



1 Article

Macrocyclic tetramers – structural investigation of peptide-peptoid hybrids

Claudine Nicole Herlan ¹, Anna Sonnefeld ², Thomas Gloge ², Julian Brückel ¹, Luisa Chiara
Schlee ¹, Claudia Muhle-Goll ², Martin Nieger ³ and Stefan Bräse ^{1,4*}

- 6 ¹ Institute of Organic Chemistry, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Fritz-Haber-Weg 6, 76131 Karlsruhe,
 7 Germany
- 8 ² Institute for Biological Interfaces 4, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Hermann-von-Helmholtz-Platz 1,
 9 76344 Eggenstein-Leopoldshafen, Germany
- ³ Department of Chemistry, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 55 (A.I. Virtasen aukio 1), FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland.
- ⁴ Institute of Biological and Chemical Systems Functional Molecular Systems, Karlsruhe Institute of
 Technology, Hermann-von-Helmholtz-Platz 1, 76344 Eggenstein-Leopoldshafen, Germany.
- 14 * Correspondence: stefan.braese@kit.edu
- 15 Received: date; Accepted: date; Published: date

16 **Abstract:** Outstanding affinity and specificity are the main characteristics of peptides, rendering 17 them interesting compounds for basic and medicinal research. However, their biological 18 applicability is limited due to fast proteolytic degradation. The use of mimetic peptoids overcomes 19 this disadvantage, though they lack stereochemical information at the α -carbon. Hybrids composed 20 of amino acids and peptoid monomers combine the unique properties of both parent classes. 21 Rigidification of the backbone increases the affinity towards various targets. However, only little is 22 known about the spatial structure of such constrained hybrids.

The determination of the three-dimensional structure is a key step for the identification of new targets as well as the rational design of bioactive compounds. Herein, we report the synthesis and the structural elucidation of novel tetrameric macrocycles. Measurements were taken in solid and solution states with the help of X-ray scattering and NMR spectroscopy. The investigations made will help to find diverse applications for this new, promising compound class.

- 28 Keywords: peptidomimetics; tetramers; macrocycles; spatial structure.
- 29

۲

 (\mathbf{c})

30 1. Introduction

Peptides, a structurally and functionally diverse class of macromolecules, are involved in all parts of life. Their unique properties render them highly promising compounds for biochemical and medicinal research [1, 2]. However, peptides come along with some drawbacks limiting their applicability as selective therapeutics: fast proteolytic degradation resulting in low bioavailability and improvable physicochemical properties [3, 4].

36 Cyclization has been shown to increase proteolytic resistance and even the binding affinity and 37 specificity of linear peptides [5, 6]. Spatially fixed arrangements of functional moieties arouse 38 outstanding bioactivities, especially in small cyclic peptides [7-12]. Another approach to improve the 39 bioavailability of linear peptides while maintaining their unique characteristics has been modifying 40 the individual building blocks [13, 14]. The formal shift of the side chain from the α -carbon to the 41 nitrogen atom results in peptoids, which mimic the structure of their parent compounds but lack

42 pivotal motifs affecting the spatial arrangement (Figure 1) [15-18].



43 **Figure 1.** L-Phenylalanine is an example of an amino acid as the monomer of a peptide (a) and its 44 respective peptoid monomer (b).

N-alkylation in peptoids prevents the formation of backbone hydrogen bonds which are crucial for stabilizing secondary structures in related peptides. The absence of the hydrogen bond donor results in enhanced conformational flexibility that comes along with increased *cis/trans*-amide isomerism [19-21]. To constrain their conformational flexibility, peptoids of different sizes have been cyclized [22-29]. Structural studies of these macrocycles revealed defined geometries entailing distinct *cis-trans* sequences depending on the size and the type of side chains [19, 20, 22].

Besides peptoid macrocycles, several studies on cyclic, *N*-methylated peptides have been reported [30-35]. However, little is known about the spatial structure of macrocycles that are built up of natural amino acids and peptoid monomers. These hybrid structures combine the unique selectivity and affinity of peptides with the outstanding metabolic stability of peptoids. To date, only a few representatives of this compound class, which holds great promise for future biochemical and medical research, are known [36-41]. Understanding the spatial structure of the peptide-peptoid hybrids allows for the search for potential targets and enables rational drug design.

Herein, we report the synthesis and structural elucidation of tetramers with different ratios of amino acids to peptoid monomers. To constrain their conformational flexibility, macrocycles made up of four monomers were built by head-to-tail cyclization. Crystallographic data and NMR studies were used to determine the three-dimensional (3D) structures of the resulting peptide-peptoid hybrids in solid and solution states. This structural investigation can be a stepping stone for further research on this promising compound class.

64 2. Results and Discussion

Initially, we aimed to synthesize a congener library of the cyclic tetrapeptide apicidin (1, Figure
2) [42]. The natural fungal metabolite is known for its ability to inhibit histone deacetylases (HDAC)
and thus to modify the gene expression in eukaryotic cells [43-46].



Figure 2. The cyclic tetrapeptide apicidin (1).

69 Our aim was the design of apicidin derivatives capable of the inhibition of the Wnt/ β -catenin 70 signaling pathway. Thus, our structures lacked the characteristic L-2-amino-8-oxodecanoic acid 71 (Aoda), which is critical for the HDAC activity of apicidin (1) [46]. While analyzing the novel 72 structures, we have observed that replacing individual amino acids with peptoid monomers has an 73 interesting influence on the spatial structure of the macrocycles. Herein, we report our findings based 74 on selecting apicidin congeners with different peptide to peptoid ratios.

Although various chemically and structurally diverse side chains were incorporated into the library of apicidin derivatives, all congeners had an aromatic amino acid and the cyclic, *N*-alkylated

2 of 16

3 of 16

amino acid proline in common. Proline was chosen due to its similarity to the building block of thelead structure apicidin (1), namely pipecolic acid, and its decreased energy barrier for *cis-trans-*

79 isomerism [47-49].

80 Peptide bonds are constrained in their free rotatability due to their strong π -character. The 81 energy distribution favors two distinct dihedral angles representing *cis*- and trans-amide bonds

82 (Scheme 1) [50, 51].



83 **Scheme 1.** The *cis-trans*-isomerism of peptide bonds.

Due to the steric hindrance of their side chains, most amino acids form *trans*-conformations with high energy barriers for *cis-trans*-isomerism [50, 51]. The unusual structure of proline results in an equimolar distribution of both the *cis-* and the *trans*-conformation when incorporated into a polypeptide [47-49]. In nature, isomers of proline are known as loop inducers due to *cis*-bond formation [52, 53]. As it is assumed that backbone *cis*-conformations can facilitate the ring closure of tense cyclic tetramers [8, 54, 55], proline was the building block of choice for the design of different macrocycles.

91 2.1. Synthesis of macrocyclic tetramers

92 Hybrid structures consisting of amino acids and peptoid monomers were built upon solid 93 support. The synthetic protocol involved the well-known solid-phase peptide synthesis described by 94 Merrifield [56] as well as the submonomer method for the assembly of peptoids published by

95 Zuckermann [57] (Scheme 2).



Scheme 2. Synthetic protocol of cyclic tetramers. [a]: Fmoc-protected amino acid, *N*,*N'*diisopropylethylamine (DIPEA), *N*-methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP), 21 °C, 16 h; [b]: piperidine,
dimethylformamide (DMF), 21 °C, 3 × 5 min; [c]: Fmoc-protected amino acid, *N*,*N'*diisopropylcarbodiimide (DIC), hydroxybenzotriazole, NMP, 21 °C, 4 h; [d]: bromoacetic acid,
DIPEA, DMF, 21 °C, 1 h; [e]: amine, DMF, 21 °C, 1–16 h; [f]: 1. bromoacetic acid, DIC, DMF, 21 °C,
30 min; 2. amine, DMF, 21 °C, 1–16 h; [g]: hexafluoroisopropanol, methylene chloride, 21 °C, 16 h; [h]:
HATU, DIPEA, DMF, 21 °C, 30 h.

103 The attachment of the C-terminal amino acid ($\rightarrow 2$) or bromoacetic acid as the first submonomer 104 of a peptoid building block (\rightarrow 4) to a 2-chlorotrityl chloride polystyrene resin was performed under 105 basic conditions. In the case of amino acids, the Fmoc-protection group was cleaved using a mixture 106 of 20% piperidine in DMF, resulting in the free primary amine 3. To build up peptoids, bromoacetic 107 acid was substituted by any desired amine (\rightarrow 5). Depending on the sequence, free amines were either 108 coupled to an amino acid or bromoacetic acid. Diisopropylcarbodiimide was used as a coupling agent 109 in both cases. To avoid racemization, hydroxybenzotriazole was added for the attachment of amino 110 acids.

111 Acetylation and substitution and amino acid coupling and deprotection were carried out until 112 the desired linear precursor 6 was constructed. Cleavage was performed under mildly acidic 113 conditions releasing a linear tetramer capable of a head-to-tail cyclization. The ring closure was 114 carried out following a protocol by Aldrich [58] with the help of the potent coupling reagent 115 [Dimethylamino(triazolo[4,5-b]pyridin-3-yloxy)methylidene]-di-methylazanium hexafluoro-116 phosphate (HATU). This iminium salt is known for its potency in energetically unfavorable 117 couplings, cyclizing constrained tetrapeptides [8, 59, 60]. To avoid favored side reactions like 118 cyclodimerizations [55, 61, 62], a 5.00 mM solution of the respective linear precursor was added 119 dropwise to a 2.40 mM solution of HATU.

Reactive moieties of side chains were masked with protecting groups. Deprotection was performed immediately after the cyclization step. After ten or eleven reaction steps, respectively, the synthetic protocol yielded cyclic tetramers, which required only a single purification step at the end of the reaction sequence. Purification was carried out *via* preparative reversed-phase HPLC, and

124 product formation was confirmed *via* MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry.

In an initial library, several macrocyclic tetrapeptides of general structure 7 were synthesized. To match the model structure apicidin (1), proline was incorporated in its D-configuration. The remaining amino acids were applied in their L-configuration. To avoid diketopiperazine formation [63, 64], D-proline was incorporated as the third building block during the modular solid-phase synthesis. Approaches with proline as *N*-terminal building block yielded low amounts of the desired macrocycles (data not shown). It was assumed that the low nucleophilicity of the secondary amine prevented cyclization.

For this reason, the sequence of the linear precursors was changed in such a way that a primary amine was in the *N*-terminal position (R¹). Cyclization of these precursors then led to moderate yields of the corresponding macrocycles. Nine derivatives with structural similarity were selected to represent the library of macrocyclic tetramers (Table 1).

136**Table 1.** Cyclic tetrapeptides of general structure 7 and their respective yields over ten or eleven137reaction steps.

		$ \begin{array}{c} $		
Macrocycle	R1	R ²	R ³	Yield
7a	,H	Ţ	\sim	22%
7b	,H	но		46%[1]
7c		-Γ _H	\sim	57%
7 d		$\overline{\mathbf{r}}$	$\bigcirc \checkmark$	44%
7e			$\bigcirc \checkmark$	56%

Molecules 2020 , 25, x FOR P	EER REVIEW				5 of 16
7f	$\mathbf{L}^{\!$	Ţ		36%	
7g	\mathbf{r}	но	HN	22%[1]	
7h		Ţ	HN	38%	
7i	NH	\checkmark		54%	

138 ^[1] Yield over eleven reaction steps.

139The *N*-terminus of the linear precursors (position R^1) consisted of branched aliphatic or aromatic140amino acids. In position R^2 , different alkyl side chains were incorporated. The *C*-terminus (position141 R^3) was built by either L-phenylalanine or L-tryptophan. Ring closure was carried out by amidation142of the *N*-terminal amine (R^1) with the carboxyl function of the *C*-terminal, aromatic amino acid (R^3).143The use of different building blocks did not influence the overall yield of the reaction. Even additional144deprotection steps (compounds 7b and 7g) had no clear effect on the yields of the macrocyclic145tetrapeptides. On average, the cyclic tetramers were isolated in 42% ± 13 overall yield.

146 In a second library, individual amino acids were replaced by a peptoid monomer. Peptoids are 147 peptidomimetics that promise high metabolic stability and outstanding biological activity [15-17]. 148 Compared to peptides, the side chain is formally shifted from the α -carbon to the backbone nitrogen 149 atom. This comes with high conformational flexibility as the amide nitrogen loses its capability to 150 serve as a hydrogen bond donor. Moreover, the modification of the amide nitrogen lowers the energy 151 barrier of cis/trans isomerization [18, 19, 65, 66]. However, a beneficial effect of this enhanced 152 flexibility on the cyclization reaction was not observed. The nine macrocyclic hybrids representing a 153 library composed of tetramers with three amino acids and one peptoid monomer were isolated in 154 $31\% \pm 14$ overall yields (Table 2).

1	~ ~	
L	~ ~	
L		

Table 2. Cyclic tetramers of general structure 8 and their respective yields over ten reaction steps.



			8			
Macrocycle	R1	R ²	R ³	\mathbb{R}^4	R ⁵	Yield
8a		Н	Н	Ţ	$\bigcirc \checkmark$	28%
8b		Н	Н	Ţ	$\bigcirc \checkmark$	8.4%
8c		Н	Н	Ţ		21%
8d	Н		Ţ	Н	$\bigcirc \checkmark$	28%
8e	Н	, H		Н	$\bigcirc \checkmark$	29%
8f	Н	,H		Н	$\bigcirc \gamma$	52%
8g	Н	, H		Н	HN HN	52%
8h	Н			Н	$\bigcirc \checkmark$	39%



To resemble the model structure apicidin (1), the nine macrocycles **8a-i** have an aromatic amino acid at the *C*-terminal end (\mathbb{R}^5) and an adjacent linear alkyl side chain in common (\mathbb{R}^3 or \mathbb{R}^4). The peptoid monomer was inserted at the *C*- or *N*-terminal position of D-proline (\mathbb{R}^1 or \mathbb{R}^3). In the latter case, cyclization was performed on the secondary amine of a peptoid building block, causing a lower yield on average (19% ± 8, **8a-c**). Incorporating a peptoid monomer in the middle of the sequence resulted in overall yields similar to those obtained for cyclic tetrapeptides (36% ± 13, **8d-i**).

Further peptoid building blocks were incorporated into the macrocycles to enhance structural
diversity, resulting in the general structure 9. Table 3 shows a selection of nine structurally similar
apicidin congeners with both aromatic and aliphatic side chains (Table 3).

165 **Table 3.** Cyclic tetramers of general structure **9** and their respective yields over ten reaction steps.

		0 R ² ∥ Ĥ O		
Macrocycle	R1	R ²	R ³	Yield
9a	\sum		$\bigcirc \checkmark$	50%
9b	$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$	Meo		14%
9c				18%
9d			$\bigcirc \checkmark$	15%
9e			$\bigcirc \checkmark$	15%
9f				28%
9g				34%
9h				20%
9i			$\bigcirc \gamma$	19%

166 The macrocyclic hybrids **9a-i** are composed of two peptoid monomers (R^1 and R^2) and two amino 167 acids (d-proline and R3) located in alternating order on opposite sides of the backbone ring system. 168 Aromatic and linear, and cyclic aliphatic peptoid monomers built the *N*-terminus of the linear 169 precursors (R^1). The individual building blocks did not influence the overall yields, similar to the 170 yields obtained for hybrids **8a-c** that were also cyclized on a secondary amine (24% ± 11).

171 2.2. Multiconformational equilibrium detected by NMR

Often multiple signal sets are detected in the NMR spectra of macrocycles depending on the dielectric properties of the solvent [11, 67-69]. This could be due to different conformers present or conformational equilibrium [20, 70]. Influencing factors are *i.a.* side chains, solvent effects, and temperature [71, 72]. For the model structure apicidin (1), as an example, it is known that multiple conformations stem from *cis-trans* isomerism of the pipecolic acid building block [69, 71].

7 of 16

HPLC purification of the compounds resulted in sharp peaks indicating that one predominant
isomer was synthesized [72-74]. However, NMR-spectra of the cyclic tetramers corroborated the
formation of several conformers for almost every macrocycle (supplemental, Table S6). This was most
prominent for cyclic tetrapeptides **7a-i**, which tended to assemble in multiconformational equilibria
due to multiple degrees of freedom.

182 The same applied to the macrocycles with one peptoid monomer. Macrocycles 8a-i revealed 183 multiple signal sets in solution, indicating different conformers' formation (supplemental, Table S6). 184 NOESY spectra of macrocycle 8f, for example, led to the identification of five separate conformers 185 which interconverted on the NMR timescale. Surprisingly, the complexity of the spectra of the 186 hybrids 8a-d was significantly reduced compared to spectra of structures 8e-i. The peptoid monomer 187 was inserted at the N-terminus in the former ones, resulting in one dominant structure next to another 188 isomer in approximately 5:1. Therefore, incorporating a peptoid building block in this position could 189 stabilize distinct isomers, decisive for biological applications.

For macrocycles **9a-i**, one dominant signal set was mostly observed (supplemental, Table S6). To illustrate this, Figure 3 displays the NH regions of selected macrocycles from series **8** and **9**, which were soluble in pure acetonitrile. In the NH region of series **9** macrocycles, only one peptide bond amide signal is visible. For macrocycles **8c**, **8d**, **8f**, and **8g**, one main signal set was accompanied by a second or third signal set of lesser intensity. Macrocycles from series **7** are not shown here, as the molecules were primarily soluble in DMSO (see supplemental, Table S6).



Figure 3: Excerpts from ¹H spectra of selected macrocycles from series 8 and 9. An asterisk (*) indicates
 the NH signals belonging to a signal set of lower intensity. The spectra were normalized to have
 similar NH intensity.

199

8 of 16

Molecules 2020, 25, x FOR PEER REVIEW

200 2.3. Spatial structure in solid-state

X-ray diffraction is a highly reliable method to determine the spatial structure of molecules in
 the solid-state [75, 76]. Crystallization of the macrocyclic hybrids was attempted *via* evaporation of
 acetonitrile, isopropanol, and methanol. Most macrocycles aggregated into amorphous powders
 during this process, some became viscous oils, and others produced polycrystalline needle-shaped
 structures. However, some single crystals were obtained from multiple attempts for each of the five
 similar cyclic tetrapeptides 7a, 7b, 7e, 7f, and 7h (Figure 4).



Figure 4: Molecular structure of the cyclic tetrapeptides 7a and 7b and one of the independent crystallographic molecules of macrocycles 7e, 7f, and 7h.

Macrocycle **7b** represents the only tetrapeptide with a polar building block crystallized in sufficient quality for X-ray diffraction. In contrast to the other structures, **7b** is equipped with L-serine instead of the alkyl side chain L-norleucine. Thus, the macrocycle **7b** is the only member of the apicidin tetrapeptide library without L-norleucine that crystallized upon vapor diffusion.

For both tetrapeptides **7a** and **7b** containing an *N*-terminal L-isoleucyl residue, the structure of one isomer was determined *via* X-ray diffraction. As for the model structure apicidin (1) [69], at least three independent structures (I, II, III etc.) each were obtained for macrocycles **7e**, **7f**, and **7h**. Their dihedral angles differ slightly from each other but show the same *cis-trans* arrangement (Table 4).

217

218 219 **Table 4:** Dihedral angles of the independent structures of macrocycles **7a**, **7b**, **7e**, **7f**, and **7h** determined *via* X-ray diffraction measurements.



Macrocycle	Structure	ωA	ωв	ως	ωd
7a	Ι	155.7°	171.1°	5.2°	-167.6°
7b	Ι	159.0°	171.5°	6.5°	-172.7°
	Ι	157.3°	170.1°	12.1°	-173.3°
7e	II	158.1°	169.5°	6.5°	-172.4°
_	III	158.5°	171.8°	13.1°	-175.6°
	Ι	160.4°	167.9°	-3.7°	-172.6°
	II	160.8°	167.4°	13.6°	-174.4°
7f	III	163.3°	166.8°	9.8°	-174.8
	IV	165.5°	163.7°	14.6°	-177.6°
	V	165.3°	163.9°	10.9°	-177.0°
	Ι	157.9°	169.0°	5.0°	-170.6°
71	II	157.1°	169.6°	-6.9°	-168.0°
/11	III	153.1°	169.6°	13.5°	-172.7°
	IV	155.3°	171.0°	3.1°	-165.6°

To elucidate the backbone conformation, dihedral angles of the individual macrocycles were measured. The dihedral angle ω describes the torsion angle of the axis between the α - and the amide carbon atom of one amino acid and the axis between the amide nitrogen and the α -carbon atom of the following building block. Due to the partial double-bond character of the peptide bond, this angle is forced into two distinct values: $\omega = 0^\circ$ or $\omega = \pm 180^\circ$. Sterical hindrance can lead to a deviation of the dihedral angles from their ideal values, but an angle close to $\omega = 0^\circ$ indicates a *cis*-conformation while $\omega = \pm 180^\circ$ indicates a *trans*-peptide bond [77].

All conformers of the five macrocycles **7a**, **7b**, **7e**, **7f**, and **7h** showed a *cis*-conformation between the nitrogen atom of their respective D-prolyl residue and the amide carbon of the adjacent amino acid (ω c). The *trans-trans-cis-trans* sequence of the backbone has also been reported for the model structure apicidin (**1**) [69] and similar cyclotetrapeptides [78]. The largest deviations from the ideal dihedral angle were measured between the nitrogen atoms of the large aromatic side chains Lphenylalanine or L-tryptophan and the amide carbon of the following building blocks (ω A).

The measurements of the configurations of the α -carbon atoms showed the expected stereochemistry: the α -carbon of every D-proline building block was (*R*)-, the ones of the remaining amino acids were (*S*)-configurated. Furthermore, the macrocycles resembled each other in the location of their side chains: while the aliphatic ring of D-proline pointed above the ring level, the remaining side chains were located below.

Crystallization preparations of hybrids containing one peptoid monomer provided single crystals of two compounds: **8e** and **8f** (Table 5). Both revealed strong structural similarities to the cyclic tetrapeptides **7a-i**. Moreover, the macrocycles **8e** and **8f** are equivalent to each other in large parts of their structure but differ in their peptoid-based alkyl side chain length.

242

9 of 16

10 of 16

Table 5: Molecular structures of the cyclic hybrids 8e and 8f and their dihedral angles determined *via* X-ray diffraction measurements.





Macrocycle	ωA	ωв	ως	ωD
8e	155.2°	169.4°	12.2°	-173.0°
8f	155.3°	170.7°	13.5°	-172.4°

The dihedral angles of the peptide-peptoid hybrids resemble the ones measured for cyclic tetrapeptides. Again, a *cis*-conformation was measured between the nitrogen atom of D-proline and the amide carbon of the following building block. As for tetrapeptides of general structure 7, three residues were located on the same side of the ring plane while the alkyl ring of D-proline pointed towards the opposite direction.

We could not successfully crystallize any cyclic hybrid of compounds with two peptoid units (series 9). Thus, we decided to use NMR data for the structure elucidation of the exemplarily chosen macrocycle 9a.

253 2.4. Spatial structure in solution state

Structural information on **9a** was obtained by recording NOESY spectra. Internuclear distances were calculated from NOE cross-peak intensities (see supplemental, Table S2 for details). Using the internuclear distance data from NOESY spectra and dihedral angle information from *J*-coupling constants, a 3D model for **9a** was constructed with the molecular modeling software Avogadro (http://avogadro.cc) [79]. This model was further structurally optimized utilizing a DFT approach using the quantum chemical calculation software Turbomole (http://www.turbomole.com).

260 However, NOE data of small molecules is often not sufficient to unambiguously select for one 261 conformation, especially in structural backbone dynamics. Additional structural information 262 regarding 9a was obtained by extraction of one- and two-bond residual dipolar couplings (RDCs) in 263 a uniaxially stretched polyethylene glycol (PEG) gel [80]. This was achieved by recording CLIP-264 HSQC [81] and P.E.HSQC [82] spectra of the molecule in an isotropic environment and under 265 anisotropic conditions in a uniaxially stretched polyethylene glycol (PEG) gel [80]. The RDCs were 266 then used to validate the NOE-derived structure. To assess whether the RDCs agree with the 267 constructed model, they were analyzed using single value decomposition (SVD) in the MSpin-RDC 268 software [83]. An SVD omitting the RDC data of the more mobile sidechains yielded acceptable 269 results. The back-calculated and experimental RDCs were in good agreement, with 7 out of 8 RDCs 270 fulfilled within the experimental error (supplemental, Table S3). A full back-calculation including 271 sidechain RDCs can be found in the supporting information (supplemental, Table S3). Although the 272 deviation between experimental and back-calculated values was higher in this case, all RDC values 273 were reasonably well reproduced. The constructed model is therefore largely in agreement with the 274 experimental NOE, J-coupling, and RDC data and can be seen to represent the dominant solution

state structure of **9a**.

11 of 16

The 3D model of **9a** indicated interesting structural differences compared to the macrocycles with three or four amino acids (Table 6).

Table 6: Dihedral angles and molecular solution-state structure of the macrocycle 9a determined *via* NMR measurements.



280 The model of **9a** displays an alternating *cis-trans*-configuration of the cyclic backbone and an 281 overall oblong ring shape. Thereby, the torsion angles ω_A and ω_c indicate a *trans*-peptide bond 282 between the amino functions of both amino acids and the carbonyl moieties of the subsequent 283 peptoid monomers. In contrast to previous structures, no *cis*-bond was measured between the 284 nitrogen atom of proline and the amide carbon of the following building block (ωc). Instead, two *cis*-285 bonds were detected between the nitrogen atoms of the peptoid monomers and the subsequent 286 carbonyl carbon atoms (ω_B and ω_D). Likewise, the dihedral angle ω_A next to the sterically demanding 287 side chains of L-phenylalanine was no longer distorted from ideal values ($\omega_A = 179.3^\circ$). Previous 288 studies on small cyclic peptoids have shown that the *cis-trans-cis-trans* arrangement represents the 289 lowest energy conformation and forms during the crystallization process of different cyclic 290 tetrapeptoids [84-86]. Our data indicate that this characteristic backbone arrangement is also favored 291 in cyclic hybrids of general structure 9. Thus, with an increase in the peptide-peptoid ratio, the 292 backbone configuration of apicidin derivatives can be easily modified.

Besides backbone configuration, the side chains of **9a** differed from previous derivatives: the side chains were located alternately above and below the ring plane. This characteristic orientation is also known for pure peptoid macrocycles of different ring sizes [23, 84, 85] and various *N*-alkylated tetrapeptides [87-92].

297 Our data indicate that the increase of the peptoid-to-peptide ratio leads to significant structural
 298 changes of the entire macrocycle, which must be considered when developing potential inhibitors of
 299 the Wnt/β-catenin pathway.

300 3. Materials and Methods

301 General procedure for the synthesis of cyclic peptoids: In a fritted syringe, a 2-chlorotrityl-302 chloride resin (125 mg, 200 µmol, 1.60 mmol/mg loading density, 100-200 mesh, 1.00 equiv.) was 303 swollen in methylene chloride (DCM) for at least 30 min at 21 °C. After filtration, either a freshly 304 prepared solution of bromoacetic acid (8.00 equiv.) and N,N'-diisopropylethylamine (DIPEA, 305 8.00 equiv.) in N,N'-dimethyl-formamide (DMF) or a Fmoc-protected amino acid (4.00 equiv.) and 306 DIPEA (4.00 equiv.) in N-methylpyrrolidone (NMP) was added and shaken for 1 h or rather 16 h at 307 21 °C. The resin was extensively washed with DMF, methanol, and DCM. In the former case, a 308 solution of the corresponding amine (8.00 equiv.) in DMF was added to the resin and shaken for 1 h 309 at 21 °C. In the latter case, a solution of 20% piperidine in DMF was repeatedly added. Following 310 extensive washing, either a solution of bromoacetic acid (8.00 equiv.) and N_{N} '-diisopropyl-311 carbodiimide (DIC, 8.00 equiv.) in DMF or a Fmoc-protected amino acid (4.00 equiv.), 312 1-hydroxybenzotriazole (HOBt, 4.00 equiv.) and DIC (4.00 equiv.) in NMP were added and shaken 313 for 30 min or 4 h at 21 °C. Substitution or rather Fmoc-deprotection and acetylation or rather amino

314 acid coupling were alternated repeatedly until the desired tetramer was built. For cleavage, a solution 315 of 33% hexafluoroisopropanol in DCM was added, and the mixture was shaken overnight. The

- 316 solvent was removed under an air stream.
- For the cyclization, a solution of the respective linear tetramer was added dropwise to a solution of [dimethylamino(triazolo[4,5-b]pyridin-3-yloxy)-methylidene]-dimethylazanium hexafluorophosphate (HATU, 1.50 equiv.) and DIPEA (8.00 equiv.) in DMF. The mixture was stirred overnight at 21 °C, and the solvent was removed under reduced pressure. The residue was purified *via* preparative reversed-phase HPLC.

322 Crystal structure determination: The single-crystal X-ray diffraction studies were carried out on 323 a Bruker D8 Venture diffractometer with a PhotonII detector at 123(2) K, 173(2) K, or 298(2) K using 324 Cu-K α radiation (λ = 1.54178 Å). Dual space methods (SHELXT) [93] were used for structure solution, 325 and refinement was carried out using SHELXL (full-matrix least-squares on F^2) [94]. Hydrogen atoms 326 were localized by difference electron density determination and refined using a riding model (H(N, A)) 327 O) free). Semi-empirical absorption corrections were applied. For 7a and 8e, extinction corrections 328 were applied. The absolute configuration was determined for all structures refinement of Parsons' x-329 parameter [95]. For disorder, restraints, constraints, and SQUEEZE, see the corresponding cif-files for 330 details. CCDC 2059042 (7a), 2059043 (7f), 2059044 (7e), 2059045 (8f), 2059047 (7h), 2059048 (8e), and 331 2059049 (7b) contain the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data can be 332 charge from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre obtained free of via 333 www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif.

334 NMR measurements: NMR spectra were recorded at 25 °C on an Avance 300 (Bruker BioSpin, 335 Germany) and a Bruker Avance 500 spectrometer. Additional NMR spectra of peptide-peptoid 336 hybrid 9a were recorded at 30 °C on a 600 MHz Avance III spectrometer with a TCI cryo-probe head 337 (Bruker BioSpin, Germany). More details on the NMR measurements can be found in the 338 supplementary information.

339 4. Conclusions

The three different classes of tetrameric cyclic peptide-peptoid hybrids presented here will pave the way to further research on this promising class of compounds. All macrocycles were designed to resemble the fungal metabolite apicidin (1) but without the characteristic Aoda side chain, critical for its literature known HDAC inhibitor activity [46]. The cyclic tetramers are accessible in moderate yields by combining different solid-phase techniques followed by ring closure in solution.

Several studies had previously shown that cyclic tetramers might adopt multiple conformations in solution, especially interchanging *cis* and *trans* peptide bonds [7, 11, 70]. The active conformation of biologically potent molecules in solution may be selected in reality from various interconverting conformers. The stability of the single conformers depends on intra- as well as intermolecular interactions [72]. The conversion rate between these conformers is quite high, making it difficult to identify every isomer formed [71, 72].

Our X-ray and NMR measurements revealed the formation of different isomers in solid and liquid states for the cyclic tetramers presented. The amount of conformational variability depended on the number of incorporated peptoid units. Solution state NMR spectroscopy indicated different conformers for all compounds that exchanged partially within the NMR time scale. Especially for macrocycles with no or one peptoid monomer, multiple signal sets were detected. The incorporation of two peptoid monomers led to the stabilization of one dominant isomer.

Crystallographically detected conformers differed only in details concerning the backbone structure of the cyclic ring. Tetrapeptide conformers varied slightly in their dihedral angles but showed the same *cis-trans* sequence. The incorporation of one peptoid monomer did not change this *cis-trans* arrangement. The insertion of two peptoid monomers significantly affected the overall conformation. Instead of one, two *cis*-bonds were detected in the resulting macrocycles, indicating that the amount of peptoid monomers influences the spatial structure of peptide-peptoid hybrids.

363 With the structural information now in hand, biological targets can be identified, and, thanks to 364 the modular approach, highly specific hybrids can be easily synthesized. These new molecules will 365 find application in biochemical and medical research and help elucidate and sustain life's complexity. 366 We will continue our work on the activity of our macrocycles towards the Wnt/ β -catenin signaling 367 pathway. So far, we have found some hybrids with inhibition constants in the range of the model 368 structure apicidin (1, data not shown). The structural investigations reported herein will help us 369 design different potent inhibitors of the Wnt/ β -catenin pathway, a signaling cascade involved in 370 embryogenesis and homeostasis, and different diseases such as cancer or neurodegenerative 371 disorders [96-102].

- 372 Supplementary Materials: The following are available online: synthetic procedure, crystallographic, and NMR 373 data.
- 374 Author Contributions: Conceptualization, C.N.H., and A.S.; methodology, C.N.H., A.S., T.G. and C.M.-G.;
- 375 validation, C.M.-G., and S.B.; formal analysis, C.N.H., A.S., T.G., M.N. and C.M.-G.; investigation, C.N.H., A.S.,
- 376 J.B. and L.C.S.; resources, C.M.-G. and S.B.; data curation, C.N.H., A.S., J.B., L.C.S., and M.N.; writing-original
- 377 draft preparation, C.N.H., and A.S.; writing-review and editing, C.M.-G., T.G., and S.B.; visualization, C.N.H., 378
- A.S.; supervision, C.M.-G., and S.B.; project administration, C.M.-G., and S.B.; funding acquisition, C.M.-G., and 379
- S.B.. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.
- 380 Funding: This research received no external funding.
- 381 Acknowledgments: We acknowledge support from the KIT and the DFG (GRK2039). C.M.-G. acknowledges

382 funding by the Helmholtz-Society. We thank Ansgar Pausch, KIT, to help Turbomole and Prof. Wim Klopper

- 383 and Dr. Sebastian Höfener, KIT, provide access to the TCHCLX400 cluster.
- 384 Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

385 References

386	1.	Beatriz, G., Albericio, F., Molecules, 2020, 25(10).
387	2.	Lee, A. CL., Harris, J. L., Khanna, K. K.,Hong, JH., Int. J. Mol. Sci., 2019, 20(10), 2383.
388	3.	Zhang, Y., Zhang, H., Ghosh, D., Williams III, R. O., Int. J. Pharm., 2020, 119491.
389	4.	Drucker, D. J., Nat. Rev. Drug Discov., 2019, 1-13.
390	5.	Zorzi, A., Deyle, K., Heinis, C., Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol., 2017, 38, 24-29.
391	6.	Choi, JS., Joo, S. H., Biomol. Ther. (Seoul), 2020, 28(1), 18.
392	7.	Horton, D. A., Bourne, G. T., Coughlan, J., Kaiser, S. M., Jacobs, C. M., Jones, A., Rühmann, A., Turner,
393		J. Y.,Smythe, M. L., Org. Biomol. Chem., 2008, 6(8), 1386-1395.
394	8.	Meutermans, W. D., Bourne, G. T., Golding, S. W., Horton, D. A., Campitelli, M. R., Craik, D., Scanlon,
395		M.,Smythe, M. L., Org. Lett., 2003, 5(15), 2711-2714.
396	9.	Sarojini, V., Cameron, A. J., Varnava, K. G., Denny, W. A., Sanjayan, G., Chem. Rev., 2019, 119(17), 10318-
397		10359.
398	10.	Davison, E. K., Cameron, A. J., Harris, P. W., Brimble, M. A., MedChemComm, 2019, 10(5), 693-698.
399	11.	Ferracane, M. J., Brice-Tutt, A. C., Coleman, J. S., Simpson, G. G., Wilson, L. L., Eans, S. O., Stacy, H. M.,
400		Murray, T. F., McLaughlin, J. P., Aldrich, J. V., ACS Chem. Neurosci., 2020, 11(9), 1324-1336.
401	12.	Betancur, L. A., Forero, A. M., Romero-Otero, A., Sepúlveda, L. Y., Moreno-Sarmiento, N. C.,
402		Castellanos, L., Ramos, F. A., J. Antibiot. Res., 2019, 72(10), 744-751.
403	13.	Grauer, A.,König, B., Eur. J. Org. Chem., 2009, 2009(30), 5099-5111.
404	14.	Ko, E., Liu, J., Perez, L. M., Lu, G., Schaefer, A.,Burgess, K., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2011, 133(3), 462-477.
405	15.	Zuckermann, R. N., Kerr, J. M., Kent, S. B., Moos, W. H., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1992, 114(26), 10646-10647.
406	16.	Sun, J.,Zuckermann, R. N., ACS nano, 2013, 7(6), 4715-4732.
407	17.	Zuckermann, R. N., Kodadek, T., Curr. Opin. Mol. Ther, 2009, 11(3), 299-307.

	Molecules	s 2020 , 25, x FOR PEER REVIEW 14 of 16
408	18.	Dohm, M. T., Kapoor, R., Barron, A. E., Curr. Pharm. Des., 2011, 17(25), 2732-2747.
409	19.	Yoo, B.,Kirshenbaum, K., Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol., 2008, 12(6), 714-721.
410	20.	De Riccardis, F., Eur. J. Org. Chem., 2020, 2020 (20), 2981-2994.
411	21.	Butterfoss, G. L., Renfrew, P. D., Kuhlman, B., Kirshenbaum, K., Bonneau, R., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2009,
412		131 (46), 16798-16807.
413	22.	Shin, S. B., Yoo, B., Todaro, L. J., Kirshenbaum, K., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2007, 129(11), 3218-3225.
414	23.	Yoo, B., Shin, S. B. Y., Huang, M. L.,Kirshenbaum, K., Chem. Eur. J, 2010, 16(19), 5528-5537.
415	24.	Vollrath, S. B., Hu, C., Bräse, S., Kirshenbaum, K., Chem. Commun., 2013, 49(23), 2317-2319.
416	25.	Webster, A. M., Cobb, S. L., Chem. Eur. J., 2018, 24(30), 7560-7573.
417	26.	Vollrath, S. B., Bräse, S., Kirshenbaum, K., Chem Sci., 2012, 3(9), 2726-2731.
418	27.	Herlan, C. N., Sommer, K., Weis, P., Nieger, M., Bräse, S., Molecules, 2021, 26(1), 150.
419	28.	D'Amato, A., Pierri, G., Tedesco, C., Della Sala, G., Izzo, I., Costabile, C., De Riccardis, F., J. Org. Chem.,
420		2019, 84(17), 10911-10928.
421	29.	Tedesco, C., Erra, L., Izzo, I., De Riccardis, F., CrystEngComm, 2014, 16(18), 3667-3687.
422	30.	Biron, E., Chatterjee, J., Kessler, H., J. Pept. Sci., 2006, 12(3), 213-219.
423	31.	Chatterjee, J., Gilon, C., Hoffman, A., Kessler, H., Acc. Chem. Res., 2008, 41(10), 1331-1342.
424	32.	Demmer, O., Dijkgraaf, I., Schottelius, M., Wester, HJ., Kessler, H., Org. Lett., 2008, 10(10), 2015-2018.
425	33.	Titlestad, K., Schwitters, B., Sundholm, F., Acta Chem. Scand. B, 1977, 31(8), 641-661.
426	34.	Wessjohann, L. A., Andrade, C. K. Z., Vercillo, O. E., Rivera, D. G., Targets Heterocycl. Syst., 2006, 10, 24-
427		53.
428	35.	Morimoto, J.,Kodadek, T., Mol. Biosyst., 2015, 11(10), 2770-2779.
429	36.	Olsen, C. A., ChemBioChem, 2010, 11(2), 152-160.
430	37.	Olsen, C. A., Montero, A., Leman, L. J., Ghadiri, M. R., ACS Med. Chem. Lett., 2012, 3(9), 749-753.
431	38.	Boehm, M., Beaumont, K., Jones, R., Kalgutkar, A. S., Zhang, L., Atkinson, K., Bai, G., Brown, J. A., Eng,
432		H., Goetz, G. H., Holder, B. R., Khunte, B., Lazzaro, S., Limberakis, C., Ryu, S., Shapiro, M. J., Tylaska,
433		L., Yan, J., Turner, R., Leung, S. S. F., Ramaseshan, M., Price, D. A., Liras, S., Jacobson, M. P., Earp, D.
434		J., Lokey, R. S., Mathiowetz, A. M., Menhaji-Klotz, E., J. Med. Chem., 2017, 60(23), 9653-9663.
435	39.	Greco, I., Emborg, A. P., Jana, B., Molchanova, N., Oddo, A., Damborg, P., Guardabassi, L., Hansen, P.
436		R., Scientific reports, 2019, 9 (1), 1-12.
437	40.	Hansen, A. M., Skovbakke, S. L., Christensen, S. B., Perez-Gassol, I., Franzyk, H., Amino Acids, 2019,
438		51 (2), 205-218.
439	41.	Frederiksen, N., Hansen, P. R., Björkling, F., Franzyk, H., Molecules, 2019, 24(24), 4429.
440	42.	Singh, S. B., Zink, D. L., Polishook, J. D., Dombrowski, A. W., Darkin-Rattray, S. J., Schmatz, D.
441		M.,Goetz, M. A., Tetrahedron Lett., 1996, 37 (45), 8077-8080.
442	43.	Darkin-Rattray, S. J., Gurnett, A. M., Myers, R. W., Dulski, P. M., Crumley, T. M., Allocco, J. J., Cannova,
443		C., Meinke, P. T., Colletti, S. L., Bednarek, M. A., PNAS USA, 1996, 93(23), 13143-13147.
444	44.	Colletti, S. L., Myers, R. W., Darkin-Rattray, S. J., Gurnett, A. M., Dulski, P. M., Galuska, S., Allocco, J.
445		J., Ayer, M. B., Li, C., Lim, J., Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett., 2001, 11(2), 107-111.
446	45.	Meinke, P. T., Colletti, S. L., Ayer, M. B., Darkin-Rattray, S. J., Myers, R. W., Schmatz, D. M., Wyvratt,
447		M. J., Fisher, M. H., Tetrahedron Lett., 2000, 41(41), 7831-7835.
448	46.	Singh, S. B., Zink, D. L., Liesch, J. M., Mosley, R. T., Dombrowski, A. W., Bills, G. F., Darkin-Rattray, S.
449		J., Schmatz, D. M., Goetz, M. A., J. Org. Chem., 2002, 67(3), 815-825.
450	47.	Grathwohl, C., Wüthrich, K., <i>Biopolymers</i> , 1981, 20 (12), 2623-2633.

doi:10.20944/preprints202107.0196.v1

	Molecule	5 2020 , 25, x FOR PEER REVIEW 15 of 16
451	48.	Fischer, G., Chem. Soc. Rev., 2000, 29(2), 119-127.
452	49.	Schubert, M., Labudde, D., Oschkinat, H.,Schmieder, P., J. Biomol. NMR, 2002, 24(2), 149-154.
453	50.	Mathieu, S., Poteau, R., Trinquier, G., J. Phys. Chem. B, 2008, 112(26), 7894-7902.
454	51.	Scherer, G., Kramer, M. L., Schutkowski, M., Reimer, U., Fischer, G., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1998, 120(22),
455		5568-5574.
456	52.	Wedemeyer, W. J., Welker, E., Scheraga, H. A., Biochemistry, 2002, 41(50), 14637-14644.
457	53.	Krieger, F., Möglich, A.,Kiefhaber, T., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2005, 127 (10), 3346-3352.
458	54.	Fairweather, K. A., Sayyadi, N., Luck, I. J., Clegg, J. K., Jolliffe, K. A., Org. Lett., 2010, 12(14), 3136-3139.
459	55.	Rodriguez, L. M. D. L., Weitkamp, A. J., Brimble, M. A., Org. Biomol. Chem., 2015, 13(25), 6906-6921.
460	56.	Merrifield, R. B., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1963, 85(14), 2149-2154.
461	57.	Zuckermann, R. N., Kerr, J. M., Kent, S. B. H., Moos, W. H., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1992, 114(26), 10646-10647.
462	58.	Aldrich, J. V., Kulkarni, S. S., Senadheera, S. N., Ross, N. C., Reilley, K. J., Eans, S. O., Ganno, M. L.,
463		Murray, T. F., McLaughlin, J. P., <i>ChemMedChem</i> , 2011, 6 (9), 1739-1745.
464	59.	Dahiya, R.,Gautam, H., Mar. Drugs, 2011, 9 (1), 71-81.
465	60.	El-Faham, A.,Albericio, F., Chem. Rev., 2011, 111 (11), 6557-6602.
466	61.	Thakkar, A., Trinh, T. B.,Pei, D., ACS Comb. Sci., 2013, 15 (2), 120-129.
467	62.	Wong, C. T., Lam, H. Y., Song, T., Chen, G., Li, X., Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2013, 52(39), 10212-10215.
468	63.	Pedroso, E., Grandas, A., de las Heras, X., Eritja, R., Giralt, E., Tetrahedron Lett., 1986, 27(6), 743-746.
469	64.	Gisin, B. F., Merrifield, R., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1972, 94(9), 3102-3106.
470	65.	Kirshenbaum, K., Barron, A. E., Goldsmith, R. A., Armand, P., Bradley, E. K., Truong, K. T., Dill, K. A.,
471		Cohen, F. E., Zuckermann, R. N., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 1998, 95(8), 4303-4308.
472	66.	Zuckermann, R. N., J. Pept. Sci., 2011, 96(5), 545-555.
473	67.	Rich, D. H., Kawai, M., Jasensky, R. D., Int. J. Pept. Protein Res., 1983, 21(1), 35-42.
474	68.	Merten, C., Li, F., Bravo-Rodriguez, K., Sanchez-Garcia, E., Xu, Y., Sander, W., PCCP, 2014, 16(12), 5627-
475		5633.
476	69.	Kranz, M., Murray, P. J., Taylor, S., Upton, R. J., Clegg, W., Elsegood, M. R., J. Pept. Sci., 2006, 12(6), 383-
477		388.
478	70.	Kessler, H., Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 1982, 21(7), 512-523.
479	71.	Horne, W. S., Olsen, C. A., Beierle, J. M., Montero, A., Ghadiri, M. R., Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2009, 48(26),
480		4718-4724.
481	72.	Aberhart, D. J., Cotting, JA.,Lin, HJ., Anal. Biochem., 1985, 151 (1), 88-91.
482	73.	Soukup-Hein, R. J., Schneiderheinze, J., Mehelic, P., Armstrong, D. W., Chromatographia, 2007, 66(7), 461-
483		468.
484	74.	Huang, Y., Pan, L., Zhao, L., Mant, C. T., Hodges, R. S., Chen, Y., Biomed. Chromatogr., 2014, 28(4), 511-
485		517.
486	75.	Chruszcz, M., Borek, D., Domagalski, M., Otwinowski, Z., Minor, W., X-ray diffraction experiment: The
487		last experiment in the structure elucidation process, in Adv. Protein Chem. Struct. Biol. 2009, Elsevier. p. 23-
488		40.
489	76.	Garman, E. F., Science, 2014, 343(6175), 1102-1108.
490	77.	Ramachandran, G., Chandrasekaran, R.,Kopple, K. D., Biopolymers, 1971, 10(11), 2113-2131.
491	78.	Nakai, H., Nagashima, K., Itazaki, H., Acta Crystallogr. Sect. C: Cryst. Struct. Commun., 1991, 47(7), 1496-
492		1499.

	Molecu	<i>les</i> 2020 , 25, x FOR PEER REVIEW 16 of 16
493	79.	Hanwell, M. D., Curtis, D. E., Lonie, D. C., Vandermeersch, T., Zurek, E., Hutchison, G. R., J.
494		<i>Cheminformatics</i> , 2012, 4 (1), 1-17.
495	80.	Gloge, T., Development of a universal alignment medium for the extraction of RDCs and structure elucidation
496		with tensorial constraints. 2020, Karlsruhe University of Technology.
497	81.	Enthart, A., Freudenberger, J. C., Furrer, J., Kessler, H., Luy, B., J. Magn. Reson., 2008, 192(2), 314-322.
498	82.	Tzvetkova, P., Simova, S.,Luy, B., J. Magn. Reson., 2007, 186(2), 193-200.
499	83.	Navarro-Vázquez, A., Magn. Reson. Chem., 2012, 50(S1), S73-S79.
500	84.	Culf, A. S., Cuperlović-Culf, M., Leger, D. A., Decken, A., Org. Lett., 2014, 16(10), 2780-2783.
501	85.	Caumes, C., Fernandes, C., Roy, O., Hjelmgaard, T., Wenger, E., Didierjean, C., Taillefumier, C., Faure,
502		S., Org. Lett., 2013, 15 (14), 3626-3629.
503	86.	Maulucci, N., Izzo, I., Bifulco, G., Aliberti, A., De Cola, C., Comegna, D., Gaeta, C., Napolitano, A.,
504		Pizza, C., Tedesco, C., Chem. Commun., 2008(33), 3927-3929.
505	87.	Dale, J., Titlestad, K., J. Chem. Soc. D, 1970(21), 1403-1404.
506	88.	Mästle, W., Link, U., Witschel, W., Thewalt, U., Weber, T.,Rothe, M., Biopolymers, 1991, 31(6), 735-744.
507	89.	Seebach, D., Bezençon, O., Jaun, B., Pietzonka, T., Matthews, J. L., Kühnle, F. N., Schweizer, W. B., Helv.
508		<i>Chim. Acta</i> , 1996, 79 (3), 588-608.
509	90.	Swepston, P. N., Cordes, A., Kuyper, L., Meyer, W. L., Acta Crystallogr. B, 1981, 37(5), 1139-1141.
510	91.	Loiseau, N., Gomis, J. M., Santolini, J., Delaforge, M., André, F., Biopolymers, 2003, 69(3), 363-385.
511	92.	Chiang, C. C., Karle, I. L., Int. J. Pept. Protein Res., 1982, 20(2), 133-138.
512	93.	Sheldrick, G., Acta Crystallogr. B, 2015, 71 (1), 3-8.
513	94.	Sheldrick, G. M., Acta Crystallogr. C, 2015, 71(1), 3-8.
514	95.	Parsons, S., Flack, H. D., Wagner, T., Acta Crystallogr. B, 2013, 69(3), 249-259.
515	96.	Logan, C. Y., Nusse, R., Annu. Rev. Cell Dev. Biol., 2004, 20, 781-810.
516	97.	Huelsken, J., Behrens, J., J. Cell Sci., 2002, 115(21), 3977-3978.
517	98.	Hoffmeyer, K., Raggioli, A., Rudloff, S., Anton, R., Hierholzer, A., Del Valle, I., Hein, K., Vogt,
518		R.,Kemler, R., Science, 2012, 336(6088), 1549-1554.
519	99.	Niehrs, C., Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol., 2012, 13(12), 767-779.
520	100.	Inestrosa, N. C., Arenas, E., Nat. Rev. Neurosci., 2010, 11(2), 77-86.
521	101.	Cisternas, P., Henriquez, J. P., Brandan, E., Inestrosa, N. C., Mol. Neurobiol., 2014, 49(1), 574-589.
522	102.	Peng, Y., Xu, Y., Cui, D., CNS Neurol. Disord., 2014, 13(5), 755-764.
523		