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#### Abstract

Adenosine derivatives developed to activate adenosine receptors (ARs) revealed $\mu \mathrm{M}$ activity at serotonin $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}}$ receptors ( 5 HTRs ). We explored the SAR at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ and modeled receptor interactions in order to optimize affinity and simultaneously reduce AR affinity. Depending on $N^{6}$ substitution, small $5^{\prime}$-alkylamide modification maintained $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ affinity, which was enhanced upon ribose substitution with rigid bicyclo[3.1.0]hexane (North (N)methanocarba), e.g. $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl $4^{\prime}-\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$ derivative $14\left(\mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{i}} 11 \mathrm{nM}\right) .5^{\prime}$ Methylamide $\mathbf{2 3}$ was 170 -fold selective as antagonist for $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ vs. $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$. $5^{\prime}$-Methyl $\mathbf{2 5}$ and ethyl 26 esters potently antagonized $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2}$ Rs with moderate selectivity in comparison to ARs; related $6-N, N$-dimethylamino analogue 30 was $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$-selective. $5^{\prime}$ position flexibility of substitution was indicated in $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ docking. Both $5^{\prime}$-ester and $5^{\prime}$-amide derivatives displayed in vivo $\mathrm{t}_{1 / 2}$ of 3-4 h. Thus, we used GPCR modeling to repurpose nucleoside scaffolds in favor of binding at nonpurine receptors, as novel $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ antagonists, with potential for cardioprotection, liver protection or CNS activity.
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## Introduction

The process of de-risking potential clinical candidate molecules typically involves broad screening at hundreds of off-target activities, consisting of receptors, ion channels, transporters and enzymes. ${ }^{1}$ The structure-activity relationship (SAR) of such off-target activities can be analyzed and controlled to either suppress or enhance a secondary activity. ${ }^{2}$ Sometimes a secondary activity within a compound series can become the major focus of a drug discovery program and even lead to an approved drug, as was accomplished for a protease-activated receptor (PAR) 1 antagonist. ${ }^{3}$ Chemical scaffolds from already approved drugs have been repurposed for new clinical indications, such as kinases drugs that served as the basis of inhibitors of trypanosome replication. ${ }^{4}$ Numerous nucleoside derivatives are approved as pharmaceuticals, indicating that this is a general scaffold that is well-tolerated in vivo. ${ }^{5}$ Other scaffolds have been applied to multiple GPCR families, such as 1,4dihydropyridines, which have been termed a privileged scaffold, because it can be molded to fit diverse sites. ${ }^{6,7}$

In the process of examining off-target interactions of nucleoside derivatives that were designed as potent ligands of the $\mathrm{A}_{3}$ adenosine receptor (AR), we found that occasionally $\mu \mathrm{M}$ affinity was observed at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}}$ serotonin receptors ( $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ ). A prototypical $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ agonist IB-MECA 10 (Chart 1), containing a ribose $5^{\prime}-\mathrm{N}$ methyluronamide group, showed binding $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ of 1.08 and $5.42 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively. ${ }^{8,9}$ Certain adenine $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2})$ and truncated adenosine derivatives $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4})$ also displayed significant $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ affinity with $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}<5 \mu \mathrm{M}$. ${ }^{9}$ In the same study, we reported that the substitution of the ribose tetrahydrofuryl ring of adenosine derivatives with a fused bicyclo[3.1.0]hexyl moiety (termed (N)-methanocarba), which maintained a conformation preferred by the $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$, was compatible with binding at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$. Thus, an otherwise $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$-selective agonist $\mathbf{3 5}$, which like $\mathbf{1 0}$ has an $N^{6}$-3-halobenzyl group, bound with even greater affinity than riboside $\mathbf{1 0}$ at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$; the $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values of $\mathbf{3 5}$ at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ were 75 and 122 nM , respectively. ${ }^{9}$ Therefore, these findings provided an opportunity to define more clearly the interaction of nucleosides with $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ and to shift the affinity in favor of this nonpurine receptor activity.

Technology for the discovery of new GPCR ligands is now largely structure-based, with the determination of the X-ray structures of $>170$ GPCR-ligand complexes. ${ }^{10}$ The four ARs belong to the family of rhodopsin-like G protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs). Thirteen of the fourteen 5 HTRs , including $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$, are also GPCRs and are located on a different, but closely related branch of rhodopsin-like GPCRs that includes various biogenic amine receptors. The interaction of $\mathbf{3 5}$ with the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ was modeled based on a recently determined X-ray crystallographic structure of the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ complex with agonist ergotamine. ${ }^{7}$ Paoletta et al. predicted the binding mode to feature a hydrophobic region deep in the binding site that could accommodate the substituted $N^{6}$-benzyl group of $\mathbf{3 5}$. ${ }^{9}$ Furthermore, a truncated (N)-methanocarba-adenosine derivative containing an $N^{6}$ dicyclopropylmethyl group 4 that acts as a moderately selective agonist of the $A_{1} A R$ was found to interact at $\mu \mathrm{M}$ concentrations with $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs} .{ }^{9}$ By in silico docking of several adenine and adenosine derivatives to $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$, self-consistent hypotheses for the orientation of the relevant nucleosides in this receptor family were proposed. ${ }^{9}$ Here, we have further explored the SAR of $(\mathrm{N})$-methanocarba-adenosine derivatives at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ in an effort to optimize affinity at 5HTRs and simultaneously reduce AR affinity. Thus, we have incorporated and modified structural features of the nucleosides to repurpose the scaffold toward the 5HT-R family.

Selective AR ligands and selective 5HT-R ligands both have varied beneficial activities in disorders of the peripheral and central nervous system (CNS) and in other tissues. ${ }^{11,12}$ $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ agonist activity is a desirable characteristic in selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), but peripheral actions at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ might also have therapeutic potential. $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonists are sought as agents potentially useful for treating chronic liver and heart disease. ${ }^{13,14}$ Activation of the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ by serotonin agonists has been associated with valvulopathy and fibrosis in many organs, ${ }^{15-17} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonists improved liver function in fibrotic disease models and were described as a "clinically safe" therapy for humans. ${ }^{13}$ In mouse models of coronary function, $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonists reduced collagen deposits and the resultant right ventricular fibrosis (RVF). ${ }^{14} \mathrm{~A}^{5} \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonist is also under development for irritable bowel syndrome. ${ }^{18}$ Therefore, the goal of this study is to discover selective $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonists that might have in vivo activities indicative of the potential for disease treatment. This requires deselecting for $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ affinity, which is closely associated with $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ in the present structural series. The combination of potent $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonist and $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ agonist activities ${ }^{19}$ in a single molecule might also be beneficial or synergistic for liver protection or cardioprotection.

## Results

We have utilized some of the previously reported analogues of adenosine (Table 1, 1-13, 35-41) that were characterized as either $\mathrm{A}_{1}$ or $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$-selective agonists, ${ }^{20-27}$ to examine the effects of structural modification on the interaction with $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$. The objectives were to use structural insights to synthesize novel nucleosides $(\mathbf{1 4 - 3 4}, \mathbf{4 2})$ with enhanced $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ affinity and at the same time progressively achieve selectivity over the ARs.

The synthesis of the ( N )-methanocarba nucleoside analogues was performed as shown in Schemes 1 and 2. The (N)-methanocarba sugar derivative 53 (Scheme1) was obtained from

D-ribose by a known method. ${ }^{28}$ Mitsunobu condensation of compound $\mathbf{5 3}$ with 2,6dichloropurine gave the nucleoside derivative $\mathbf{5 4}$, which underwent amination with various amines to give compounds $\mathbf{5 5} \mathbf{- 6 3}$. Treatment of TBAF solution with compounds (55-62) gave the desilylated compounds 64-71. The isopropylidine group of compounds (64-72) was deprotected with Dowex50 resin to give the nucleoside derivatives 14-21. Compound 63 was treated with $10 \%$ TFA solution at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to afford compound 22. The $4^{\prime}$-ethylester derivative 74 (Scheme 2), which obtained from L-ribose by a reported method, ${ }^{29}$ was converted to nucleoside derivative 75 by a Mitsunobu condensation with 2,6-dichloropurine. Amination of compound 75 with dicyclopropyl amine and $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethyl amine gave compounds 76 and 77, respectively, which upon acid hydrolysis provided the nucleoside derivatives 26 and 29. Hydrolysis of ethyl ester group of compounds 26 and 29 with 2 N aqueous sodium hydroxide provided the carboxylic acid derivatives 28 and $\mathbf{3 0}$. Coupling of compound 28 with methanol and propanol in the presence of DCC and DMAP gave the ester derivatives 25 and 27. Treatment of compound $\mathbf{2 6}$ and $\mathbf{2 9}$ with $40 \% \mathrm{MeNH}_{2}$ solution gave the $5^{\prime}$-methylamide nucleosides 23 and 24, respectively. Compound 26 was also treated with 1,2-diaminoethane and 1,3-diamino propane to afford the compound $\mathbf{3 1}$ and 32, respectively, which underwent acetylation upon treatment of acetic acid $N$-hydroxysuccinimide ester in the presence of triethylamine to provide acetyl derivatives $\mathbf{3 3}$ and $\mathbf{3 4}$.

The binding assays at diverse receptors and transporters, other than ARs, were performed at the Psychoactive Drug Screening Program (PDSP) at the University of North Carolina under the direction of Bryan L. Roth. ${ }^{1}$ Initially a concentration of $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ was used to probe binding at diverse sites, and compounds that achieved $>50 \%$ inhibition at this concentration were analyzed with full curves to determine $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values. We have focused on the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$, because none of the compounds tested showed significant interaction (>50\% inhibition at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) in binding assays at other 5 HTRs : $5 \mathrm{HT}_{1 \mathrm{~A}}, 5 \mathrm{HT}_{1 \mathrm{~B}}, 5 \mathrm{HT}_{1 \mathrm{D}}, 5 \mathrm{HT}_{1 \mathrm{E}}$, $5 \mathrm{HT}_{4}, 5 \mathrm{HT}_{6}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{7}$. Affinity at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{R}$, which is related in sequence to $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$, was also consistently low $\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}>10 \mu \mathrm{M}\right)$ or absent; when $<50 \%$ inhibition was noted at any of the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$, the \% values at are provided in the table. However, one compound displayed measurable affinity at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{3} \mathrm{R}$, e.g. truncated nucleoside $\mathbf{3}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} 3.26$ $\pm 0.54 \mu \mathrm{M}(\mathrm{n}=3)$, and compound 30 bound weakly to the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{5 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{R}$.

Binding at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ was performed using standard high affinity radioligands, $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right] 43$ and $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right] \mathbf{4 4}$, respectively. As we reported previously, adenine derivatives $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2}$, lacking $N^{9}$ substitution, or with a $2^{\prime}, 3^{\prime}$-dihydroxy-bicyclo[3.1.0]hexyl substitution of ribose, i.e. $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{4}$, bound to the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ with $\mu \mathrm{M}$ affinity. ${ }^{9}$ Appending the adenine C 2 substitution with a rigid arylethynyl group in $\mathbf{2}$ maintained affinity at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$, but eliminated $\mu \mathrm{M}$ affinity at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ that was observed with compounds $\mathbf{1 , 3}$ and 4. Ribonucleosides 5-9, known AR agonists that display varied AR selectivities, were found to be inactive at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$. Compound $\mathbf{5}$ is often taken to closely approximate the pharmacology of adenosine itself; thus, it is unlikely that endogenous adenosine would be interacting with $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ in situ. Depending on $N^{6}$-substitution, appending a 9-ribose moiety with a small alkyl amide modification at the $5^{\prime}$ position was tolerated at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$, as with compounds $\mathbf{1 0}$ and 11. Changing $\mathrm{C} 2-\mathrm{H} 10$ to $\mathrm{C} 2-\mathrm{Cl} 11$ in the ribose series did not have
a major effect on the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ affinity; both of those $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$-selective agonists are in current clinical trials. ${ }^{30}$

The SAR of (N)-methanocarba derivatives $\mathbf{1 2} \mathbf{- 4 2}$ was analyzed in detail. In the $4^{\prime}-\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$ series $\mathbf{1 2 - 2 2}$, a slight increase of $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ affinity was observed with introduction of an $N^{6}$ methyl group on the exocyclic amine (as in previously reported (N)-methanocarba nucleosides $\mathbf{1 3}$ vs. 12). Enhancement of $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ affinity was observed upon introduction of a rigid (N)-methanocarba moiety, compared to ribose, in analogues containing a $4^{\prime}$ hydroxymethyl group (as in $\mathbf{1 2}$ vs. $\mathbf{5} ; \mathbf{1 4}$ vs. $\mathbf{6}$, in which the C 2 substitution also changes). Notably, $\Lambda^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl $4^{\prime}-\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$ derivative 14 containing a (N)-methanocarba substitution displayed a potent $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ value of 11 nM at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ with slight (8-fold) selectivity vs. $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ ( $P<0.05$, unpaired t-test). Consequently, analogues of $\mathbf{1 4}$ with slight modifications of the $\Lambda^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl group and defined stereochemistry (compounds 15-21) were evaluated in an attempt to tune the pharmacological properties. Cyclopropyl was changed to ethyl, isopropyl or cyclobutyl in an effort to enhance $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ affinity or selectivity. Thus, pairs of diastereomeric nucleosides differing in the chirality of the Ca group at $N^{6}$ were compared. In comparing $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl derivative 14 with $R$-isomers 16, 18, and 21 and with $S$-isomers 17, 19, and 20, there was no consistent preference for a particular stereoisomer, and all of these variations of $\mathbf{1 4}$ moderately reduced the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ affinity. Also, the $N^{6}$-achiral derivative 15 was most reduced in $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ affinity compared to 14. Among these chiral $N^{6}$ derivatives of $\mathbf{1 4}, \mathrm{S}$-isomer 20 was the most potent at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} 34 \mathrm{nM}\right)$, and R-isomer 18 was the most potent at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} 190\right.$ $\mathrm{nM})$.
$5^{\prime}$-Carbonyl group modifications had variable effects on $\mathrm{A}_{3} A R$ affinity in comparison to the corresponding $4^{\prime}-\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$. The $5^{\prime}$-methylamide derivative 23, related to $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl analogue 14 , was 12 -fold selective in binding for $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ vs. $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}(P<0.05$, unpaired t-test). However, the same $5^{\prime}$-methylamide in the ( N )-methanocarba series generally resulted in small decreases in $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ affinity ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} 23 \mathrm{nM}, 23 \mathrm{vs} .11 \mathrm{nM}, \mathbf{1 4}$ ) and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ affinity ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} 269 \mathrm{nM}, 23 \mathrm{vs} .84 \mathrm{nM}, \mathbf{1 4}$ ). $5^{\prime}$-Methyl ester $\mathbf{2 5}$ and $5^{\prime}$-ethyl ester 26 derivatives were particularly potent and selective at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}\left(15-19 \mathrm{nM}\right.$ at $\left.5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}\right)$ with only intermediate affinity at the ARs (roughly $\mu \mathrm{M}$ ). Compound $\mathbf{2 5}$ was 6 -fold selective for the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ compared to $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}(P<0.05$, unpaired t -test $)$,

Representative inhibition curves are shown for $5^{\prime}$-methyl ester 25 (Figure 1), which bound to the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ as potently as the reference compound 49 . The corresponding $5^{\prime}$-propyl ester 27 and $5^{\prime}$-carboxylic acid derivative 28 were less potent at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ than the methyl and ethyl esters.

For comparison, we include affinities at the human $A_{1} A R, A_{2 A} A R$ and $A_{3} A R$, often from archival data (Table 1). ${ }^{21-26}$ Selected newly synthesized structures were assayed at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ at the $\mathrm{A}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{AR}$, which is disfavored in binding of $(\mathrm{N})$-methanocarba adenosines in general. We did not include affinity at the human $A_{2 B} A R$, because we already established that in the (N)methanocarba series, especially those containing compounds C 2 substitution, the affinities tend to be much lower at that subtype than at the other AR subtypes. ${ }^{25}$ (N)-Methanocarba $4^{\prime}$-hydroxymethyl $\mathbf{1 4}$ and $5^{\prime}$-methylamide $\mathbf{2 3}$ derivatives were more potent at the $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$
than the corresponding $5^{\prime}$-alkyl esters $\mathbf{2 5} \mathbf{- 2 7}$. However, $\mathbf{1 4}$ was most potent at the $\mathrm{A}_{1} A R$ with a $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ value of 39 nM . The affinity at the $\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{AR}$ and $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ of the diastereomeric nucleosides 16-21 was significantly reduced (typically by 20- to 30-fold) compared to $\mathbf{1 4}$. Similarly, in a previous modeling study of the $4^{\prime}$-truncated equivalents of compounds 14 21, ${ }^{22}$ any deviation from the $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl group reduced both $\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{AR}$ and $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ affinity. Furthermore, $\mathbf{2 5}$ was significantly more potent at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ than at $\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{AR}$ (23-fold) and $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ (40-fold) ( $P<0.05$, one-way ANOVA with post-hoc test). Functional assays of $A_{1} A R-m e d i a t e d ~ i n h i b i t i o n ~ o f ~ c A M P ~ f o r m a t i o n ~ 22 ~ s h o w e d ~ t h a t ~ 14 ~ a n d ~ 26 ~ w e r e ~ f u l l ~ a g o n i s t s, ~$ with maximal efficacy (at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) of $104 \pm 4 \%$ and $89 \pm 3 \%$ of $\Lambda^{6}$-cyclopentyladenosine ( 1 $\mu M$ ). In a functional assay of $A_{3} A R-m e d i a t e d ~ i n h i b i t i o n ~ o f ~ c A M P ~ f o r m a t i o n ~(~ n=3), ~, ~ 22 ~ e s t e r s ~$ 25 and 26 were partial agonists (at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) with maximal efficacy of $41.4 \pm 2.8 \%$ and $26.3 \pm 6.1 \%$, respectively, compared to 48 set at $100 \%$, and amide 23 was a full agonist (96.7 $\pm 1.0 \%$ ).

All of the previous analogues mentioned up to this point contained either an exocyclic $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ group or a monosubstituted NH. The effects of di-methyl substitution of the $\Lambda^{6}$ group was examined in the following 2-Cl analogues: $4^{\prime}$-hydroxymethyl $\mathbf{2 2}, 5^{\prime}$-methylamide 24, $5^{\prime}$ ethyl ester $\mathbf{2 9}$ and $5^{\prime}$-carboxylic acid $\mathbf{3 0}$ derivatives. The $4^{\prime}-\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$ analogue $\mathbf{2 2}$ displayed $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values of $5-8 \mu \mathrm{M}$ at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ and $\sim 2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ at the $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$. The corresponding $5^{\prime}$-CONH-Me analogue 24 displayed only slightly improved $\mu \mathrm{M}$ affinity at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$, $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ and $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$. However, the corresponding $5^{\prime}$-ethyl ester analogue 29 displayed $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values of 671 nM at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $1.35 \mu \mathrm{M}$ at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ with no measurable affinity at the $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$. Thus, $\Lambda^{6}$-dimethyl analogue 29 was $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$-selective in binding assays. $5^{\prime}$ Carboxylate derivatives $\mathbf{2 8}$ and $\mathbf{3 0}$ displayed roughly $\mu \mathrm{M}$ affinity at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}, 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ and $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$.

In order to reduce AR affinity while further enhancing $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ affinity, we examined in detail the molecular modeling of these GPCRs. The docking of nucleoside derivatives at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ by Paoletta et al. proposed two hypothetical binding modes depending on substituent groups. ${ }^{9}$ The most general docking mode, applicable to all nucleosides examined, proposed that a nonpolar $N^{6}$ group, i.e. a 3-chlorobenzyl group in 35, was anchored the analogues in a deep hydrophobic region. ${ }^{2}$ This mode would allow the ribose moiety access to the exofacial side of the receptor and therefore might provide greater flexibility of substitution. An alternative mode of $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ docking, which was very similar to the position of related adenosine derivatives in ARs with the ribose moiety facing downward in a deep hydrophilic region, was possible only in the absence of an extended C2 substituent. We proceeded initially assuming the first predicted binding mode (above), leading to the hypothesis that the more external ribose moiety (or (N)-methanocarba moiety) would have considerable freedom of substitution in binding to the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 B} \mathrm{R}$. In order to design analogues that might lack interaction with ARs, we referred to our previous studies of the modification of $5^{\prime}$-amide derivatives in the adenosine (9-riboside) series. ${ }^{31}$ It was noted that $5^{\prime}-N-2$-aminoethyl and $5^{\prime}-N-3$-aminopropyl amides in the ribose series were of greatly reduced AR affinity. Therefore, we prepared compounds 31 and $\mathbf{3 2}$, which are $5^{\prime}-N$ (aminoalkyl)amide derivatives containing the preferred $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl group to test if the interaction with the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ would be maintained. In fact, these two compounds
bound with moderate affinity at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$, with a preference for the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ (both displayed $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values of $\sim 140 \mathrm{nM}$ ). Moreover, as predicted by receptor docking modes, compounds 31 and $\mathbf{3 2}$ were selective for the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ in comparison to ARs. Therefore, we added two more analogues $\mathbf{3 3}$ and $\mathbf{3 4}$, which were the $N$-acetylation products of $\mathbf{3 1}$ and $\mathbf{3 2}$ and that displayed roughly $\mu \mathrm{M}$ or sub- $\mu \mathrm{M}$ affinity in $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ and $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values of $\sim 1.7-2.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ at the $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$. Evidently, there is a freedom of substitution at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ of this extended functionalized chain attached at the $5^{\prime}-\mathrm{CO}$ position, consistent with modeling predictions that indicate the ribose moiety to be pointing toward the extracellular medium. However, in AR docking, based on the X-ray structures of nucleoside-bound $\mathrm{A}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{ARs}$, the ribose binding subpocket and the region around the $5^{\prime}$ position are more sterically limited. Curiously, compound 33 displayed a $K_{i}$ value of $0.40 \mu \mathrm{M}$ at the $\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{AR}$, which was more potent than other members of the extended $5^{\prime}$-amide series.

Effects on $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ affinity of extensions at the C 2 position were compared. Compound $\mathbf{3 5}$ has been studied as a potent $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ agonist in an inflammation model. ${ }^{30}$ Although it displayed substantial affinity at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$, $\mathbf{3 5}$ was nevertheless 260 -fold selective for $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ vs. $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$. Other ( N )-methanocarba derivatives with extended C 2 substituents $\mathbf{3 6} \mathbf{- 4 1}$, which were already reported as particularly potent and selective at the $A_{3} A R,{ }^{20,22-26}$ displayed at best $\mu \mathrm{M}$ affinity at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$, e.g. 37, 38, and 41. Thus, the approach of C 2 extension that we have taken in recent SAR studies to enhance $A_{3} A R$ selectivity generally precluded activity at 5HTRs. The dialkylation of the exocyclic amine of $\mathbf{4 2}$ slightly increased affinity at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ with an accompanying 34-fold reduction of $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ affinity ( 39 vs. 42).

Functional assays indicated antagonist activity of $\mathbf{1 4}$ and $\mathbf{2 6}$ at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B} / \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{Rs}$, similar to our previous report with adenine/adenosine derivatives that are moderately potent $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ ligands. ${ }^{9}$ Compounds $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{3 5}$ were previously found to be antagonists of the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$, with functional $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ of 0.89 and $3.26 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively. ${ }^{9}$ Here, $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values in fully antagonizing receptor activation by serotonin at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ were determined (Figures 1C,D), respectively, for compounds ( $\mathrm{n}=$ ): 14, $22.3 \pm 4.0 \mathrm{nM}$ (2) and $337 \pm 27 \mathrm{nM}(2) ; \mathbf{2 3}, 4.4 \pm 2.6 \mathrm{nM}(4)$ and $752 \pm 431 \mathrm{nM}(3) ; \mathbf{2 5}, 3.2 \pm 1.9 \mathrm{nM}(4)$ and $4.1 \pm 1.6$ nM (4); 26, $1.8 \pm 0.7 \mathrm{nM}$ (3) and $3.9 \pm 2.9 \mathrm{nM}$ (3). Thus, $5^{\prime}$-methyamide 23 displayed 170fold selectivity at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$. Compounds $\mathbf{1 4}, \mathbf{2 3}, \mathbf{2 5}$, and 26 at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ had no appreciable agonist or partial agonist activity at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ and no activity as agonist or antagonist at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{R}$ (Figure 2, Figure S 6 , Supporting Information). Therefore, within the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$, all four derivatives were potent antagonists at two subtypes, and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ functional selectivity was observed for amide derivative 23 (Figure S7, Supporting information). The ligand efficiency (LE) in $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ binding for four compounds was: 14, $0.41 ; \mathbf{2 3}, 0.37 ; \mathbf{2 5}, 0.37 ; 26,0.37$.

Two representative $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl derivatives $\mathbf{2 3}$ and $\mathbf{2 5}$ that differed only at the $5^{\prime}$ position were examined for ADME and toxicological parameters (Table 2, Supporting Information). $5^{\prime}$-Methylamide 23 and $5^{\prime}$-methyl ester 25 demonstrated $\sim 100 \%$ stability in human plasma over 2 h , and $87 \% \mathbf{2 3}$ and $94 \% \mathbf{2 5}$ remained after 1 h exposure to human liver microsomes with cofactor present. Both compounds lacked inhibition of cytochrome P450 enzymes (Table 2) and were found to be relatively non-toxic to HepG2 liver cells (growth
inhibition $<30 \%$ at $30 \mu \mathrm{M})$. Their stability at pH 6.5 was high, with $97 \%$ of each compound remaining after 2 h in simulated intestinal fluid). However, the stability in simulated gastric fluid at pH 1.6 showed only $\sim 50 \%$ of each compound remaining after 2 h . The reduced acid stability is likely common to compounds containing a $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl group. 23 was moderately permeable in CACO-2 cells with evidence of efflux (A-to-B $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{app}}=4.73 \times$ $10^{-6} \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{sec}$; efflux ratio $=11.7$ ), while 25 was highly permeable with no significant efflux (A-to-B $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{app}}=18.5 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{sec}$; efflux ratio $=1.67$ ). The half-life following intravenous administration ( $1.0 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ ) in male Sprague-Dawley rats was $2.89 \pm 0.67 \mathrm{~h}$ for 23 and $3.56 \pm 0.32 \mathrm{~h}$ for $\mathbf{2 5}$ (mean $\pm$ SEM, $\mathrm{n}=3$ ). Thus, the ester group of $\mathbf{2 5}$ was not subject to rapid hydrolysis, probably due to the steric hindrance of the tertiary $4^{\prime}$-carbon. Compound $23\left(\mathrm{C}_{0}=1070 \pm 30 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{mL} ; \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dss}}=3.16 \pm 0.41 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{kg}\right)$ displayed better pharmacokinetic exposure than $\mathbf{2 5}\left(\mathrm{C}_{0}=349 \pm 7 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{mL} ; \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{dss}}=4.62 \pm 0.18 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{kg}\right)$.

A few other off-target activities $\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}<10 \mu \mathrm{M}\right)$ at receptors and ion channels determined by the PDSP that are not already reported were detected (Figure S5, Supporting Information). For example, riboside derivative 9 showed only two such interactions ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ at $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$ receptors, 4.1 and $1.4 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively). Compounds $\mathbf{1 3}$ and $\mathbf{4 2}$ displayed $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values at the $\sigma_{2}$ receptor of $2.22 \pm 0.88$ and $7.3 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively. Compound 14 inhibited binding at the dopamine transporter $\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} 4.8 \mu \mathrm{M}\right)$ and compounds 26 and 27 at the translocator protein (TSPO, $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} 2.1 \mu \mathrm{M}$ and $2.2 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively). There were no such interactions with other closely related GPCR families: muscarinic cholinergic, $\alpha$ - and $\beta$ - adrenergic, dopaminergic or histaminergic receptors.

## Molecular Modeling

We performed docking and MD simulations to explain the observed binding data by focusing on the h5 $5 T_{2 B} \mathrm{R}$. The available X-ray structure of the receptor in complex with the biased agonist ergotamine (ERG) features signatures of both active and inactive states, ${ }^{32}$ thus entailing potential limitations in using this structure to elucidate the binding of antagonists. We therefore built a homology model for the native $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ using the ERG$\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ X-ray structure as template, ${ }^{32}$ docked a selected compound by means of induced fit docking (IFD), and refined the obtained binding pose with 30 ns of membrane MD simulations.

Induced Fit Docking-For our modeling analysis, we focused on the $N^{6}$ -
dicyclopropylmethyl $5^{\prime}$-methylamide derivative $\mathbf{2 3}$, which is 12 -fold selective in binding at the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ in comparison to the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$. The compound was docked into the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ homology model by means of IFD (docking score $-8.265 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ ). As depicted in Figure 3 A , the ligand lies perpendicular to the membrane plane with the pseudo-sugar moiety pointing toward the extracellular side in an orientation similar to the most general (riboseup) binding mode previously described. ${ }^{9}$ A network of hydrogen bonds and extended hydrophobic contacts (Figure 3A) anchor the ligand to the upper part of TM2, TM3 and TM7, and to the downstream region of the second extracellular loop (EL2). The NH group of the amide moiety in $5^{\prime}$ and the secondary amino group $\left(N^{6}\right)$ act as H-bond donors to the backbone of Cys207 ${ }^{\mathrm{EL} 2}$ of the conserved disulfide bridge and the sidechain of the conserved Asp $135^{3.32}$ residue, respectively. The $2^{\prime}$ and $3^{\prime}$ OH groups of the pseudo-sugar moiety
establish H-bond interactions with the sidechains of Gln3597.32, Glu363 ${ }^{7.36}$, and Thr114 ${ }^{2.64}$. The $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl moiety engages in extended hydrophobic contacts with residues located in TM3 (Leu132 and Val136), TM6 (Trp337 and Phe340), TM7 (Val366 and Tyr370), and at the interface between EL2 and TM5 (Leu209 and Phe217). The methyl group of the $5^{\prime}$-methylamide points toward TM3 and establishes hydrophobic contacts with $\operatorname{Trp} 121^{\mathrm{EL} 1}, \operatorname{Trp} 131^{3.28}$, and the sidechain of Cys207 ${ }^{\mathrm{EL} 2}$. The (N)-methanocarba ring faces the extracellular side and engages in hydrophobic contacts with Val208 ${ }^{\text {EL2 }}$.

MD simulations-The above-described binding mode of $\mathbf{2 3}$ was subjected to 30 ns of allatom MD simulations. The visualization of the trajectory (Video S1) along with the Interaction Energy (IE) profile (Lower right panel in Video S1 and Figure S1) showed that the interaction network did not persist when water molecules were allowed to diffuse into the membrane-embedded system. Indeed, after a few ns, a flip of the glycosidic bond (Video S1) triggered the ligand to move deeper in the binding side and to establish an extended network of H-bond interactions with the conserved Asp135 ${ }^{3.32}$ and Tyr370 ${ }^{7.43}$ through the interplay of water molecules. The pseudoglycosidic bond angle was $-117.2^{\circ}$ for the docked compound (anti) and $12.7^{\circ}$ for the final structure after MD (syn). In the other two trajectories (data not shown), the flip of the glycosidic bond was assisted by an H-bond interaction between the side chain of Glu363 ${ }^{7.36}$ and the $5^{\prime}$-methylamide moiety. As this residue occurs as $\mathrm{Asn}^{7.36}$ in the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$, we believe that this transient interaction might assist the ligand while approaching the binding site and therefore might account for the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ selectivity of the $5^{\prime}$-methylamide with respect to $5^{\prime}$-alkylester groups. The new placement of the ligand (Figure 3B) - with the adenine core lying almost parallel to the membrane plane and the $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl moiety pointing toward TM5 and TM6 persisted for the rest of the trajectory and was stabilized by extended water-mediate H -bond interactions. The binding mode proposed by the MD analysis (Figure 3B) features a $\pi-\pi$ stacking interaction between the adenine core and Phe $340^{6.51}$ and nine tightly bound water molecules ( $w 1-w 9$ ) mediating the ligand-protein H-bond interactions: w1 (highlighted in yellow) anchors the $5^{\prime}$-carbonyl group to the sidechain of $\mathrm{Gln} 359^{7.32}$ (acting as H -bond donor) and the backbone of Leu209 ${ }^{\mathrm{EL} 2}$ (acting as H-bond acceptor); w2 and w3 (highlighted in magenta) connect the $2^{\prime} \mathrm{OH}$ group of the pseudo-sugar moiety to conserved Asp135 3.32 and Tyr3707.43; w4 and w5 (highlighted in green) bridge the backbone of Cys207 to the sidechain of the conserved Asp135 ${ }^{3.32}$ through the interplay of the $3^{\prime} \mathrm{OH}$ group; w6 (highlighted in purple) mediates the H -bond interaction between the sidechain of Ser139 ${ }^{3.39}$ and the $\Lambda^{6}$ amine; ${ }_{W} 7-{ }_{W} 9$ (highlighted in cyan) connect the N3 nitrogen atom of the adenine core to the sidechains of the conserved Asp135 ${ }^{3.32}$ and Asn344 ${ }^{6.55}$ residues. This putative binding mode agrees with the flexibility of substitution at the $5^{\prime}$ position of the pseudosugar moiety as well as with the intolerance of bulkier groups at the adenine C 2 position (pointing toward TM6). Indeed, active compounds bearing different groups at the $5^{\prime}$ position (14: hydroxy; 25: methyl ester; 26: ethyl ester; 27: propyl ester, Figure 4A-D) as well as the $N^{6}$-3-chlorobenzyl $5^{\prime}$-methylamide derivative $\mathbf{3 5}$ (data not shown) docked to this receptor conformation with good scores (Table S1) by maintaining the above describe interaction pattern and by retaining water molecules. Notably, as reported in Table S1, we were able to dock the compounds using also the XP scoring function, which is known to
require a greater ligand-receptor shape complementarity, thus further emphasizing the feasibility of this interaction network.

As emerged from this analysis, all of the ligand-receptor interactions, except the H -bond network mediated by w1 and a hydrophobic contact with Met218 ${ }^{5.39}$ (transparent surface on the right in Figure 3B), involve highly conserved residues. Nonetheless, we believe that these two interactions might account for the greater affinity of $\mathbf{2 3}$ for the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$. Indeed, the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ features a Glu residue (which sidechain that cannot act as H -bond donor) in place of $\mathrm{Gln}^{7.32}$ and a shorter EL2. While the Glu ${ }^{7.32}$ side chain would not enable the H bond network as mediated by $w 1$ in the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$, the shorter EL 2 is expected to affect the three-dimensional arrangement of the downstream loop region as well as of the extracellular tip of TM5 - where Leu 209 and Met ${ }^{5.39}$ (occurring as Val ${ }^{5.39}$ in the h5HT ${ }_{2 C}$ R), respectively, are located.

Concerning the activity at the $\mathrm{hA}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{hA}_{3}$ ARs exhibited by $5^{\prime}$-methylamide derivatives, we expect binding modes similar to the previously discussed poses of ( N )-methanocarba adenosines ${ }^{21,33}$ envisaging the placement of the scaffold perpendicular to the membrane plane with the pseudo-sugar pointing toward the intracellular side. In this binding mode, the $\mathrm{C}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ and $\mathrm{C} 3^{\prime} \mathrm{OH}$ groups interact with the sidechains of the conserved His ${ }^{7.43}$ and Ser ${ }^{7.42}$, respectively, and the NH group of the $5^{\prime}$-methylamide engages in an H -bond interaction with $\mathrm{Thr}^{3.36}$.

Analysis of Receptor Structures-The overlay between the starting docking structure and the MD-refined complex (Figure S2A, alignment base on alpha carbon atoms of TM domains) shows that the largest structural rearrangements in the protein occurred in TM5, TM6, and TM7. In the final $23-h 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ structure (cyan ribbons in Figure S 2 A ), the bulge in TM5 - that protruded into the binding site in the initial structure (magenta ribbons in Figure S2A) - was pushed outward by the $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl moiety of the ligand, the intracellular tip of TM6 moved toward the TM bundle, and a disruption of the alpha helix structure in TM7 (residues 372 to 374 ) occurred. All these structural rearrangements are compatible with a transition from an active-like to an inactive protein structure, as emerged by the comparison between the $\beta_{2}$-adrenergic active ${ }^{34}$ and inactive ${ }^{35}$ structures. Moreover, the average distances of the sidechains of Phe ${ }^{6.41}$ and Phe ${ }^{6.44}$ with respect to TM5 ( $\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{C}_{4}{ }^{-}\right.$ Phe $\left.{ }^{6.44}-\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{A}}-\operatorname{Pro}^{5.50}\right)=12.8 \AA ; \mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{C}_{4}-\mathrm{Phe}^{6.41}-\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{A}}-\mathrm{Met}^{5.54}\right)=9.8 \AA$ ) and the sidechain of Tyr ${ }^{7.53}$ oriented toward TM3 further suggest that the final receptor structure is in the inactive state. ${ }^{36,37}$ In addition, the average density of water molecules calculated during the trajectory (Figure S2B) highlighted the presence of the previously hypothesized ${ }^{36}$ hydrophobic connector that hampers the entrance of water molecules.

We also performed the check of the "inactive signatures" 37 by comparing the results with MD simulations of the apo receptor. Surprisingly, the ionic lock between $\mathrm{Arg}^{3.50}$ and Glu ${ }^{6.30}$ persisted in the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$-apo structure but not in the ligand-bound structure (Figure S 3 A , Supporting Information). Indeed, in the $\mathbf{2 3}-\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ complex, $\mathrm{Arg}^{3.50}$ establishes a persistent H -bond interaction with the sidechain of $\mathrm{Tyr}^{7.53}$ of the conserved NPxxY motif (Figure S3B). In both structures, the salt bridge between Asp ${ }^{3.49}$ and Arg $^{3.50}$ (conserved DRY motif, Figure S3C) is not present because Asp ${ }^{3.49}$ faces TM4 and establishes a salt
bridge with Lys ${ }^{4.45}$ (Figure S3D). According to structure-based sequence alignments, ${ }^{38}$ Lys ${ }^{4.45}$ is a not conserved residue present only in the $h 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ and human histamine $H_{3} R$. Indeed, other biogenic amine receptors as well as nucleotide receptors feature a positively charged residue (Lys or Arg ) in the $4.41,4.43$ or 4.44 position (Table S 2 ). Moreover, in the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ structure experimentally determined through serial femtosecond crystallography, ${ }^{39}$ a salt bridge between Glu ${ }^{3.60}$ and the non-conserved Lys ${ }^{5.68}$ was found. This provided further evidence of the interplay between non-conserved Lys residues and negatively charged conserved residues as well as the existence of a slightly different interaction network in the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ with respect to other class A GPCRs. However, it is still to be determined whether these differences can be ascribed to the biased signaling of the co-crystallized ligand, and hopefully future X-ray structures in complex with biased agonists will clarify this point.

## Discussion

Rigid nucleosides also appear to be a privileged scaffold at diverse sites, in addition to purine receptors. In our repurposing of nucleosides to obtain novel $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ ligands, we utilized a structure-based approach. Similar methods could be suitable for the repurposing of scaffolds to other GPCRs. The lead for our present study originated from a fortuitous hit in the off-target screening of known AR ligands, i.e. the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ interaction of $\mathbf{1 0}$, but it is conceivable to structurally modify a given scaffold to fit to a GPCR target of choice purely using computational methods and not be dependent on fortuitous empirical screening. By repurposing a nucleoside scaffold from one set of GPCRs, i.e. ARs, to interact selectively with $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ as guided by structural information, we can create novel ligands with physicochemical characteristics that are different from known $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ ligands. The rational design of new GPCR ligands aided by computational analysis of new X-ray structures is gaining momentum. ${ }^{19}$

Several compounds demonstrated moderate selectivity for the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2}$ Rs. Small alkyl esters 25 and 26 were the most potent in this series at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$, with $\mathbf{2 5}$ being slightly selective in binding with respect to $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$. Both compounds were modestly selective in comparison to ARs, at which they display only $\mu \mathrm{M}$ affinity. The corresponding $6-N, N$-dimethylamino analogue 29 was less potent but still $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$-selective. An amino-propylamide $\mathbf{3 2}$ was moderately selective for $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ in comparison to ARs. Moderate binding selectivity for the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ in comparison to $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ was achieved with compounds $\mathbf{1 4}, \mathbf{2 0}, 23$ and 41. In functional assays, $5^{\prime}$-amide 23 , which also bound to the $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$, was $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$-selective, while 14, 25 and 26 were nonselective. Several compounds in addition to 23 were mixed ligands at ARs and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2}$ Rs. For example, $\mathbf{1 4}$ was a mixed potent ligand at $\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{AR}$ (agonist) and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ (antagonist). Compounds $\mathbf{1 6}$ and $\mathbf{2 1}$ were mixed potent ligands at $\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{AR} / \mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ and $\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{AR}$ (agonists), respectively, and at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ (likely antagonists). Compound 24 was a mixed ligand at $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B} / \mathrm{C}}$ Rs. Thus, we have identified ( N )-methanocarba nucleosides that favored $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ affinity (Figure S 4 , Supporting Information, and in some cases also $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ ). The $5^{\prime}$-methyl or ethyl ester modification lowered affinity at the $\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{AR}$ by roughly 4 -fold and at $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ by 10 - to 20 -fold. The effects of amide chain extension at the $5^{\prime}$ position were complex and resulted in only modest selectivity.

Thus, we can tune the mixture of AR and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ activities by structural manipulation to provide novel compounds displaying mixed activities within the two families of receptors or favoring activity at either family. The SAR herein determined is consistent with a previous prediction that the $(\mathrm{N})$-methanocarba nucleosides bind at the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ in an orientation different from the presumed binding mode at the ARs (i.e. with the pseudo-sugar portion projecting into the TM bundle). The specific preference for the $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl group is consistent with a small pocket at the TM5/TM6 interface. The modeling analysis herein presented suggests that ligand-recognition at the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ might occur with the scaffold lying almost parallel to the membrane plane. In this position, the $5^{\prime}$ group points toward the EL2 and the extracellular tip of TM5, a region exhibiting structural diversity in the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$, thus revealing the potential for further derivatization at this position. In particular, the selection of suitable anchoring points among non-conserved residues might achieve selectivity at the desired $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ subtype.

The design of selective ligands of the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ is warranted based on recent biological findings. Selective antagonists might be useful for treating the heart or pulmonary hypertension. ${ }^{14,40}$ Their experimental use in liver protection has been demonstrated; $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ blockade reduces chronic fibrosis and enhances hepatic regeneration. ${ }^{14} \mathrm{~A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ is highly expressed in the liver, and its agonists are also of interest for the treatment of liver disease. ${ }^{20}$ Thus, a combined agent with both $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonist and $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$ agonist activity might have a synergistic benefit in the liver. The application of $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonists for treating irritable bowel syndrome was also proposed. ${ }^{2,18}$ However, one recent study comparing selective 5 HTR antagonists failed to confirm that activity. ${ }^{41} \mathrm{~A}$ variety of approaches have contributed to recent efforts to discover selective $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ agonists and antagonists from screening and computational analysis. For example, computational activity prediction and microfluidics-assisted synthesis enabled the discovery of new $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonists. ${ }^{42}$ Other novel antagonists were discovered as a result of broad screening programs. ${ }^{43,44}$ Activity at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{R}$, considered to be a mechanism of hallucinogenic activity of a subset of its agonists, ${ }^{45}$ is consistently low or absent throughout this compound series.

In general, $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ modulation in the brain contributes to the activity of antidepressant drugs. Various antidepressant drugs raise levels of 5 HT , which can activate the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and downregulate the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ to contribute to the action of these drugs. Inhibition of the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$, which forms functional GPCR heterodimers with the melatonin $\mathrm{MT}_{2} \mathrm{R},{ }^{46}$ has both antidepressant and anxiolytic effects. However, $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ activation has antinociceptive properties related to the association of this subtype with descending inhibitory pain pathways originating in the rostroventral medial medulla (RVM). ${ }^{47-49}$ The typically low penetration of nucleoside derivatives into the brain ${ }^{50}$ would be of benefit when applying $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonists for peripheral conditions such as cardiac and hepatic fibrosis. This might be an advantage of the nucleoside $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonists over brain penetrant heterocycles. We have not determined if the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ antagonist activity in this chemical series represents neutral antagonism or inverse agonism, which has a bearing on potential therapeutic applications because of receptor constitutive activity. ${ }^{51}$ It was also noted that AR agonists might facilitate passage of various solutes across the blood brain barrier, ${ }^{52}$ but if this activity is removed from the current analogues, then that would not be a factor.

In conclusion, we have transformed rigid carbocyclic nucleosides that are $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}$-selective agonists into moderately potent $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and/or $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ antagonists using a structure-based approach. Although many of the compounds are nonselective between these two receptor subtypes, there is a tendency toward greater affinity at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$. We have analyzed the molecular recognition in this chemical series, aided by the X-ray structural determination of rhodopsin-like GPCRs and the availability of broad screening, to shift and optimize the binding of the same scaffold to a new family of receptors.

## Experimental section

## Chemical synthesis

Materials and instrumentation-All reagents and solvents were purchased from SigmaAldrich (St. Louis, MO). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were obtained with a Bruker 400 spectrometer using $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ and DMSO as solvents. Chemical shifts are expressed in $\delta$ values ( ppm ) with tetramethylsilane ( $\delta 0.00$ ) for $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ and water ( $\delta 3.30$ ) for $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$. NMR spectra were collected with a Bruker AV spectrometer equipped with a z-gradient $\left[{ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C},{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}\right]$-cryoprobe. TLC analysis was carried out on glass sheets precoated with silica gel F254 ( 0.2 mm ) from Aldrich. The purity of final nucleoside derivatives was checked using a Hewlett-Packard 1100 HPLC equipped with a Zorbax SB-Aq $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ analytical column ( $50 \times 4.6 \mathrm{~mm}$; Agilent Technologies Inc., Palo Alto, CA). Mobile phase: linear gradient solvent system, 5 mM TBAP (tetrabutylammoniumdihydrogenphosphate)- $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ from 80:20 to 0:100 in 13 min ; the flow rate was $0.5 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$. Peaks were detected by UV absorption with a diode array detector at 230, 254, and 280 nm . All derivatives tested for biological activity showed $>95 \%$ purity by HPLC analysis (detection at 254 nm ). Lowresolution mass spectrometry was performed with a JEOL SX102 spectrometer with $6-\mathrm{kV}$ Xe atoms following desorption from a glycerol matrix or on an Agilent LC/MS 1100 MSD, with a Waters (Milford, MA) Atlantis C18 column. High resolution mass spectroscopic (HRMS) measurements were performed on a proteomics optimized Q-TOF-2 (MicromassWaters) using external calibration with polyalanine, unless noted. Observed mass accuracies are those expected based on known performance of the instrument as well as trends in masses of standard compounds observed at intervals during the series of measurements. Reported masses are observed masses uncorrected for this time-dependent drift in mass accuracy. All of the monosubsituted alkyne and branched amine intermediates were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO), Small Molecules, Inc. (Hoboken, NJ), Anichem (North Brunswick, NJ), PharmaBlock, Inc. (Sunnyvale, CA), Frontier Scientific (Logan, UT) and Tractus (Perrineville, NJ).
(1R,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-1-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-2,3-diol (14): Dowex50 (27 mg) was added to a solution of compound $64(49 \mathrm{mg}, 0.11 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{MeOH}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and water $(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the mixture stirred for 5 h at room temperature. After completion of reaction, the reaction mixture filtered and filtrate was evaporated under vacuum. The crude mixture was purified on flash silica gel column chromatography $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH}=30: 1\right)$ to give compound $\mathbf{1 4}$ $(37 \mathrm{mg}, 84 \%)$ as a colorless foamy powder. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.78(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$,
3.49 (br s, 1H), 1.64-1.61 (m, 1H), 1.55-1.53 (m, 1H), 1.18-1.09 (m, 2H), 0.78-0.74 (m, 1H), $0.60-0.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.47-0.39(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 406.1646; found 406.1653.
( $1 R, 2 R, 3 S, 4 R, 5 S)$-4-(2-Chloro-6-(pentan-3-ylamino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-1-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-2,3-diol (15): Compound 15 (85\%) was prepared from compound 65 following the method for compound $14 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta$ $8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.81(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.19(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.53(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.97(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H})$, 0.78-0.75 (m, 1H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 382.1646; found 382.1647.
(1R,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-(((1R)-cyclopropylpropyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-1-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-2,3-diol (16): Compound 16 (73\%) was prepared from compound 66 following the method for compound 14. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta$ $8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.66(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.72(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.55(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.02-0.99(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.78-0.74(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.61-0.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.47-0.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.36-0.33(\mathrm{~m}$, 1H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 394.1646; found 394.1647.
(1R,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-((1-cyclopropylpropyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-1-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-2,3-diol (17): Compound 17 (72\%) was prepared from compound 67 following the method for compound $14 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta$ $8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.67(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.70(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.56(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.02-0.99(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.78-0.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.59-0.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.45-0.42(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.36-0.30(\mathrm{~m}$, 1H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 394.1646; found 394.1642.
(1R,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-(((1R)-cyclopropyl-2-methylpropyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-1-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-2,3-diol (18): Compound 18 (67\%) was prepared from compound 68 following the method for compound $14 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.61$ (br s, 1H), 2.09-2.02 (m, 1H), 1.64-1.62 (m, 1H), $1.54(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08-1.04(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 0.78-0.74(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.67-0.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.45-0.36$ $(\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 408.1802; found 408.1806.
(1R,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-(((1S)-cyclopropyl-2-methylpropyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-1-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-2,3-diol (19): Compound 19 (68\%) was prepared from compound 69 following the method for compound $14 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.61(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.08-2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.55(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08-1.04(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 0.78-0.74(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.66-0.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.45-0.36$ $(\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 408.1802; found 408.1798.
(1R,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-(((S)-cyclobutyl(cyclopropyl)methyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-1-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-2,3-diol (20): Compound 20 ( $69 \%$ )
was prepared from compound 70 following the method for compound $14 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR
$\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89-3.82(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.73-2.65(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-2.07(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $1.85-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.97-0.91(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.78-0.74$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.58-0.53(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.40-0.36(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+$ $H)^{+}$: 420.1796; found 420.1796 .
(1R,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-(((R)-cyclobutyl(cyclopropyl)methyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-1-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-2,3-diol (21): Compound 21 (69\%) was prepared from compound 71 following the method for compound $14 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.89-3.82(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.71-2.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-2.07(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $1.83-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.97-0.90(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.78-0.74$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.58-0.53(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.40-0.36(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 420.1802; found 420.1799 .

## (1R,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-(dimethylamino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-1-

(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-2,3-diol (22): $10 \%$ TFA in water ( 1.5 mL ) was added to a solution of compound $\mathbf{6 3}(16 \mathrm{mg}, 0.02 \mathrm{mmol})$ in methanol $(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the mixture heated at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 6 h . Solvent was evaporated under vacuum, and the residue was purified on flash silica gel silica chromatography $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH}=30: 1\right)$ to give compound $22(6 \mathrm{mg}, 68 \%)$ as a syrup. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.81(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.77$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.30(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.85(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H})$, 1.64-1.61 (m, 1H), $1.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.78-0.75(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 340.1176$; found 340.1177.
(1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,3-dihydroxy- N -methylbicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1-carboxamide (23): $40 \% \mathrm{MeNH}_{2}$ solution (2 mL ) was added to a solution of compound $26(41 \mathrm{mg}, 0.09 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{MeOH}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the mixture stirred overnight at room temperature. Solvent was evaporated, and the residue was purified on flash silica gel column chromatography $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH}=20: 1\right)$ to give compound $23(25 \mathrm{mg}, 65 \%)$ as asyrup. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.04(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.07$ (d, $J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.87(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 2.08-2.04 (m, 1H), $1.82(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.60-0.55$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 0.47-0.39 (m, 6H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{ClN}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 433.1755; found 433.1771.
(1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-(dimethylamino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,3-dihydroxy- $N$ -methylbicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1-carboxamide (24): Compound 24 (67\%) was prepared from compound 29 following the method for compound 23. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.96$ (s, 1H), $5.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.87$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.06-2.04(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{ClN}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 367.1285$; found 367.1290 .

Methyl (1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,3-dihydroxybicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1-carboxylate (25): DCC ( $28 \mathrm{mg}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and DMAP ( $2.76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added to a solution of compound $28(19 \mathrm{mg}, 0.04 \mathrm{mmol})$ in DMF $(0.7 \mathrm{~mL})$. After stirring the reaction mixture for 10 min at room temperature, anhydrous $\mathrm{MeOH}(6.0 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added and the mixture stirred overnight at same condition. Solvent was evaporated, and the residue was purified on flash silica gel column chromatography (ethyl acetate: $\mathrm{MeOH}=85: 1$ ) to give compound $25(13 \mathrm{mg}, 68 \%)$ as a syrup. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.78(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 4.07 (d, $J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.19-2.15(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.15-1.11(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.63-0.53(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.45-0.42(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 434.1595; found 434.1603.

## Ethyl (1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-chloro-6-((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-

 yl)-2,3-dihydroxybicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1-carboxylate (26): Dowex50 (107 mg) was added to a solution of compound $76(166 \mathrm{mg}, 0.34 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{MeOH}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ and water $(3 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the mixture heated for 1 h at $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After completion of reaction, the reaction mixture was filtered and the filtrate was evaporated under vacuum. The crude mixture was purified on flash silica gel column chromatography (hexane:ethyl acetate $=1: 2$ ) to give compound 26 (131 mg, 86\%) as a colorless foamy powder. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.96(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.77(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.28-4.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 2.18-2.15(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.87(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 1.18-1.09 (m, 2H), 0.61-0.54 (m, 2H), 0.47-0.42 (m, 6H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 448.1752$; found 448.1745 .
## Propyl (1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-chloro-6-((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-

 yl)-2,3-dihydroxybicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1-carboxylate (27): Compound 27 (66\%) was prepared from compound 28 following the method for compound $25 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right.$, $400 \mathrm{MHz}) \delta 7.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.77(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.16(\mathrm{t}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $4.10(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.19-2.16(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 1.78-1.69 (m, 2H), 1.64-1.60 (m, 1H), 1.17-1.09 (m, 2H), 0.99 (t, $J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.61-0.54$ $(2 \mathrm{H}), 0.47-0.41(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 462.1908$; found 462.1903.
#### Abstract

(1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,3-dihydroxybicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1-carboxylic acid (28): 2 N NaOH solution ( 1.5 mL ) was added to a solution of compound $26(39 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$ in methanol $(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the mixture stirred at room temperature for 1.5 h . The reaction mixture was neutralized with acetic acid and evaporated under vacuum. The crude product was purified on flash silica gel column chromatography ( $\mathrm{CH} 2 \mathrm{Cl} 2: \mathrm{MeOH}: \mathrm{TFA}=20: 1: 0.1$ ) to give compound 28 ( 27 mg , $76 \%)$ as colorless powder. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.99(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.18(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.10(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.19-2.16(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.90(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.62(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.16-1.11(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.61-0.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.47-0.39(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 420.1439; found 420.1438 .


Ethyl (1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-chloro-6-(dimethylamino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,3-dihydroxybicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1-carboxylate (29): $10 \%$ TFA in water ( 2.5 mL ) was added to a solution of compound $77(58 \mathrm{mg}, 0.137 \mathrm{mmol})$ in methanol $(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the mixture heated at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 h . Solvent was evaporated under vacuum, and the residue was purified on flash silica gel silica chromatography $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH}=40: 1\right)$ to give compound $29(46 \mathrm{mg}, 88 \%)$ as a syrup. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.88(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.78(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.28-4.22(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.08(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.17-2.14$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.64-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.32(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 382.1282$; found 382.1283 .
(1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-4-(2-Chloro-6-(dimethylamino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,3-dihydroxybicyclo [3.1.0]hexane-1-carboxylic acid (30): Compound $\mathbf{3 0}$ ( $77 \%$ ) was prepared from compound 29 following the method for compound 28. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.89(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.08(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.18-2.15(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.91(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.66-1.62(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{H}^{+}$: 354.0969 ; found 354.0969 .
(1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-N-(2-Aminoethyl)-4-(2-chloro-6-((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,3-dihydroxybicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1-carboxamide (31): Ethylenediamine (1 mL ) was added to a solution of compound $\mathbf{2 6}(19 \mathrm{mg}, 0.04 \mathrm{mmol})$ in methanol $(0.3 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the mixture stirred for 3 days at room temperature. Solvent was evaporated, and the residue was purified on flash silca gel column chromatography $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH}: \mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{OH}=9: 1: 0.1\right)$ to give compound $31(12 \mathrm{mg}, 63 \%)$ as a syrup. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.07(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.13(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.81(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.45-3.39(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.84$ $(\mathrm{t}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.10-2.07(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.83(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.42-1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.18-1.09$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.60-0.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.46-0.39(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{ClN}_{7} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+$ $H)^{+}$: 462.2020; found 462.2021.
(1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-N-(3-Aminopropyl)-4-(2-chloro-6-((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,3-dihydroxybicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1-carboxamide (32): Compound 32 ( $64 \%$ ) was prepared from compound 29 following the method for compound $\mathbf{3 1} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.04(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.13(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.03(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.47-3.38(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.82(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.06-2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.84-1.65(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 1.40-1.36 (m, 1H), 1.16-1.09 (m, 2H), 0.60-0.55 (m, 2H), 0.46-0.39 (m, 6H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{ClN}_{7} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 476.2177$; found 476.2172 .

## (1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-N-(2-Acetamidoethyl)-4-(2-chloro-6-

((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,3-dihydroxybicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1-
carboxamide (33): Triethylamine ( $3.2 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.011 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to a solution of compound 31 ( $3.61 \mathrm{mg}, 0.007 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and acetic acid $N$-hydroxysuccinimide ester ( 1.77 mg , 0.011 mmol ) in DMF ( 1 mL ) and the mixture stirred at room temperature overnight. Solvent was evaporated, and the residue was purified on flash silica gel column chromatography $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}: \mathrm{MeOH}=15: 1\right)$ to give compound $33(2.3 \mathrm{mg}, 59 \%)$ as a syrup. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right.$, $400 \mathrm{MHz}) \delta 8.06(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.81(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.42-3.38(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.36-3.32(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.06(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.95(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.83(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$,
$1 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.17-1.09(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.60-0.56(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.55-0.44(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{ClN}_{7} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 504.2116 ; found 504.2126 .
(1S,2R,3S,4R,5S)-N-(3-Acetamidopropyl)-4-(2-chloro-6-
((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,3-dihydroxybicyclo[3.1.0]hexane-1carboxamide (34): Compound 34 (58\%) was prepared from compound $\mathbf{3 2}$ following the method for compound 33. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.09(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.27-3.23(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.06(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.96(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.84(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76(\mathrm{t}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.41-1.37(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 1.18-1.09 (m, 2H), 0.60-0.55 (m, 2H), 0.47-0.39 (m, 6H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{ClN}_{7} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 518.2283$; found 518.2289.

9-((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-3b-(((tert-Butyldiphenylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethylhexahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-5-yl)-2,6-dichloro-9Hpurine (54): DIAD ( $0.17 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.89 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to a solution of 2,6-dichloropurine $(170 \mathrm{mg}, 0.89 \mathrm{mmol})$ and triphenylphosphine ( $235 \mathrm{mg}, 0.89 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF $(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and the mixture was stirred for 20 min at room temperature. A solution of compound $\mathbf{5 3}$ ( $197 \mathrm{mg}, 0.49 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 2 mL ) was added into the reaction mixture and the mixture stirred overnight at room temperature. Solvent was evaporated, and the residue was purified on flash silica gel column chromatography (hexane:ethyl acetate=5:1) to give compound $\mathbf{5 4}$ $(189 \mathrm{mg}, 69 \%)$ as colorless foamy powder. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.42(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.63-7.61(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.42-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 5.28(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.09(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2$ Hz, 1H), 4.29 (d, $J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.59-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.55(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 1.25(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.17-1.15(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.11(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.07-1.04(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{SiN}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 609.1856; found 609.1857.

## 9-((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-3b-(((tert-Butyldiphenylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-

 dimethylhexahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-5-yl)-2-chloro- $N$ -(dicyclopropylmethyl)-9H-purin-6-amine (55): 2,2-Dicyclopropyl-methylamine ( 80 mg , $0.54 \mathrm{mmol})$ and triethylamine $(0.25 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added to a solution of compound $54(110,0.18 \mathrm{mmol})$ in methanol $(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the mixture stirred at room temperature overnight. The reaction mixture was evaporated under vacuum, and the residue was purified on flash column chromatography (hexane:ethyl acetate $=4: 1$ ) to give the desired product 55 $(105 \mathrm{mg}, 85 \%)$ as a syrup. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.06(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.66-7.62(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $7.44-7.33(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 5.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.02(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.30(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.63-3.60(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.61-1.58(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.54(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.29-1.25(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.08$ $(\mathrm{s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.07-1.03(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.98-0.94(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.60-0.44(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{38} \mathrm{H}_{47} \mathrm{ClSiN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 684.3131; found 684.3132 .9-((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-3b-(((tert-Butyldiphenylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2dimethylhexahydrocyclopropa $[3,4]$ cyclopenta $[1,2-d][1,3]$ dioxol-5-yl)-2-chloro- $N$ -(pentan-3-yl)-9H-purin-6-amine (56): Compound 56 (81\%) was prepared from compound 54 following the method for compound 55. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.26(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 7.66-7.64 (m, 4H), 7.43-7.31 (m, 6H), 5.35 (d, $J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.76(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.76-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.56$
$(\mathrm{m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.14-1.11(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.09(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}), 1.02-0.95(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H})$.
HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{47} \mathrm{ClSiN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 660.3137$; found 660.3135 .

9-((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-3b-(((tert-Butyldiphenylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-
dimethylhexahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-5-yl)-2-chloro- N -((1R)-cyclopropylpropyl)-9H-purin-6-amine (57): Compound 57 (83\%) was prepared from compound 54 following the method for compound $55 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.25$ $(\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.65-7.63(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.44-7.33(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 5.34(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.69(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.90-1.72(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.61-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.13-1.10(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~s}$, $9 H), 1.06-1.02(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.98-0.95(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.63-0.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.48-0.40(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.37-0.32$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{37} \mathrm{H}_{47} \mathrm{ClSiN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 672.3137; found 672.3127.

9-((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-3b-(((tert-Butyldiphenylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethylhexahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-5-yl)-2-chloro-N-((1S)-cyclopropylpropyl)-9H-purin-6-amine (58): Compound 58 (82\%) was prepared from compound $\mathbf{5 4}$ following the method for compound $55 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.25$ (s, 1H), 7.66-7.64 (m, 4H), 7.43-7.33 (m, 6H), $5.34(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.68(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.88-1.72(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.13-1.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08(\mathrm{~s}$, $9 H), 1.04-1.00(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.95(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.62-0.57(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.48-0.44(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.38-0.35$ $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{37} \mathrm{H}_{47} \mathrm{ClSiN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 672.3137; found 672.3136.

9-((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-3b-(((tert-Butyldiphenylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethylhexahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-5-yl)-2-chloro- $N$-((1R)-cyclopropyl-2-methylpropyl)-9H-purin-6-amine (59): Compound 59 (81\%) was prepared from compound 54 following the method for compound $55 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta$ 8.26 (s, 1H), 7.66-7.64 (m, 4H), 7.42-7.31 (m, 6H), 5.33 (d, $J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.94$ (s, 1H), 4.71 (d, $J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.64(\mathrm{t}, J=6.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.59(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.16-1.02(\mathrm{~m}$, $16 \mathrm{H}), 1.01-0.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.66-0.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.46-0.37(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{38} \mathrm{H}_{49} \mathrm{ClSiN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 686.3293$; found 686.3293 .

> 9-((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-3b-(((tert-Butyldiphenylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethylhexahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-5-yl)-2-chloro-N-((1S)-cyclopropyl-2-methylpropyl)-9H-purin-6-amine (60): Compound 60 ( $81 \%$ ) was prepared from compound 54 following the method for compound 56. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta$ 8.27 (s, 1H), 7.66-7.64 (m, 4H), 7.43-7.32 (m, 6H), 5.34 (d, $J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.74(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.64(\mathrm{t}, J=6.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.11-2.02(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.63-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.15-1.05(\mathrm{~m}$, 16 H ), 0.99-0.93 (m, 2H), 0.67-0.63 (m, 1H), 0.46-0.40 (m, 3H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{38} \mathrm{H}_{49} \mathrm{ClSiN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 686.3293$; found 686.3298 .
cyclobutyl(cyclopropyl)methyl)-9H-purin-6-amine (61): Compound 61 (78\%) was prepared from compound $\mathbf{5 4}$ following the method for compound $55 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right.$, $400 \mathrm{MHz}) \delta 8.25(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.66-7.64(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.43-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 5.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.87$ (br s, 1H), 3.77 (d, $J=$ $10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.73-2.69(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.17-2.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.01-1.84(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.61-1.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.14-1.07(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.59-0.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 0.38-0.37 (m, 3H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{39} \mathrm{H}_{49} \mathrm{ClSiN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 698.3293; found 698.3303 .

9-((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-3b-(((tert-Butyldiphenylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2dimethylhexahydrocyclopropa $[3,4]$ cyclopenta $[1,2-d][1,3]$ dioxol-5-yl)-2-chloro- $N$-((R)-cyclobutyl(cyclopropyl)methyl)-9H-purin-6-amine (62): Compound 62 (79\%) was prepared from compound 54 following the method for compound $55 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right.$, $400 \mathrm{MHz}) \delta 8.25(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.66-7.64(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.45-7.31(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 5.34(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.86(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $10.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.72-2.68(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-2.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.99-1.84(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.16-1.04(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.57-0.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 0.39-0.37 (m, 3H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{39} \mathrm{H}_{49} \mathrm{ClSiN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 698.3293; found 698.3281 .

9-((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-3b-(((tert-Butyldiphenylsilyl)oxy)methyl)-2,2-dimethylhexahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-5-yl)-2-chloro- $N, N$ -dimethyl-9H-purin-6-amine (63): Compound 63 (84\%) was prepared from compound 54 following the method for compound $55 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.11(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.66-7.62(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.41-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 5.32(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.91(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.17(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.58-1.52$ (m, $4 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.11-1.06(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.95(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{33} \mathrm{H}_{41} \mathrm{ClSiN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}:$618.2667; found 618.2675.

((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-5-(2-Chloro-6-(pentan-3-ylamino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,2dimethyltetrahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta $[1,2-d][1,3]$ dioxol-3b(3aH)-yl)methanol (65): TBAF ( $0.08 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{M}$ solution in THF) was added to a solution of compound 56 (39 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.06 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 2 mL ) and the mixture stirred for 1 h at room temperature. Solvent was evaporated under vacuum, and the residue was purified on flash silica gel column chromatography (hexane:ethyl acetate $=1: 1$ ) to give compound $\mathbf{6 5}(16.8 \mathrm{mg}, 68 \%)$ as a colorless syrup. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.37(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.95$ $(\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.21-4.19(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.68(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.62-1.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.15(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.00-0.93(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 422.1959; found 422.1954.

## ((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-5-(2-Chloro-6-(((1R)-cyclopropylpropyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,2-dimethyltetrahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxol-3b(3aH)-

 yl)methanol (66): Compound $\mathbf{6 6}(78 \%)$ was prepared from compound 57 following the method for compound $\mathbf{6 5}$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.39(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$,$1 \mathrm{H}), 4.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.67-3.65(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.81(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.77-1.68(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.15(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.04-0.97(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 0.61-0.56(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.47-0.40(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.36-0.33$ (m, 1H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 434.1959; found 434.1962.
((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-5-(2-Chloro-6-(((1S)-cyclopropylpropyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,2-dimethyltetrahydrocyclopropa $[3,4]$ cyclopenta $[1,2-d][1,3]$ dioxol-3b(3aH)yl)methanol (67): Compound 67 (79\%) was prepared from compound 58 following the method for compound $65 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.39(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.67-3.65(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.88-1.81(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.75-1.68(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.14(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.03-0.95(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 0.62-0.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.44-0.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.36-0.33$ (m, 1H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 434.1959; found 434.1952.

## ((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-5-(2-Chloro-6-(((1R)-cyclopropyl-2-methylpropyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,2-dimethyltetrahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d]

[1,3]dioxol-3b $(3 a H)$-yl)methanol (68): Compound $68(80 \%)$ was prepared from compound 59 following the method for compound 65. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.39(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 3.62-3.59 (m, 2H), 2.08-2.02 (m, 1H), 1.72-1.68 (m, 1H), 1.52 (s, 3H), $1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.15(\mathrm{t}$, $J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08-1.03(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.97(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.65-0.62(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.43-0.36(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 448.2115 ; found 448.2112 .
((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-5-(2-Chloro-6-(((1S)-cyclopropyl-2-methylpropyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,2-dimethyltetrahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d]
[1,3]dioxol-3b(3aH)-yl)methanol (69): Compound 69 ( $79 \%$ ) was prepared from compound 60 following the method for compound 65. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.38(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 3.62-3.59 (m, 2H), 2.08-2.03 (m, 1H), 1.72-1.68 (m, 1H), 1.52 (s, 3H), $1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.14(\mathrm{t}$, $J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.08-1.04(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.95(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.66-0.61(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.42-0.36(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 448.2115 ; found 448.2115 .
((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-5-(2-Chloro-6-(((S)-cyclobutyl(cyclopropyl)methyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,2-dimethyltetrahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d]
[1,3]dioxol-3b(3aH)-yl)methanol (70): Compound 70 (77\%) was prepared from compound 61 following the method for compound $65 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.39(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.68(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 3.86-3.82 (m, 1H), 3.62 (d, $J=11.6, \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.71-2.63(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-2.09(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.02-1.86 (m, 3H), 1.83-1.80 (m, 1H), 1.73-1.68 (m, 1H), $1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.15(\mathrm{t}$, $J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.86(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.58-0.53(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.40-0.36(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 460.2115 ; found 460.2109 .
((3aR,3bR,4aS,5R,5aS)-5-(2-Chloro-6-(((R)-cyclobutyl(cyclopropyl)methyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,2-dimethyltetrahydrocyclopropa $[3,4]$ cyclopenta $[1,2-d]$
$[1,3]$ dioxol-3b(3aH)-yl)methanol (71): Compound 71 (78\%) was prepared from compound

62 following the method for compound 65. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.21(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $5.39(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.87-3.84(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.6, \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.71-2.67(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.12-2.09(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $2.02-1.87(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.80(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.71-1.68(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.52(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.15(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.99-0.86(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.58-0.53(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 0.40-0.36(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 460.2115; found 460.2107.

## Ethyl (3aR,3bS,4aS,5R,5aS)-5-(2-chloro-6-((dicyclopropylmethyl)amino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,2-dimethyltetrahydrocyclopropa $[3,4]$ cyclopenta $[1,2-d][1,3]$ dioxole-3b(3aH)-

 carboxylate (76): 2,2-Dicyclopropyl-methylamine ( $244 \mathrm{mg}, 1.94 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and triethylamine ( $0.53 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.9 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added to a solution of compound $75(161,0.39 \mathrm{mmol})$ in methanol ( 5 mL ) and the mixture stirred at room temperature overnight. The reaction mixture was evaporated under vacuum, and the residue was purified on flash column chromatography (hexane:ethyl acetate $=3: 1$ ) to give the desired product $76(166 \mathrm{mg}, 87 \%)$ as a syrup. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 8.03(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.96(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.28-4.18(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.45(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.27-2.23(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 1.68-1.64 (m, 1H), 1.54-1.51 (m, 4H), $1.33(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.17-1.10(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 0.60-0.54(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.46-0.38(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$. HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}$: 488.2065; found 488.2065.Ethyl (3aR,3bS,4aS,5R,5aS)-5-(2-chloro-6-(dimethylamino)-9H-purin-9-yl)-2,2-dimethyltetrahydrocyclopropa[3,4]cyclopenta[1,2-d][1,3]dioxole-3b(3aH)-carboxylate (77): Compound 77 ( $85 \%$ ) was prepared from compound 75 following the method for compound 76. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta 7.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.87(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.94$ $(\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.83(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.28-4.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.25-2.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 1.67-1.63 (m, 1H), 1.53-1.55 (m, 4H), 1.34 (t, $J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ), 1.29 (s, 3H). HRMS calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{ClN}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{4}(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H})^{+}: 422.1595$; found 422.1591.

## Binding to ARs, $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ and to other diverse sites

Binding assays at ARs was performed as described. ${ }^{15,25} \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ determinations using 96-well plates and binding profiles in a broad screen of receptors and channels were generously provided by the National Institute of Mental Health's Psychoactive Drug Screening Program, Contract \# HHSN-271-2008-00025-C (NIMH PDSP). The NIMH PDSP is Directed by Bryan L. Roth MD, PhD at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Project Officer Jamie Driscol at NIMH, Bethesda MD, USA. For experimental details please refer to the PDSP web site http://pdsp.med.unc.edu/ and click on "Binding Assay" or "Functional Assay" on the menu bar. The cell line used for preparing membranes for $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{R}$ binding is transiently transfected HEKT cells, grown in DMEM medium containing $10 \%$ serum. Stable HEK cells were used for preparing membranes for $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ binding and grown in medium containing $2 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ Puromycin. Flp-In HEK cells were used for preparing membranes for $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ binding and grown in DMEM medium containing $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ Hygromycin B. Radioligands used and their measured $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{R}$ affinities from saturation experiments are given in Table 1. The binding buffer consisted of 50 mM Tris. $\mathrm{HCl}, 10 \mathrm{mM}$ $\mathrm{MgCl}_{2}, 0.1 \mathrm{mM}$ EDTA at pH 7.4 and at RT, and the wash buffer was cold 50 mM Tris. HCl at pH 7.4. Nonspecific binding was determined as noted in Table 1. Untransfected HEK-293
cells do not express specific $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right] \mathbf{4 3}$ binding. ${ }^{54}$ Where we use a nonspecific radioligand, $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right] 43$, and an antagonist of broad specificity ( $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ clozapine for $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~A}}$ ) to define nonspecific binding, only the receptor of interest is detected as specific binding because it is overexpressed in HEK cells. Although only a single 5HT receptor was overexpressed in the HEK cells, it is possible that $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right] 43$ binds to endogenous serotonin or non-serotonin receptors with affinities within the nanomolar range in these cells. Results were analyzed in Prism 5.0 by nonlinear least-squares regression to obtain $K_{i}$ values. Statistical significance of the difference was assessed using unpaired t-test or One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) followed by post-hoc test where appropriate.

## Functional assays at $\mathbf{5 H} \mathbf{T}_{2} \mathbf{R s}$

In functional assays, the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{R}, 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ were expressed in Flp-In HEK cells. Cells were plated into poly-L-lysine coated 96-well black clear bottom cell culture plates with DMEM supplemented with $1 \%$ dialyzed FBS and cultured overnight before assays. Activity an agonist or antagonist (using 5-HT as reference agonist at the $\mathrm{EC}_{80}$ ) was determined in calcium mobilization experiments using a FLIPR ${ }^{\text {TETRA }}$ (Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale, CA). Plates were loaded with the Fluo-4 Direct Calcium dye (prepared in 20 mM HEPES, $1 \times$ HBSS, 2.5 mM Probenecid, pH 7.4 ) and incubated for 60 min at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, followed by a 10 min incubation at room temperature in the dark. The FLIPR then collected 10 readings ( 1 read per second) first as a baseline before addition of solutions of the test compound. For agonist activity, the fluorescence intensity was recorded for 2 min after test compound addition. To measure antagonist activity, test compound stocks were prepared at $4 \times$ of the final concentration and added as above for potential effects on basal levels for 2 min first, followed by a 5 to 10 min incubation before addition of reference agonist 5 - HT at a final concentration equivalent to the $\mathrm{EC}_{80}$ to measure remaining agonist activity.

Maximal fluorescence intensity (RFU) was recorded within a min after drug addition. $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values obtained were converted to $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values using the Cheng-Prusoff equation. ${ }^{53}$ The FLIPR calcium assay does not differentiate between inverse agonist and neutral antagonist activity. In control HEK293 cells, there was no endogenous response to 5-HT, using either calcium transients in functional assays or specific radioligand binding assays (results not shown). Comparison between experimental curves was performed using F-test ( $P<0.05$ was considered as statistically significant).

## Preclinical testing

Parameters in Table 2 were determined by GVK BIO Sciences Pvt Ltd Hyderabad, India.

## Molecular Modeling

Computational facilities-Ligand geometry optimization, homology modeling and molecular docking simulations were carried out using a 6 Intel® Xeon® E5-1650 v3 CPU workstation. Membrane MD simulations were run in part on an in-house cluster composed of two NVIDIA® 970 GTX and one NVIDIA® 980Ti GTX, and in part by exploiting the computational resources (four NVIDIA® Tesla® K20X) of the NIH HPC Biowulf cluster (http://biowulf.nih.gov).

Ligand Preparation-Selected compounds were built using Maestro ${ }^{55}$ and subjected to gas phase geometry optimization with the Jaguar 8.9 quantum chemistry package ${ }^{56}$ using density functional theory (DFT) with the B3LYP hybrid functional and the 6-31G** basis set. Frequency calculations were performed to ensure the structures represented minima on the potential energy surfaces.

Homology modeling-The $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ homology model was built upon the X-ray structure of the ERG-h5 $\mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ complex. ${ }^{11}$ The template structure was retrieved from the RCSB PDB database ${ }^{57}$ (http://www.rcsb.org, PDB ID: 4IB4), and the amino acid sequence of the target receptor was retrieved from the Universal Protein Resource ${ }^{58}$ (UniProt IDs: P41595). The template was pre-processed as follows: after manual removal of the apocytochrome $\mathrm{b}_{562}$ RIL (BRIL) fusion protein and co-crystallized ligand, water, and lipid molecules, ionization states of protein sidechains and hydrogen positions were assigned with the Protein Preparazion Wizard tool. ${ }^{59}$ Prime $4.1^{60}$ was used to build homology models (ClustalW alignment method and knowledge-based building method) and to reconstruct and refine missing loop domains except IL3 (Serial loop sampling, default level of accuracy). Nterminal and C-terminal portions were not modeled if their lengths exceeded those of the template. The C - and N -termini of the protein and the boundaries of missing IL3 were capped with acetyl and methylamino groups, respectively.

Induced Fit Docking-Compound $\mathbf{2 3}$ was docked to the homology model by means of the IFD procedure based on Glide search algorithm ${ }^{61}$ using the Standard Protocol (SP) and OPLS3 force field. ${ }^{62}$ The centroid of Asp ${ }^{3.33}$ residue was selected as center of the Glide grid (inner box side $=10 \AA$; outer box side = auto). The ligand was initially docked rigidly into the receptor by applying a scaling factor of 0.5 to both ligand and protein van der Waals (vdW) radii. Up to 20 poses were collected, and the sidechains of residues within $5 \AA$ of the ligand were refined with Prime. ${ }^{60}$ The ligand were re-docked into the newly generated receptor conformations with Glide ${ }^{61}$ by generating up to 10 poses using the SP scoring function and reverting the vdW radii scaling factors to their default values.

Molecular dynamics-The best obtained docking pose of $\mathbf{2 3}$ and the homology model of the apo receptor were subjected to 30 ns of membrane MD simulations. The structures were embedded in a 1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (POPC) lipid bilayer ( $80 \times 80 \AA$ wide, generated through the $\mathrm{VMD}^{63}$ Membrane Plugin tool) according to the orientation suggested by the "Orientations of Proteins in Membranes (OPM)" server. ${ }^{64}$ Overlapping lipids (within $0.6 \AA$ ) were removed upon protein insertion and the systems were solvated with TIP3P ${ }^{65}$ water and neutralized by $\mathrm{Na}^{+} / \mathrm{Cl}^{-}$counter-ions (final concentration $0.154 \mathrm{M})$. MD simulations with periodic boundaries conditions were carried out with the ACEMD program ${ }^{66}$ using the CHARMM36 ${ }^{67,68 / C G e n F F}(3.0 .1)^{69,70}$ force fields for lipid and protein, and ligand atoms, respectively. Ligand parameters were obtained by analogy through the ParamChem service with no further optimization. After parameters validation, constrains were applied to the dihedral angles of the ( N )-methanocarba ring to avoid unfeasible south ring puckering. The systems were equilibrated through a stepwise procedure: in the first stage, after 2500 cycles of conjugate-gradient minimization aimed at reducing steric clashes arising from the manual setup of the system, 10 ns of MD simulation
were performed in the NPT ensemble, restraining protein (and ligand) atoms by a force constant of $1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol} \cdot \AA^{2}$. In the second stage, once water molecules diffused inside the protein cavity and the lipid bilayer reached equilibrium, the constraints on the ligand atoms were maintained whereas those on protein atoms were removed except for alpha carbon atoms (force constant $=0.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol} \cdot \AA^{2}$ ) for other 10 ns . During the equilibration procedure, the temperature was maintained at 310 K using a Langevin thermostat with a low damping constant of $1 \mathrm{ps}^{-1}$, and the pressure was maintained at 1 atm using a Berendensen barostat. Bond lengths involving hydrogen atoms were constrained using the M-SHAKE ${ }^{71}$ algorithm with an integration timestep of 2 fs . The equilibrated systems were then subjected to 30 ns of unrestrained MD simulations (NVT ensemble, damping constant of $0.1 \mathrm{ps}^{-1}$ ). Long-range Coulomb interactions were handled using the particle mesh Ewald summation method (PME) ${ }^{72}$ with grid size rounded to the approximate integer value of cell wall dimensions. A non-bonded cutoff distance of $9 \AA$ with a switching distance of $7.5 \AA$ was used. The biophysical validity of the membrane-protein systems was assessed by measuring the average area per lipid headgroup (APL, Table S3) using Grid-MAT-MD. ${ }^{73}$ The simulation on the $23-\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ were run in triplicate and selection of a representative trajectory was based upon the cumulative total Ligand-Protein interaction energy ( $\mathrm{IE}_{\text {tot }}$ ) expressed as the sum of van der Waals $\left(\mathrm{IE}_{\mathrm{vdW}}\right)$ and electrostatic ( $\mathrm{IE}_{\text {ele }}$ ) contribution and computed at frames extracted every 50 ps with the mdenergy function implemented in $\mathrm{VMD}^{60}$ exploiting NAMD 2.10. ${ }^{74}$ From the $\mathrm{IE}_{\text {tot }}$ values so obtained, we computed the cumulative sum of ligand-protein $\mathrm{IE}_{\text {tot }}$ (hereby denoted as "dynamic scoring function", $\mathrm{DSF}_{\text {tot }}$ ) as follows:

$$
D S F_{\mathrm{tot}}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} I E_{\mathrm{tot}}
$$

and derived the slope values by fitting a linear function as previously reported. ${ }^{75}$ The replica that returned the highest absolute slope value (Supporting Information, Table S1) was selected. IE versus simulation time graphs were generated with Gnuplot. ${ }^{76}$

Docking of compounds 14, 25, 26, 27 and 35—The selected compounds were docked to the final $23-\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{MD}$ refined structure including all the selected water molecules ( $w 1-$ ${ }_{W} 9$ ) with Glide ${ }^{61}$ by generating up to 5 poses using both the SP and XP scoring functions. The centroid of $\mathbf{2 3}$ was selected as center of the Glide grid (inner box side $=10 \AA$; outer box side $=30 \AA$ ).

## Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.
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#### Abstract

Abbreviations AR adenosine receptor cAMP adenosine $3^{\prime}, 5^{\prime}$-cyclic monophosphate CHO Chinese hamster ovary CNS central nervous system

CYP cytochrome P450 DMEM Dulbecco's modified Eagle medium DMF $\quad N, N$-dimethylformamide EL extracellular loop GPCR G protein-coupled receptor HEPES 2-[4-(2-hydroxyethyl)piperazin-1-yl]ethanesulfonic acid HEK human embryonic kidney HRMS high resolution mass spectroscopy 5HT 5-hydroxytryptamine IFD induced fit docking NMR nuclear magnetic resonance PBS phosphate buffered saline PDSP Psychoactive Drug Screening Program RFU relative fluorescence unit SAR structure-affinity relationship TBAP tetrabutylammonium dihydrogenphosphate TEA triethylamine TM transmembrane helix tPSA total polar surface area TSPO translocator protein MW molecular weight
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Figure 1.
Representative binding curves at the (A) $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and (B) $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ for compound 25 (black curves), in comparison to reference compounds (red curves): (A) 3,5-dihydro-5-methyl- N -3-pyridinylbenzo[1,2-b:4,5- $b^{\prime}$ ]dipyrrole-1(2H)-carboxamide (49, SB206553) and (B) 6-[2-[4-[bis(4-fluorophenyl)methylene]-1-piperidinyl]ethyl]-7-methyl-5H-thiazolo[3,2-a]pyrimidin-5-one ( $\mathbf{5 0}$, ritanserin). Radioligands used were: $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$, binding with $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$ lysergic acid diethylamide $\mathbf{4 3} ; 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$, binding with $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$ mesulergine 44.
Representative functional assays at the (C) $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and (D) $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ for compounds $\mathbf{2 3}, \mathbf{2 5}$
and 26, in comparison to reference compound 5-HT applied to desensitize the response. 5HT ( $3 \mathrm{nM}, \mathrm{EC}_{80}$ ) was used as an agonist in both C and D. Compound $26(10 \mu \mathrm{M})$ did not display significant agonist or antagonist activity (>10\%) at the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{R}$ or agonist activity at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ or $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ (data not shown). RFU, relative fluorescence units. Mean $\pm$ s.e.m. is shown ( $\mathrm{n}=3$ ). The curves for all compounds were best fit using a monophasic isotherm with a variable Hill slope (F-test, $P<0.05$ was considered as statistically significant).


Figure 2.
Representative functional assays at the (A, B) $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 A} \mathrm{R}$, (C, D) $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ and (D, E) $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R}$ for compound $\mathbf{1 4}$, in comparison to reference compound $5-\mathrm{HT}$ applied to desensitize the response. 5-HT ( $3 \mathrm{nM}, \mathrm{EC}_{80}$ ) was used as agonist in $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{D}$ and F . RFU, relative fluorescence units.


Figure 3.
Hypothetical binding modes predicted by IFD (A) and following MD (B) simulation of $N^{6}$ dicyclopropylmethyl $5^{\prime}$-methylamide ( $N$ )-methanocarba derivative 23 (cyan carbon atoms, sticks representation) at the h5 $\mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$. Side chains of residues important for ligand recognition (grey carbon atoms) and water molecules (highlighted with different colors according to the ligand moiety they interact with) are reported as sticks. Residues establishing hydrophobic contacts with the ligand are depicted also as transparent surfaces. $H$-bonds and $\pi-\pi$ stacking interactions are pictured as dashed yellow and cyan lines,
respectively. Nonpolar hydrogen atoms are omitted. Helices are shown as ribbon structures numbered (from right to left) in A, TMs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, and in B, TMs 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.


Figure 4.
Hypothetical binding mode predicted by rigid docking at the $\mathrm{h} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ (including all water molecules) for $N^{6}$-dicyclopropylmethyl ( $N$ )-methanocarba derivatives bearing different $5^{\prime}$ groups: A) $\mathbf{1 4}$ (5'-hydroxy, orange carbon atoms); B) $\mathbf{2 5}$ ( $5^{\prime}$-methyl ester, green carbon atoms); C) $\mathbf{2 6}$ (5'-ethyl ester, yellow carbon atoms, two alternative binding modes are reported); and D) $\mathbf{2 7}$ ( $5^{\prime}$-propyl ester, pink carbon atoms). Side chains of residues important for ligand recognition (grey carbon atoms) and water molecules (highlighted with different colors according to the ligand moiety they interact with) are represented as sticks. Residues establishing hydrophobic contacts with the ligand are also depicted as transparent surfaces. $H$-bonds and $\pi-\pi$ stacking interactions are pictured as dashed yellow and cyan lines, respectively. Nonpolar hydrogen atoms, the sidechain of Asn $344^{6.55}$ and $w 8$ and ${ }_{w} 9$ are omitted to aid visualization. mitted to aid visualization.

[^1]

## Scheme 2.

Synthesis of $N^{6}$-alkyl-(N)-methanocarba-adenosine ( $4^{\prime}$-carbonyl) derivatives. Reagents and Condition: (a) 2,6-dichloropurine, $\mathrm{Ph}_{3} \mathrm{P}$, DIAD, THF, rt; (b) $\mathrm{RNH}_{2}, \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{MeOH}$, rt, 85$87 \%$; (c) Dowex50, MeOH-H2O, rt, 86-88\%; (d) $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}, \mathrm{MeOH}, \mathrm{rt}, 76-77 \%$; (e) $40 \%$ $\mathrm{MeNH}_{2}, \mathrm{MeOH}, \mathrm{rt}, 65-67 \%$; (f) $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~N}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{NH}_{2}, \mathrm{MeOH}, \mathrm{rt}, 63-64 \%$; (g) 2,5-dioxo-2,5-dihydro- $1 H$-pyrrol-1-yl acetate, $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$, DMF, rt, 58-59\%; (h) ROH, DMAP, DCC, DMF, rt.


Chart 1.
Adenine (1, 2), nucleoside (10) and (N)-methanocarba nucleoside (3, 4, 31) derivatives that were previously reported to interact with the $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R}$ (binding $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values are shown in italics). ${ }^{9}$
Table 1
Structures and binding affinities of nucleoside derivatives at $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{Rs}$ and at $\mathrm{A}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{A}_{3} \mathrm{ARs}$, including newly synthesized (14-34, 42) derivatives and
previously reported (1-13, 35-41) nucleosides. $\mathrm{R}^{3}=\mathrm{NHCH}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{N}$, unless noted. Human (h) ARs, unless noted ( $r=$ rat).
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|  |  |  |  |  | $N_{R^{2}}$ <br> 42 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | R ${ }^{1}$ | $\mathbf{R}^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{R} \\ \% \\ \text { inhibition } \\ \text { or } \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} \\ (\mu \mathrm{M})^{a} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{~B}} \mathrm{R} \\ \% \\ \text { inhibition } \\ \text { or } \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} \\ (\mu \mathrm{M})^{a} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \mathrm{HT}_{2 \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{R} \\ \mathbf{\%}^{2} \\ \text { inhibition } \\ \text { or } \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} \\ (\mu \mathrm{M})^{a} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{AR}, \\ \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { inhibition } \\ \text { or } \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} \\ (\mu \mathrm{M})^{b} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A}_{2 \mathrm{~A}} \mathrm{AR}, \\ \% \\ \text { inhibition } \\ \text { or } \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} \\ (\mu \mathrm{M})^{b} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{A}_{3} \mathrm{AR}, \\ \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { inhibition } \\ \text { or } \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}} \\ (\mu \mathrm{M})^{b} \end{gathered}$ |
| $39^{\text {c }}$ | $\mathrm{NHCH}_{3}$ |  | 19\% | <10\% | 30\% | <10\% | 24\% | 0.00070 |
| $40^{c}$ | $\mathrm{NHC}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ |  | <10\% | 13\% | 38\% | 28\% | 12\% | 0.0038 |
| $\stackrel{41^{c}}{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{C H}}$ | $\mathrm{NHC}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ |  | 47\% | $\begin{gathered} 2.21 \pm \\ 0.30 \end{gathered}$ | <10\% | 10\% | <10\% | 0.0017 |
| 42 | $\mathrm{N}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{2}$ |  | 27\% | <10\% | $8.5{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 25 5 \% | 15士8\% | $\begin{gathered} 0.0235 \pm \\ 0.0106 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Binding in membranes prepared from cells stably expressing one of three $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2}$ receptors: $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{AR}$, HEKT cells, binding with $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$ ketanserin $\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}} 1.57 \mathrm{nM}\right)$; $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{BR}$, stable HEK cells, binding with [ ${ }^{3} \mathrm{H}$ ]lysergic acid diethylamide $\mathbf{4 3}\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}} 1.04 \mathrm{nM}\right)$; $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{CR}$, Flp IN HEK cells, binding with $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right]$ mesulergine $\mathbf{4 4}\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}} 2.92 \mathrm{nM}\right)$. Values are expressed as the mean $\pm$ SEM. A percent in italics refers to inhibition of binding at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$. Nonspecific binding was determined using $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ clozapine ( $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{AR}$ ), $\mathbf{4 9}\left(5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{BR}\right)$ or $\mathbf{5 0}\left(5 \mathrm{HT}_{2} \mathrm{CR}\right)$. $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values were calculated as reported. ${ }^{41} \mathrm{All}$ of the compounds displayed $<50 \%$ inhibition at the human $5 \mathrm{HT}_{1 \mathrm{~A}}, 5 \mathrm{HT}_{1 \mathrm{~B}}, 5 \mathrm{HT}_{1 \mathrm{D}}, 5 \mathrm{HT}_{1 \mathrm{E}}, 5 \mathrm{HT}_{3}$ and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{5} \mathrm{ARs}$, unless noted. Compound $\mathbf{3}$ bound weakly at human $5 \mathrm{HT}_{3}$ and compound $\mathbf{3 0}$ bound weakly at the human $5 \mathrm{HT}_{5} \mathrm{AR}$ (Supporting Information).

Id!̣こsnuew גOYın $\forall$
${ }^{b}$ Affinity at the A1 AR (binding with $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right] N^{6}$-phenylisopropyladenosine 45 ) and A3AR (binding with [ $\left.{ }^{125}{ }^{\mathrm{I}}\right] N^{6}$-(4-amino-3-iodobenzyl)adenosine-5' $-N$-methyluronamide 46 ) determined as reported, 22,24 unless noted. Selected compounds were tested for binding inhibition ( $\left[{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}\right] 2$ - $[\mathrm{p} \text {-( } 2 \text {-carboxyethyl)phenyl-ethylamino }]^{\prime} 5^{\prime}-N$-ethylcarboxamidoadenosine 47 ) at hA 2 AAR in HEK 293 cell membranes. The binding affinity was expressed as $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values ( $\mathrm{n}=2-4$, unless noted). A percent in italics refers to inhibition of binding at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$. Nonspecific AR binding was determined using adenosine-5' $-N$ ethyluronamide $\mathbf{4 8}(10 \mu \mathrm{M})$. Values are expressed as the mean $\pm \mathrm{SEM} . \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{i}}$ values were calculated as reported. 53
${ }^{c}$ Archival data at ARs and $5 \mathrm{HT}_{2}$ Rs, as reported. $22,24-27$ $d_{\mathrm{n}=1}$
ND - not determined.

Table 2
In vitro stability parameters for $5^{\prime}$-methylamide 23 and $5^{\prime}$-methyl ester 25. ${ }^{a}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underline{\mathrm{R}^{3}=\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{NH} 23} \\
& =\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{O} 25 \\
& { }^{a} \text { Procedures were described in Supporting Information and in Tosh et al. and Carlin et al. } 22,77
\end{aligned}
$$

> (average of $\mathrm{n}=2$ ).
> ${ }^{d}{ }_{\text {CLint }}$ values ( $\mu \mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min} / \mathrm{mg}$ protein) in human liver microsomes: 23, 1.75; 25, 0.77.


[^0]:    Address correspondence to: Dr. Kenneth A. Jacobson, Laboratory of Bioorganic Chemistry, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892-0810 USA. Phone: 301-496-9024. Fax: 301-496-8422.
    kajacobs@helix.nih.gov.
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    ## Supporting Information Available:

    NMR and mass spectra of selected synthesized compounds, results of PDSP screening, MD trajectory Video, additional modeling Figures S1, S2 and S3, Table S1, S2 and S3, 3D coordinates of the starting docking and MD-refined 23-h5HT2BR complexes, Figure S4 (affinity correlation plot), Figures S5 and S6 (biological data), in vitro ADME measurements. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

[^1]:    
    

    55, 64, 14; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=$ dicyclopropylCH
    56, 65, 15; $R^{1}=H, R^{2}=$ diethylCH
    57, 66, 16; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=(R)$-cyclopropylethylCH
    58, 67, 17; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=(S)$-cyclopropylethylCH
    $59,68,18 ; \mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=(R)$-cyclopropylisopropylCH

    60, 69, 19; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=(S)$-cyclopropylisopropylCH 61, 70, 20; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=(S)$-cyclopropylcyclobutyICH
    62, 71, 21; $\mathrm{R}^{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}^{2}=(R)$-cyclopropylcyclobutyICH 63, 72, 22; $R^{1}=\mathrm{Me}, R^{2}=\mathrm{Me}$

    ## Scheme 1.

    Synthesis of $N^{6}$-alkyl-(N)-methanocarba-adenosine ( $5^{\prime}-\mathrm{OH}$ ) derivatives. Reagents: (a) 2,6dichloropurine, $\mathrm{Ph}_{3} \mathrm{P}$, DIAD, THF, rt, $69 \%$; (b) $\mathrm{RNH}_{2}, \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, \mathrm{MeOH}, \mathrm{rt}, 78-85 \%$; (c) TBAF, THF, rt, 68-80\%; (d) Dowex50, MeOH-H2O, 67-85\%. All steps were performed at rt. Compound 22 was prepared from 63 without isolation of protected intermediate.

