ChemComm

Cite this: Chem. Commun., 2012, 48, 4444-4446

www.rsc.org/chemcomm

COMMUNICATION

Oxo-ester mediated native chemical ligation on microarrays: an efficient and chemoselective coupling methodology[†]

Martin J. Weissenborn, \ddagger^a Roberto Castangia, \ddagger^a Johannes W. Wehner,^b Robert Šardzík,^a Thisbe K. Lindhorst^{*b} and Sabine L. Flitsch^{*a}

Received 6th February 2012, Accepted 19th March 2012 DOI: 10.1039/c2cc30844d

We report a highly efficient and selective method for the coupling of peptides and glycoconjugates bearing *N*-terminal cysteines to activated surfaces. This chemoselective method generates stable amide linkages without using any thiol additives.

Peptide and protein microarrays are well established in the field of proteomics and provide platform technologies for drug discovery and clinical diagnosis.¹ Such arrays are mostly generated by covalent coupling of pre-prepared ligands to solid surfaces.² The conjugation chemistry needs to be highly chemoselective, site-specific and efficient to ensure correct presentation of the ligand on the surface. Next to rather classical chemical acylation methods, more specific bioorthogonal coupling methods³ have been developed such as Staudinger ligation,⁴ "click chemistry",⁵ and native chemical ligation (NCL).⁶⁷

NCL is particularly attractive as it can be carried out under physiological conditions.⁸ NCL generally involves the reaction of a thioester and a cysteine (Cys) derivative, such as an *N*-terminal Cys-peptide. If the NCL is performed on solid phase, either the Cys- or the thioester-peptide needs to be immobilised.^{6,9} Starting with immobilised Cys requires thioesterpeptides, which are incompatible with Fmoc protecting groups in solid phase peptide synthesis.¹⁰ The reverse coupling method proceeds from thioester-functionalised surfaces **1** by coupling of the Cys derivative *via* a reversible transthioesterification to give thioester **2** and the native peptide **3** after irreversible rearrangement (Fig. 1). The formation of **1** has been shown first by Lesaicherre *et al.*¹¹ albeit in only 1/10 of monoloyer coverage.⁸

As an alternative, we have therefore investigated NCL coupling protocols starting from readily available activated oxo-ester 5 on surfaces (Fig. 2) instead of using thioester surface 1.^{12,13} A concern using such oxo-esters would be higher reactivity and it was therefore important to investigate if



Fig. 1 The native chemical ligation (NCL) performed on thioesterfunctionalised surfaces.



Fig. 2 The chemoselective coupling of Cys derivatives on PFPactivated gold plates is a powerful method for oxo-ester mediated NCL on surfaces.

selectivity of cysteines over other amines could be retained in the coupling reaction.

All our experiments were conducted on gold arrays covered with self-assembled monolayers (SAMs) formed by alkane thiols,¹⁴ which are omega-functionalised with hexaethylene glycol (OEG₆) carboxylic acid, thus providing points for chemical modification (4, Fig. 3). Any reaction on this surface can be monitored directly and label-free using matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionisation-time-of-flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-ToF MS).¹⁵

In the first instance, a range of activated oxo-esters such as *para*-nitrophenyl (*pNP*), *N*-hydroxysuccinimidoyl (NHS) and 2,3,4,5,6-pentafluorophenyl (PFP) esters were generated from carboxy-functionalised surfaces and were reacted with Cys. Analysis of the reactions by MALDI-ToF mass spectrometry suggested that the coupling reactions were most efficient using PFP activation and this activation method was therefore chosen for subsequent studies.

The coupling of Cys itself was then further investigated for efficiency of coupling and selectivity over other amino acids.^{16,17} The coupling was tested at different Cys concentrations using the standard NCL conditions (7.5 eq. tris(2-carboxyethyl)-phosphine hydrochloride (TCEP), 5 M guanidine buffer, 75 mM Na₂HPO₄, pH 7)¹⁸ and it was found that coupling was observed even at a concentration of 2 mM of Cys, which compared favourably to the 50 mM previously necessary for

^a School of Chemistry & Manchester Interdisciplinary Biocentre, The University of Manchester, 131 Princess Street,

Manchester M17DN, UK. E-mail: sabine.flitsch@manchester.ac.uk; Fax: +44-(0)161-275-1311; Tel: +44-(0)161-306-5172

^b Otto Diels Institute of Organic Chemistry, Christiana Albertina University of Kiel, Otto-Hahn-Platz 3/4, 24098 Kiel, Germany. E-mail: tklind@oc.uni-kiel.de; Fax: +49-431-880-7410

[†] Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. See DOI: 10.1039/c2cc30844d

[‡] These authors contributed equally to this work.





Fig. 3 (a) Coupling experiments with 4-mercaptophenylacetic acid (MPAA). (b) MALDI-ToF MS analysis of 7. (c) MALDI-ToF MS analysis of 7.

peptide coupling. By addition of imidazole^{12,17} we were able to further lower the Cys concentration necessary to 0.25 mM. Thiophenol and 4-mercaptophenylacetic acid (MPAA) were less effective.

With a robust coupling protocol in hand, we investigated the selectivity of Cys coupling over other amino acids. Interestingly, when the activated surfaces **5** were reacted with glycine (Gly) or phenylalanine (Phe) in the presence of thiol MPAA as additive, only thioester **8** was formed and no conversion to the respective amide was observed (Fig. 3). The same reaction with Cys and MPAA, however, showed the Cys amide **7** as the sole product. These experiments suggest that on the surface *O*- to *S*-transesterification (**5** to **8**) is fast. The thioester **8** consequently undergoes a reaction with Cys *via* transthioesterification which rearranges to the amide **7**. This difference in acylation rates was also observed in competition experiments. When Gly, Phe and Cys were added to the reaction mixture in equimolar amount in the presence of MPAA only the Cys-product **7** was formed.

Interestingly, similar selectivities were observed in the presence of imidazole (instead of the thiol MPAA).¹² Competitive studies with mixtures of β -alanine (β -Ala), Phe, Gly and Cys (1 mM each) also showed exclusively the Cys product even at 1:25 ratio of Cys: Gly (Fig. S17, ESI†). All subsequent reactions were therefore performed with imidazole as additive.

Similar selectivities were observed with longer peptides containing either cysteine or glycine at their *N*-termini (Table 1). When mixtures of peptides **9** and **10**, **11** and **10**, and **11** and **12**, respectively, were applied to the surface, only the products **24** or **25** were observed.

As an alternative and more sensitive method of analysis, surface plasmon resonance (SPR) was employed. 13 and 14 were applied in a competitive assay at a concentration of



(9, 11, 13, 23) 0. 12. 14. 15. 21 imidazole Entry Starting material Product CQDSETRTFY 9 1 R'-CQDSETRTFY 24 GALGVTSAPAG 10 CALGVTSAPAG 11 2 GALGVTSAPAG 10 R'-CALGVTSAPAG 25 or GAPGPTPGPAGK 12 3 15 0 23 4 21 27 N-Acetyl-β-D-glucosamine -s()onof-of α-D-Mannose

2 mM each on PFP activated SAMs. The SPR slide was subsequently interrogated with the mannose binding lectin concanavalin A (ConA) followed by the *N*-acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc) binding lectin wheat germ agglutinin (WGA).¹⁹ There was strong ConA and no WGA binding observed which showed that exclusively the Cys-Man **13** had coupled to the surface, but not **14**.

After these promising results with small amino acids and peptides, the coupling method was tested on more complex bioconjugates. Of particular interest was the coupling of glycoconjugates, which are used in glycoarrays²⁰ and which can often only be obtained in small quantities. Efficient coupling strategies are therefore of great importance to the field. The cysteine derivatives such as 13 are easily obtained from aminoethyl glycosides 15. In competition with 15, cysteine derivative 13 was exclusively coupled to surfaces giving the product 26 as shown in MALDI-ToF MS analysis. To test this coupling strategy further, we investigated multivalent glycoconjugates, which have become important tools to probe multivalent binding events on cell surfaces.²¹ The required trivalent glycoclusters²² were synthesized as shown in Scheme 1. Trivalent glycoclusters 21 and 23 were synthesized



Scheme 1 Synthesis of trivalent glycoclusters 21 and 23.

starting from the known building block 17.23 For the preparation of the trivalent wedge 19 Fmoc-glycine (16) was coupled in a HBTU/DIPEA-mediated reaction with 17 followed by deprotection of the tBu esters with formic acid vielding compound 19 in 85% over two steps. Mannosides were introduced *via* peptide coupling following published chemistry²⁴ giving 20 in a satisfying yield of 64%. Fmoc deprotection with piperidine in DMF gave the trivalent cluster mannoside 21 in 89% yield. An amount of 21 was further functionalized with Boc-L-Cys(Trt)-OH in another peptide coupling reaction yielding 22 in 58%. This step was followed by one step removal of the Boc and Trityl protecting groups using TFA in DCM under addition of TES followed by a treatment with basic ion exchange resin Amberlyst A-21 following a literature protocol.²⁵ After size exclusion and reversed phase chromatography the Cysterminated ligand 23 was obtained in 65% yield.

The trivalent cluster mannosides manno-Cys **23** and manno-Gly **21** were then compared in coupling experiments to the gold array surfaces. From reaction mixtures containing 4 mM each of **21** and **23** the manno-Cys product **27** was formed exclusively (Table 1).

Complex bioconjugates containing *N*-terminal cysteines can be efficiently coupled to surfaces through amide bond formation *via* native chemical ligation starting with activated oxo-esters on the surface. These surface oxo-esters are easily prepared from their carboxylic acids. Our studies have shown that the ligation in the presence of imidazole is highly selective for cysteine derivatives over competing amines.

This work was supported by the Royal Society (Wolfson Award to SLF), the European Commission (MJW), the EPSRC and the Evonik Foundation (JWW).

Notes and references

 G. MacBeath and S. L. Schreiber, *Science*, 2000, 289, 1760–1763;
 D. Weinrich, P. Jonkheijm, C. M. Niemeyer and H. Waldmann, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2009, 48, 7744–7751; L. Berrade,
 A. E. Garcia and J. A. Camarero, *Pharm. Res.*, 2011, 28, 1480–1499.

- 2 Z. A. Gurard-Levin and M. Mrksich, Annu. Rev. Anal. Chem., 2008, 1, 767–800.
- 3 E. M. Sletten and C. R. Bertozzi, Acc. Chem. Res., 2011, 44, 666–676; C. P. R. Hackenberger and D. Schwarzer, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2008, 47, 10030–10074.
- 4 A. Watzke, M. Köhn, M. Gutierrez-Rodriguez, R. Wacker, H. Schroder, R. Breinbauer, J. Kuhlmann, K. Alexandrov, C. M. Niemeyer, R. S. Goody and H. Waldmann, *Angew. Chem.*, *Int. Ed.*, 2006, **45**, 1408–1412; S. S. van Berkel, M. B. van Eldijk and J. C. M. van Hest, *Angew. Chem.*, *Int. Ed.*, 2011, **50**, 8806–8827.
- 5 H. C. Kolb, M. G. Finn and K. B. Sharpless, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2001, **40**, 2004; M. Meldal and C. W. Tornoe, *Chem. Rev.*, 2008, **108**, 2952–3015.
- 6 J. A. Camarero, Y. Kwon and M. A. Coleman, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2004, 126, 14730–14731.
- 7 S. B. H. Kent, Chem. Soc. Rev., 2009, 38, 338-351.
- 8 S. Anderson, Langmuir, 2008, 24, 13962-13968.
- 9 B. Helms, I. van Baal, M. Merkx and E. W. Meijer, *ChemBio-Chem*, 2007, 8, 1790–1794.
- 10 S. K. Mahto, C. J. Howard, J. C. Shimko and J. J. Ottesen, *ChemBioChem*, 2011, **12**, 2488–2494.
- 11 M. L. Lesaicherre, M. Uttamchandani, G. Y. J. Chen and S. Q. Yao, *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.*, 2002, **12**, 2079–2083.
- 12 G. M. Fang, H. K. Cui, J. S. Zheng and L. Liu, *ChemBioChem*, 2010, **11**, 1061–1065.
- 13 Q. Wan, J. Chen, Y. Yuan and S. J. Danishefsky, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2008, 130, 15814–15816.
- 14 E. Ostuni, R. G. Chapman, R. E. Holmlin, S. Takayama and G. M. Whitesides, *Langmuir*, 2001, 17, 5605–5620.
- 15 N. Laurent, R. Haddoub, J. Voglmeir, S. C. C. Wong, S. J. Gaskell and S. L. Flitsch, *ChemBioChem*, 2008, 9, 2592–2596; B. T. Houseman and M. Mrksich, *Chem. Biol.*, 2002, 9, 443–454.
- 16 P. E. Dawson, T. W. Muir, I. Clarklewis and S. B. H. Kent, *Science*, 1994, 266, 776–779.
- 17 E. C. B. Johnson and S. B. H. Kent, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2006, 128, 6640–6646.
- 18 P. E. Dawson and S. B. H. Kent, Annu. Rev. Biochem., 2000, 69, 923–960; D. Macmillan, M. De Cecco, N. L. Reynolds, L. F. A. Santos, P. E. Barran and J. R. Dorin, ChemBioChem, 2011, 12, 2133–2136.
- 19 N. Laurent, J. Voglmeir and S. L. Flitsch, Chem. Commun., 2008, 4400–4412.
- 20 R. Sardzik, G. T. Noble, M. J. Weissenborn, A. Martin, S. J. Webb and S. L. Flitsch, *Beilstein J. Org. Chem.*, 2010, 6, 699–703; O. Bohorov, H. Andersson-Sand, J. Hoffmann and O. Blixt, *Glycobiology*, 2006, 16, 21c–27c; O. Blixt, S. Head, T. Mondala, C. Scanlan, M. E. Huflejt, R. Alvarez, M. C. Bryan, F. Fazio, D. Calarese, J. Stevens, N. Razi, D. J. Stevens, J. J. Skehel, I. van Die, D. R. Burton, I. A. Wilson, R. Cummings, N. Bovin, C. H. Wong and J. C. Paulson, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2004, 101, 17033–17038; M. Hartmann, A. K. Horst, P. Klemm and T. K. Lindhorst, *Chem. Commun.*, 2010, 46, 330–332.
- 21 M. Hartmann and T. K. Lindhorst, Eur. J. Org. Chem., 2011, 3583–3609.
- 22 H. A. Shaikh, F. D. Sönnichsen and T. K. Lindhorst, *Carbohydr. Res.*, 2008, **343**, 1665–1674.
- 23 G. R. Newkome, R. K. Behera, C. N. Moorefield and G. R. Baker, J. Org. Chem., 1991, 56, 7162–7167.
- 24 J. W. Wehner and T. K. Lindhorst, *Synthesis*, 2010, 3070–3082;
 A. Schierholt, M. Hartmann and T. K. Lindhorst, *Carbohydr. Res.*, 2011, 346, 1519–1526.
- 25 N. Srinivasan, A. Yurek-George and A. Ganesan, Mol. Diversity, 2005, 9, 291–293.