

University of Newcastle

Biological Characterisation of Anthranilic Acid Holoenzyme Assembly Inhibitors

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Biological Sciences

This research was supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship.

Michael James Miller BBiotech(Hons)(Newcastle)
August 2022

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby certify that the work embodied in the thesis is my own work, conducted under normal supervision. The thesis contains no material which has been accepted, or is being examined, for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made. I give consent to the final version of my thesis being made available worldwide when deposited in the University's Digital Repository, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968 and any approved embargo.

Michael James Miller

15 August 2022

Table of Contents

Table of Figures.....	v
Table of Tables.....	vii
Abstract.....	1
1 Introduction	2
1.1 The Antimicrobial Resistance Crisis: Challenges, Drivers, and Solutions.....	2
1.2 Transcription	6
1.2.1 The Architecture of The Machinery of Transcription.....	8
1.2.2 The Bacterial Transcription Initiation Factor, σ	11
1.2.3 The Inhibition of transcription	15
1.3 Holoenzyme Assembly Inhibitors.....	18
1.3.1 HAIs discovered by Assay.....	20
1.3.2 Peptides	23
1.3.3 Pharmacophore Driven Discovery	23
1.3.4 Indole Based Holoenzyme Assembly Inhibitors.....	26
2 Materials and Methods.....	30
2.1 Microbial Growth Inhibition Assays.....	32
2.1.1 Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) for <i>S. aureus</i> and <i>E. coli</i>	32
2.1.2 Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) for <i>M. smegmatis</i>	33
2.1.3 Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) for <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>	33
2.1.4 Determination of Growth Kinetics of Hyperporinated <i>E. coli</i>	33
2.1.5 Minimum Bactericidal Concentration (MBC).....	34
2.1.6 Disc Diffusion Assays.....	34
2.2 Transcription Assays	34
2.2.1 Overproduction and purification of <i>B. subtilis</i> RNAP.....	34
2.2.2 Overproduction and purification of <i>E. coli</i> RNAP.....	35
2.2.3 Overproduction and purification of <i>E. coli</i> σ^{70} and <i>B. subtilis</i> σ^A	35
2.2.4 Preparation of Plasmid Template	36

2.2.5	Preparation of Linear Template	36
2.2.6	Transcription Assay for GKL Compounds	37
2.2.7	Transcription Assay for Atomwise Compounds	37
2.2.8	σ -dependent transcription inhibition	38
2.3	Fluorescence Microscopy.....	38
2.4	Propidium Iodide Uptake Assay	38
2.5	Multi-passage Resistance Selection Study.....	39
2.6	Studies with <i>Galleria Mellonella</i>	40
2.6.1	<i>Galleria mellonella</i> toxicology assays.....	40
2.6.2	<i>Galleria mellonella</i> efficacy assays.....	40
3	Biological Characterisation of the GKL Series	41
3.1	Introduction	41
3.1.1	The GKL Series.....	41
3.1.2	Assays used to assess biological function	43
3.2	Results.....	47
3.2.1	Structure Activity Relationship of GKL Compounds.....	47
3.2.2	SAR of Anthranilic Ring System.....	47
3.2.3	SAR of 1H-Indole Ring System.....	52
3.2.4	Modifications of the Glyoxylamide Linker	54
3.2.5	Confirmation of Mechanism of Action.....	56
3.2.6	Antimicrobial Activity Against Gram-Negative Organisms	61
3.2.7	Discriminating Between Efflux and Permeability Mediated Resistance.....	64
3.2.8	Barriers To Activity In <i>E. coli</i>	64
3.3	Discussion.....	70
3.3.1	Comparison to other published SAR of holoenzyme assembly inhibitors.....	70
3.3.2	Cellular Uptake and Conversion of GKL Compounds into Broad-Spectrum Agents.	74
3.3.3	Summary	76
4	Resistance Potential, Toxicology and Efficacy of the GKL Compounds	78

4.1	Introduction	78
4.2	Results	79
4.2.1	Multipassage Resistance Selection Study	79
4.2.2	Whole Genome Sequencing of Isolates from Resistance Passaging.....	83
4.2.3	Evaluation of Cross-resistance to Non-GKL Antibiotics on GKL Passaged Strains	90
4.2.4	Determination Of Susceptibility to The Cationic Antimicrobial Peptide Colistin For GKL278 Passaged Strains	91
4.2.5	<i>In vitro</i> Examination of Cytotoxicity of GKL Compounds.	92
4.2.6	<i>In vivo</i> Examination of Cytotoxicity of GKL Compounds.	93
4.2.7	<i>In vivo</i> Examination of Efficacy of GKL Compounds.....	94
4.3	Discussion.....	95
4.3.1	Resistance Mechanism 1: Inactivation of Response regulator protein GraR	97
4.3.2	Resistance Mechanism 2: Modification of Potassium Homeostasis by KtrA.....	99
4.3.3	Toxicity Potential of the GKL Compounds	99
4.3.4	<i>In vivo</i> Efficacy of the GKL Compounds.....	100
4.4	Conclusions	101
5	Atomwise Compound Screening.....	102
5.1	Introduction	102
5.2	Results.....	103
5.3	Discussion.....	108
5.4	Conclusions	115
6	Discussion.....	116
7	References	122
8	Appendix 1 – Structures of All GKL Compounds Tested.	143
9	Appendix 2 – Structures of All Atomwise Compounds Tested.	147

Table of Figures

Figure 1.1. A combination of factors drives the development and spread of antimicrobial resistance.....	2
Figure 1.2 Subunit composition of RNA Polymerases from Bacteria and Archaea.....	7
Figure 1.3 Bacterial Transcription Cycle..	8
Figure 1.4 Structure of <i>B. subtilis</i> RNAP.....	11
Figure 1.5 The domain architecture of σ^{70} -like σ -factors.	12
Figure 1.6 Structure of Switch Region Binding Transcription Inhibitors Bound to RNAP.	16
Figure 1.7 Multiple transcription inhibitors bind near the active site of RNAP.	17
Figure 1.8 Bridge helix and trigger loop dynamics during nucleotide addition and translocation. ..	18
Figure 1.9. Protein sequence alignment of holoenzyme assembly hotspot	19
Figure 1.10 Mutagenesis of β' -CH and $\sigma_{2.2}$	20
Figure 1.11 Holoenzyme assembly inhibitor identified by an assay first approach.....	21
Figure 1.12 Pharmacophore model of β' -CH and $\sigma^A_{2.2}$ interaction.....	23
Figure 1.13 C3 Derived Holoenzyme Assembly Inhibitors.	25
Figure 1.14 C5 and steroid-like Holoenzyme assembly Inhibitors.....	26
Figure 1.15 Indole Based Holoenzyme Assembly Inhibitors. GKL003.....	28
Figure 3.1. General chemical scaffold of the GKL Series.	41
Figure 3.2. Representative Docking of GKL244 into the β' -CH.....	42
Figure 3.3. 2D representation of protein-ligand interactions identified in docking.	43
Figure 3.4 Schematic of Gram-Positive Cell Wall.	44
Figure 3.5 Schematic of Gram-Negative Cell Wall.....	45
Figure 3.6 Schematic of the Mycobacterial Cell Wall.....	46
Figure 3.7 Molecular Docking of GKL Compounds in the β' -CH.....	54
Figure 3.8 Crystal Structure of Methyl-benzoate Precursor of GKL252.....	56
Figure 3.9. Representative Epifluorescence Microscopy of <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> treated with GKL Compounds.	58
Figure 3.10. Transcription inhibition against <i>B. subtilis</i> RNAP with increasing concentration of σ . 60	
Figure 3.11. Propidium Iodide Uptake Assay. 63	
Figure 3.12. Disk diffusion assay in <i>E. coli</i>	65
Figure 3.13. Disk diffusion assay in <i>A. baumannii</i>	67
Figure 3.14. Disk diffusion assays of <i>P. aeruginosa</i> PAO1.....	69
Figure 3.15 Representatives of the various identified series of holoenzyme assembly inhibitors. ..	70
Figure 3.16. Core structures of Holoenzyme Assembly Inhibitors.....	71

Figure 3.17. Tautomeric forms 5-substituted-tetrazoles.....	73
Figure 4.1 GKL compounds selected for resistance passaging.....	80
Figure 4.2 Development of resistance over multipassage resistance selection study.	81
Figure 4.3 Percentage growth after 16 hours of incubation.	83
Figure 4.4 Whole Genome Sequencing of Isolates from GKL278 resistance passaging experiment	84
Figure 4.5 Protein sequence alignment of Wildtype and GraR AC379A. Shading of amino acids is by similarity. Red and gold annotation are domains identified by PROSITE.	87
Figure 4.6 Mutations found in the Rifampicin Resistance Determining Regions (RRDR) of <i>S. aureus</i>	89
Figure 4.7. Antibiotic susceptibility of whole genome sequenced isolates.	90
Figure 4.8 GKL278 lineages susceptibility to colistin.....	92
Figure 4.9: Survival Plot of <i>G. mellonella</i> treated with GKL Compounds.	93
Figure 4.10: Survival Plot of <i>G. mellonella</i> treated with GKL Compounds.	94
Figure 4.11. Survival Plot of <i>G. mellonella</i> treated with GKL Compounds.	95
Figure 5.1 BOILED-Egg Graph of Atomwise and GKL Compounds..	103
Figure 5.2. Growth Inhibiting AW Compounds.	103
Figure 5.3 Transcription Assay of AW Compounds.	104
Figure 5.4 Dose-Dependent Transcription Inhibition By AW Compounds.	105
Figure 5.5 Epifluorescence Microscopy of BS1048 Treated with AW Compounds..	106
Figure 5.6. Growth Kinetics of Porinated <i>E. coli</i> Strains Treated with AW26..	107
Figure 5.7 The chemical scaffold of AW26 is present in other bioactive small molecules..	114

Table of Tables

Table 2.1 Strains utilised in this study	30
Table 2.2 Plasmids utilised in this study	31
Table 2.3 Primers utilised in this study	32
Table 2.4 PCR Protocol to make the linear template.	36
Table 3.1. Activity of GKL Compounds with modified carboxylic acid group.	48
Table 3.2. Activity of GKL Analogue with differing COOH positioning.	49
Table 3.3. Activity of 3-(4-bromophenol)-indole GKL scaffolds with substitutions in on the anthranilic acid ring system.	50
Table 3.4. Activity of 2,3-phenylindole GKL scaffold with substitutions in on the anthranilic acid ring system.	51
Table 3.5. Activity of Monoaryl-Indole GKL Scaffolds	52
Table 3.6. Activity of Diaryl-Indole GKL Scaffolds	53
Table 3.7. Activity of GKL Scaffolds with Modified Linkers.	55
Table 3.8. Growth inhibition by GKL Scaffolds on Wild-type and Efflux Deficient E. coli.	61
Table 3.9. Activity of GKL Scaffolds with Amine Tails.	62
Table 4.1: Summary of Mutations found over the development of increased fitness to GKL278. ...	85
Table 4.2: Summary of Mutations found in Day 31 samples from GKL252 and Rifampicin passaging experiment	88
Table 4.3: Growth Inhibition of S. cerevisiae by GKL compounds under fermentative and oxidate respiration.	92
Table 5.1: Summary of Chemical Properties of the Atomwise Compound Set.	102
Table 5.2 HTS Cytotoxicity Assay for AW26.	113

Abstract

The antimicrobial resistance crisis is one of the greatest threats that humankind is facing in the 21st century. Comprehensive assessments of the global burden of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) estimate that 5 million deaths were associated with bacterial AMR in 2019. AMR is not a new problem, and for the first few decades of the antibiotic era, resistance was kept in check by developing and discovering new drugs. The lack of development of novel antibiotics has multiple overlapping causes that span the spheres of economics, policy, and science. Even with all efforts to reduce and reverse the AMR crisis, new antimicrobial drugs are still needed.

A series of hybrid compounds incorporating anthranilic acid with activated 1H-indoles through a glyoxylamide linker were designed to target bacterial RNA polymerase holoenzyme formation. Biological testing of the hybrids identified a range of potent anti-transcription inhibitors with activity against a range of pathogenic bacteria with minimum inhibitory concentrations as low as 3.1 μ M. A structure-activity relationship study identified the key structural components necessary to inhibit bacterial growth and transcription. Correlation of *in vitro* transcription inhibition activity with *in vivo* mechanism of action was established using fluorescence microscopy, and resistance passaging using Gram-positive bacteria showed no resistance development over 30 days. Furthermore, no toxicity was observed from the compounds in a wax moth larvae model, establishing a platform for the development of a series of new antibacterial drugs with an established mode of action. The compounds developed in this thesis are an excellent starting point for developing a series of potent new antimicrobial compounds. The future directions for this series of inhibitors are varied, but the resulting lead molecules would address overlooked clinical needs.