discovery of mRNA and the process of gene transcription owes much to the earnest work of early cell biologists who showed that actinomycin was an exquisitely selective inhibitor of transcription by virtue of its specific inhibitory action on the newly discovered enzyme RNA polymerase; that in turn was attributable to tight but reversible binding of actinomycin to the double-helical DNA template [5]. These discoveries firmly established the business of ligand–DNA interaction as a matter of concern to biologists, clinicians, and a breed of pharmacologists who later emerged as key players in founding what was to become the illustrious discipline of molecular interactions.

The second area of endeavor, though it had little influence on the development of ideas about reversible ligand–nucleic acid interactions, is the remarkable work of people like Kohn, Brooks, and Lawley on nitrogen mustards and comparable alkylating agents used for cancer chemotherapy [6, 7]. We should recall that nitrogen mustards were the very first chemicals used to treat cancer, prompted by unhappy events that occurred during the Second World War; it is indeed salutary that so evidently worthy a purpose as the alleviation of suffering from one of humanity's most dreaded diseases should have come about in such an inauspicious manner. The determined attentions of a few medically minded individuals capable of grappling with rather complicated and messy chemistry did a lot to clarify the mechanisms of action of these highly reactive substances, and again the critical target turned out to be DNA. Painstaking analysis of the products formed *in vitro* and *in vivo* when cells were exposed to mustards eventually identified the N7 position of the guanine ring as the most reactive (i.e. nucleophilic) site for alkylation of DNA, and the perceived correlation of anticancer activity with the possession of two alkylating centers spaced some five atoms apart led to the concept that bifunctional reactivity must be crucial for therapeutic effect.

## 1.2

### Formulation of Molecular Models and Mechanisms of Binding to DNA

Before we return to the historic turning point at which the intercalation hypothesis was born, it is logical to finish consideration of the early alkylating agents by referring to their identification as crosslinking agents capable of covalently linking the complementary strands of the DNA double helix. At first it was thought that this action would adequately explain their cytotoxic activity through inhibiting the progress of the replication fork, but more recently the possible contribution of *intra*-strand crosslinks and DNA–protein crosslinks has brought this assumption into question [8, 9]. Meanwhile other types of powerful alkylating agents have been discovered that do not necessarily form interstrand crosslinks but are endowed with excellent biological activity. Moreover, an early twist to the tale of covalent reaction with DNA came with the finding that the antibiotic mitomycin C must be activated by reduction prior to forming inter-strand DNA crosslinks; this discovery added impetus to the idea of bioreductive activation of pro-drugs, particularly for cancer treatment, which has become an important focus for the efforts of several groups of drug designers (see Chapter 9). There is also a complex relation between bond-forming and bond-breaking interactions with nucleic acids that can be seen with several DNA-binding compounds described elsewhere in this volume (see Chapters 3 and 23).

A unifying theme that runs through these lines of work, and indeed throughout the volumes of this publication, is the extraordinarily sophisticated chemistry that attends the reaction of many compounds with nucleic acids, not to mention the amazing biosynthetic capabilities of the organisms that produce those substances that are of natural origin. Neither should we belittle the remarkable inventiveness and achievements of the organic chemists who increasingly are succeeding in their efforts to design strategies to come up with novel DNA-reactive compounds for chemotherapy as well as other purposes.

Returning to the historical thread, we go back to the year 1961, which was when the first reasonably explicit model for binding of a drug to the double helix – the intercalation hypothesis – was proposed for the interaction of aminoacridines like proflavine with DNA [1]. It is no secret, though not often appreciated outside laboratories of molecular biology, that the notion of frameshift mutation furnished a degree of inspiration for the model. However, the idea of intercalation was not universally acclaimed: indeed it was greeted with profound skepticism in certain quarters. Lerman's original evidence, drawn from observations of changes in viscosity, sedimentation coefficient, and X-ray diffraction from oriented fibers of DNA, was perfectly reasonable so far as it went. But that was not far enough to satisfy many of the “real” structure solvers, who made it clear that they were not going to believe the postulate unless and until it had been verified by their own favorite “direct” technique as opposed to the admittedly rather indirect evidence adduced by Lerman. One of the present authors remembers conversations including such phrases as “do you believe in intercalation?”, as if it were an article of faith akin to religion. In due course, experiments were devised to verify or disprove the hypothesis, eventually to the satisfaction (or conversion) of the most hardened skeptics.

One early experiment was the circular DNA unwinding test, based upon the generally (but not quite universally) agreed expectation that intercalation must locally unwind the double helix [10]. It worked, and confirmed ethidium together with aminoacridines and several other interesting ligands, including actinomycin, as intercalators [11]. By the same token, antibiotics like netropsin and distamycin were identified as something else: minor groove binders as we now know [11]. It also became clear that different drugs unwind the helix by different angles when they intercalate, and the test even unearthed certain ligands that could unwind the double helix somewhat without apparently intercalating in the usual sense: steroidal diamines and triphenylmethane dyes [12, 13]. Questions still remain to be answered about these ligands. Of course a legacy of this early work is the detailed understanding of higher order structure, especially circularity, of DNA which studies on drug interactions have helped to elucidate. Thirty-five years after it was first shown to unwind circular DNA, ethidium is still routinely used to isolate plasmids.

Perhaps because of the seminal contributions of physical (bio)chemists during the early years of probing mechanisms of drug–nucleic acid interaction, the study of reaction kinetics soon emerged as a powerful tool for throwing light on the forces involved [14]. Don Crothers, an influential advocate of the kinetic approach, used to remark that the study of kinetics was uniquely valuable, if only because it added a new dimension – time – to the analysis of the phenomena. He was absolutely right. A highlight was the discovery that some ligands which bound well but not outrageously tightly to DNA could be characterized by on-rates and off-rates many orders of magnitude slower than ostensibly comparable substances. The anthracycline antibiotic nogalamycin is a good case in point; its slow association and dissociation kinetics are attributable to the disruption of base pairing needed to “thread” its bulky sugar substituents through the double helix [15]. Slow dissociation kinetics have been correlated with improved biological activity, and underlie the success of Phillips’ relatively recent assay for transcription termination at particular drug-binding sites on DNA [16]. Direct ligand transfer between binding sites on DNA without involving complete dissociation from the polymer was evidenced many years ago and has given rise to the “shuffling” concept whereby ligands are supposed to migrate one-dimensionally along a DNA molecule in search of better (tighter) binding sites [17, 18].

### 1.3

#### **Specificity of Nucleotide Sequence Recognition**

Although the value of DNA and, to a lesser extent, RNA as a target for selective drug action had been evident from the outset, it also quickly became apparent that few known drugs showed much, if any, selectivity for binding to particular nucleotide sequences. Yet the holy grail of selectively suppressing gene expression was conceived early on, together with the realization that to attain this end it would be necessary to recognize moderately long stretches of base pairs. Eventually it was

calculated that one might need to recognize a sequence composed of a number of base pairs in the high teens in order to identify a single targeted site in the human genome. The first experiments aimed at examining drug-binding preferences were crude and laborious to say the least, consisting of little more than attempts to detect different levels of binding to nucleic acids from different sources. Scatchard plots were employed to determine affinity constants, together with the frequency of binding sites, initially by simple and inappropriate means that were eventually much improved by better theoretical treatments like those of McGhee and von Hippel [19]. Sometimes the available methods (spectroscopy, equilibrium dialysis, etc.) were simply inapplicable because of the poor aqueous solubility of the ligands under investigation and alternative techniques had to be devised, such as solvent partition analysis used for the quinoxaline antibiotics [20]. Much effort was required just to establish a preference for, say, GC-rich DNA. Then the steady development of chemical methods for polynucleotide synthesis began to extend the range of synthetic, defined sequences available to the investigator and furnished substrates that could be used to examine whether or not a particular sequence would support interaction with a drug of interest.

A quantum leap occurred in the early 1980s with the invention of footprinting methodology in several laboratories at much the same time, using enzymes or Dervan's cleverly designed synthetic reagent MPE-Fe(II) to cut a cloned radio-labeled DNA fragment [21–23]. At a stroke it became possible to identify exactly where the preferred binding sites for a ligand were on a substrate that amounted to a real gene or a chosen fragment of a known gene. Although only semiquantitative at first, methods were quickly developed to adapt the technology to provide passable binding constants so that a true thermodynamic comparison of ligand affinity and capacity to discriminate between different sites could be gained in a single experiment or series of experiments. The power of the footprinting technique can be gauged from the reports of sequence-selectivity to be found in several chapters of this book. With its application, a substantial database of binding affinities for different sequences has been amassed, so that it is now becoming possible to enquire about general mechanisms that underlie the recognition of particular base-pair sequences, such as whether binding occurs predominantly in the major groove, the minor groove (much the most common with small molecules), or occasionally both.

Some workers have focused attention on the distinction between “digital” and “analog” readouts of sequence information, based on the notion that micro-structural variation in the exact parameters of the double helix (groove width, for example) can sensitively reflect nucleotide sequence heterogeneity and therefore afford a means of sequence recognition that is independent of direct, specific contacts with the base pairs themselves. One of the techniques that can throw light on such questions involves looking at the behavior of DNA molecules containing unnatural nucleotide substitutions, which have the effect of shifting, removing, or adding specific base substituents. Such experiments have amply confirmed the dominant role of the 2-amino group of guanine in directing many ligands to their preferred binding sites, and have also thrown light upon related questions like the

role of base pair substituents in modulating groove width, reactivity towards alkylating agents, helix curvature or flexibility, and the sequence-dependent winding of DNA around the histone octamer in nucleosome core particles [24].

While footprinting and related gel methodology continues to play a major role in studies of this sort it has recently been joined by the elegant but simple method of competition dialysis, whereby the relative binding of a test ligand to many different types of nucleic acids can be assessed at the same time [25]. This method is of particular interest for investigating structure-specific binding of drugs to nucleic acids or indeed other polymers, whether natural or synthetic.

## 1.4

### Details at the Atomic and Molecular Levels

Insight into the structure and dynamics of intercalation complexes has progressed by a close synergy between theoretical and experimental approaches, which today has developed to the point at which it is now possible to give a complete molecular description of what a drug–DNA complex looks like at the atomic level, and how its constituent atoms move in solution. The techniques that have proved invaluable in this quest are X-ray crystallography, NMR spectroscopy, quantum chemistry, molecular mechanics, and molecular dynamics. Lerman himself used X-ray fiber diffraction data from proflavine–DNA complexes as part of the initial evidence he marshaled for the intercalation hypothesis [1], and Fuller and Waring adopted the technique to produce the first molecular model of the ethidium–DNA complex [26].

These early attempts at model building took an important step forward at the beginning of the 1970s when Sobell and colleagues solved the crystal structure of a 2:1 actinomycin–deoxyguanosine complex, which enabled them to construct a fairly precise intercalation model based upon purely geometrical constraints [27]. Later in the 1970s the commercial availability of DNA and RNA dinucleoside monophosphates made possible crystallographic and NMR studies of intercalated mini-duplexes of ethidium and aminoacridines such as 9-aminoacridine, proflavine, and acridine orange. The crystallographic studies by Sobell, Neidle, Rich, and their colleagues provided the first truly atomic description of intercalation complexes, and unequivocally proved that the DNA duplex could indeed stretch so as to sandwich acridine and phenanthridine chromophores between two base pairs [28–30].

These were seminal studies that not only provided insight into the fine details of individual drug–DNA complexes, but also revealed modifications to the geometry of the sugar–phosphate backbone generally required to open the intercalation cavity. Armed with the latter information, Neidle and others were able to construct molecular models of suitably modified B- and A-DNA duplexes containing stereochemically sound intercalation cavities [31, 32]. This provided the means for many investigators, Neidle, Pullman, and Hopfinger prominent amongst them, to use