



**HAL**  
open science

# Permeability of the blood brain barrier: molecular mechanism of transport of drugs and physiologically important compounds

Clifford W Fong

► **To cite this version:**

Clifford W Fong. Permeability of the blood brain barrier: molecular mechanism of transport of drugs and physiologically important compounds. *Journal of Membrane Biology*, 2015, 248 (4), pp.651-669. 10.1007/s00232-015-9778-9 . hal-01326584

**HAL Id: hal-01326584**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01326584v1>**

Submitted on 4 Jun 2016

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**Permeability of the blood-brain barrier: molecular mechanism of transport of drugs and physiologically important compounds**

**Abstract**

A new molecular model for the permeability of drugs and other physiologically important compounds to cross the blood-brain barrier (BBB) has been developed. Permeability (logPS) is dependant on desolvation, lipophilicity, molecular volume and dipole moment. Previous models for BBB permeability have not considered desolvation and dipole moment as critical factors. The model applies to passive diffusion processes, and some facilitated diffusion processes. Passive permeability models may not apply to active transport processes, where complex membrane protein binding processes (eg stereoselectivity) are involved. Model phosphatidylcholine (PC) lipid bilayer membranes have been used to evaluate how charged or polar neutral compounds can interact through their molecular dipoles with the cell membrane to induce electromechanical changes in the cell membrane which facilitate permeation. The free energy of solvation in n-octanol has been shown to be a good measure of membrane lipophilicity by calculating the solvation free energy of a model PC lipid membrane in a series of closely related alcohols. The passive diffusion model for alcohols correlates with the known modulation of membrane bilayers which showed a size dependent “cut-off” point in potency. For most drugs and related molecules, the neutral species are the permeating species.

Clifford W. Fong

Eigenenergy, Adelaide, South Australia

Email: cwfong@internode.on.net

Keywords: permeability, blood-brain barrier, quantum mechanics, molecular mechanism, quantitative models

Running head: new model of blood-brain barrier permeability

### **Abbreviations**

BBB blood-brain barrier

CNS central nervous system

LogPS log value of permeability.surface area

QSAR quantitative structure activity relationships

PC phosphatidylcholine

DPPC dipalmitoylphosphatidylcholine

DPHYPC diphytanoylphosphatidylcholine

POPC 1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphatidylcholine

DLPC dilauroyl phosphatidylcholine

DOPSE 1,2-dioleoyl phosphatidylserine

POPC 1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphatidylcholine

QM quantum mechanics

PSA molecular polar surface area

$\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  water desolvation free energy

$\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  solvation free energy in n-octanol, or lipophilicity

V molecular volume in n-octanol

D dipole moment in water

SEE standard error of the estimate (logPS)

$R^2$  regression correlation coefficient

## **Introduction**

One of the biggest challenges of developing therapeutic agents for the treatment of neurodegenerative disorders is the blood-brain barrier (BBB). Effective drug delivery means that the BBB needs to be circumvented to achieve adequate drug doses in the brain. It has been noted that 98% of drugs fail in clinical trials due to inadequate BBB permeability [1].

The BBB plays an important role in the homeostasis, or maintenance of the central nervous system CNS, by controlling the movement of nutrients and toxins to and from the CNS. Drugs that have non-CNS targets need to have characteristics that prevent transport across the BBB to avoid unwanted side effects.

The BBB is a highly selective permeable cellular phospholipid protein bilayer barrier that separates the circulating blood from the brain extracellular fluid in the CNS. The blood–brain barrier is composed of capillary endothelial cells, which are connected by tight junctions with an extremely high electrical resistivity of at least  $0.1 \Omega \cdot m$ . The BBB also includes a thick basement membrane and astrocytic endfeet. The blood–brain barrier allows the passage of water, some gases, and lipid soluble molecules by passive diffusion, as well as the selective transport of molecules such as glucose and amino acids that are crucial to neural function. The BBB also protects the brain from many common bacterial infections. Antibodies are too large to cross the blood–brain barrier, and only certain antibiotics are able to pass.

Compounds cross the BBB by a variety of mechanisms [2-6]:

- 1) *Trans-membrane or trans-cellular passive non-saturable diffusion*: usually molecules with high lipophilicity and low molecular size can passively diffuse across the BBB in the direction of the concentration gradient, without the input of

energy. Paracellular diffusion is usually negligible because of the tight junctions between cells.

- 2) *Active saturable transporters* are integral membrane proteins (ATP dependent or ATP independent) which can transport drugs across the BBB against the concentration gradient. There are two types of transporters: (a) carrier mediated transporters, and (b) active efflux transporters (eg p-glycogen) which carry drugs and other compounds out of the brain. There are two classes of membrane transport proteins: carrier proteins, which carry specific molecules across, and channel proteins, which form a narrow pore through which ions can pass. Channel proteins carry out passive transport, in which ions travel spontaneously down their gradients. Some carrier proteins mediate passive transport (also called *facilitated diffusion*), while others can be coupled to a source of energy to carry out active transport, in which a molecule is transported against its concentration gradient. *Facilitated diffusion* is a process of spontaneous passive transport which does not require ATP energy, and differs from passive diffusion in relying on binding between the drug and carrier protein or membrane embedded channel, and it is a saturable process which is more reliant on temperature dependent binding processes than passive diffusion. The main role of the drug transporters is carrying the drugs and other xenobiotics into and out of the brain, and they are integral to other cell processes such as inflammation, differentiation of immune cells, cell detoxification, lipid trafficking, hormone secretion and development of stem cells.
- 3) *Endocytosis and exocytosis* whereby substances (proteins etc) are engulfed by the membrane and pass through the cell by vesicles and released on the other side.
- 4) *Extracellular pathways*.

### Important molecular properties associated with BBB permeability:

Pajouhesh [6] has reviewed various retrospective classification databases in the literature to determine the common attributes and their ranges that facilitate BBB permeability:

- 1) Experimental in vivo measures of permeability: log BB (which is a steady state equilibrium measure of the drug partitioning in the blood or brain) or log PS (obtained from in situ brain perfusion studies, usually using rats, is a kinetic rate measure of the volume cleared per unit time). An effective permeability  $>1 \times 10^{-6}$  cm/sec is considered a lower limit.
- 2) Lipophilicity has a positive correlation with ability to cross BBB: usually  $\log P_{(o/w)}$  for neutral compounds, with a minimal hydrophobicity ( $C_{log} > 5$ ).
- 3) Hydrogen bonding of polarity has a negative correlation with ability to cross BBB: indicators include Abraham coefficients, or the number of acidic and basic atoms, or number of H-bond donor atoms  $< 3$ , and number of H-bond acceptor atoms  $< 7$
- 4) Molecular weight  $< 450$ , though there are exceptions [5]
- 5) Molecular topological polar surface area (TPSA):  $< 60-70 \text{ \AA}^2$
- 6) Molecular shape: spherical shape preferred over rod shape, increased branching shows negative correlation with ability to cross BBB: McGowan characteristic volume for molecular size
- 7) Molecular flexibility has a positive correlation with ability to cross BBB, with the number of rotatable bonds being  $< 8$
- 8) The concentration of uncharged chemical species in water at the physiological pH level is critical, with the estimated pKa range for BBB permeability being 4-10 [7]

or 7.5-10.5 [6] The presence of a positive charge at pH 7-8, or compounds with a tertiary N atom, tend to enhance BBB permeability [10]. Strong acids, including carboxylic acids, and bases are generally not easily transported across the BBB.

- 9) Metabolic stability with >80% remaining after 1 hour, since a high metabolic rate would remove the drug rapidly from the blood plasma.
- 10) Not being a high-affinity serum albumin ligand ( $K_d < 10\mu\text{M}$ ), since this would decrease the effective concentration of the drug in blood plasma.

Statistical (multiple linear regression) quantitative structure activity relationships

(QSAR) models: The major descriptors [6-14] found to be important in QSAR models (which predominantly seek correlations with logBB) are:

- 1) Lipophilicity usually expressed as ClogP, has been found to be a critical factor relating to permeability. ClogP has a median value of 2.5 for successful CNS drugs. Alternatively, logD should be between 0-3 for smaller compounds.
- 2) It has been suggested that the molecular weight (MW) should be below 400-600 for successful CNS drugs (lower than the MW of drugs undergoing oral absorption. The mean MW for marketed CNS drugs is 310, whereas the median for orally active drugs is 377.
- 3) All the QSAR models include hydrogen bonding, either as polarity, polar surface area (PSA), hydrogen bond donor or acceptor coefficients (Abraham coefficients), or counting heteroatoms (O, N atoms) capable of hydrogen bonding. Generally CNS drugs tend to have lower PSA values than other drugs, usually falling within the range 60-90 Å<sup>2</sup>. There is also a trade-off relationship between polarity or PSA of a molecule and lipophilicity for larger organic compounds, where the polar component is counter balanced by the hydrophobic component of the molecule.

- 4) The consistent finding in QSAR modelling shows that lipophilicity is positively correlated, PSA is negatively correlated, hydrogen bonding is negatively correlated, and molecular size (or molecular weight) is negatively correlated to permeability. [6-14] There is some evidence that molecular volume might show a parabolic relationship to permeability, since a smaller volume positively increases diffusion, but a larger molecular volume might also increase lipophilicity, which is positively correlated with permeability. [14]
- 5) The order of permeability appears to be active uptake compounds > passive diffusion compounds > efflux compounds (by about one logPS unit in each case), and the effect of molecular charge for logPS passive diffusion was basic compounds > neutral compounds > acidic compounds. [15]
- 6) Much of the effort in QSAR studies have focussed an *finding and improving statistical* relationships between logBB and variables such as lipophilicity, PSA, molecular size etc. However, given that the error in logBB (and logPS) experimental measurements is quite large, and a widely diverse range of compounds which have very different chemical structures, size, polarity etc have been examined, improvements in correlation coefficients may not necessarily be real (outliers may only be gross outliers). There are also significant errors in variables such as lipophilicity, polarity, size etc. Multiple regression analysis is particularly error prone where logBB is correlated with 3-5 variables. There is a significant error in the logPS values themselves, since experimental conditions can vary amongst different studies. It is suggested that only a molecular mechanistic approach which starts from a sound physical-chemical basis on a structurally similar range of compounds can be meaningfully correlated with experimental permeability measures such as logPS. In silico methods based on



QM methods can help reduce errors in molecular properties, and errors from wet chemical methods used in logP lipophilicity measurements.

Huwlyer et al [16] recently used a decision tree analysis of 153 log PS data to find the dominant descriptors of permeability were lipophilicity (aLogP) and charge (PSA), with molecular geometry and connectivity also important factors. Their model also appeared to account for active transport as well as passive diffusion permeability. The property ranges used were: molecular weight 46–1201 Da, partition coefficient (aLogP)  $-4.3$  to  $-2.4$ , polar surface area (PSA)  $3.2$ – $279 \text{ \AA}^2$ , rotatable bonds count 0–18, hydrogen bond acceptor count 1–23. A broad distinction was found between positive (CN<sub>Sp</sub><sup>+</sup>) and negative (CN<sub>Sp</sub><sup>−</sup>) molecules (compounds with logPS values  $\geq -2$  and  $\leq -3$ , respectively, with logPS values between  $-2.1$  and  $-2.9$  were exempt from consideration). Huwlyer's model is generally consistent with the previous regression QSAR models, but includes a broader range of physiochemical properties, and the analysis is not constrained to parameters that are used in QSAR regression models.

A significant issue relating to the many QSAR studies of BBB permeability is the distinction between passive diffusion and active transport processes. It is not clear how many studies have made the distinction, since these two broad categories involve very different mechanisms. Recent work has shown that many of the higher molecular weight (volume) permeants utilize active transport mechanisms, such that true passive diffusion is not common. [1-6,8,38]

The characteristics of the BBB itself clearly are dominant in any mechanistic considerations of permeability by drugs or other compounds such as amino acids, etc. One important factor which affects the passage of highly polar and charged species is the **dipole potential** of the lipid bilayer membrane, [17-24] which has a

phosphatidylcholine (PC) head attached to a long chain fatty acid bilayer. Charged molecules can modify the membrane dipole potential by electrostatically interacting with the BBB membrane by attraction or repulsion. Positively charged molecules interact with the membrane, causing the  $N^+$  end of the head group to move towards the water phase, away from the lipid membrane surface. Conversely negative charged molecules cause the  $N^+$  end of the head group to move towards to the lipid surface. By changing the angle of the dipole with respect to the membrane surface, the membrane potential is altered. *Alteration of the membrane potential affects the permeability of charged ions through the BBB.* Exactly how charged and polar species interact with the BBB is unknown, but using model lipid bilayer membranes such as DPPC (dipalmitoylphosphatidylcholine) or DPHYPC (diphytanoylphosphatidylcholine) the membrane potential has been measured at 243 +/- 4 and 228 +/- 5 mV respectively. [19] However while *formally* charged lipophilic molecules such as the tetraphenylborate anion and tetraphenylphosponium cation interact with PC lipid membranes (possibly because high charge dispersal to the phenyl rings allows the dominant molecular lipophilicity to facilitate passive diffusion through the membrane), uncharged species such as phloretin also interact with the PC lipid membranes. The suggested interaction between phloretin (which is known to lower the membrane potential) and PC lipid bilayers, is a hydrogen bond between the phloretin and the P=O of the phospholipid, or the C=O of the lipid ester. [18,24] Charged species, including zwitterionic species such as amino acids such as glycine, alanine etc at the physiological pH 7.4 of blood serum can interact with the phospholipid membrane which can sense the charge on the interacting species [21] or by affecting the capacitance of the membrane and causing electromechanical changes in the membrane [22], or other similar electrodynamic processes [23]. These

electromechanical processes are related to the thermal fluctuation of defects, or small mobile free volumes in the hydrocarbon phase of membranes which might allow passage of small molecules through the membranes. [25] A molecular dynamics study [43] of three adamantanes with a model PC lipid bilayer membrane (POPC, 1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphatidylcholine) has shown that the protonated species interact with the PS lipid head group, creating a deformation of the membrane. The positively charged ammonium group faces the negatively charged phosphate moiety, and remain in this orientation until the adamantanes reach the centre of the lipid bilayer, then flips to face the PC headgroup of the other lipid leaflets. By computing the  $pK_a$  as a function of lipid depth, it was concluded that *deprotonation* occurs, although it is unclear whether deprotonation occurred in the bulk solution or after initial adsorption into the interface region. This work will be shown to support a “preorganization” desolvation - dipole process prior to initial adsorption.

There are three separate potentials involved at the blood – membrane interface: (1) the transmembrane potential,  $\Delta\psi$ , is the potential difference between the aqueous solutions on either side of the membrane. It arises from concentration differences of ions; (2) the surface potential,  $\psi_s$ , is the potential difference between the membrane surface and the aqueous bulk. It arises from fixed charges at the membrane/water interface, affecting the negatively charged head groups of lipid molecules; (3) the dipole potential,  $\psi_D$ , is the potential difference between the center of the bilayer and the membrane/water interface. It follows that any relationship between a charged (or highly polar) species and the BBB membrane potentially involves all three types of potentials which importantly includes water molecules as well as the drug or other physiologically important molecules. Cafiso [24] has suggested that a significant

proportion of changes to the dipole potential of lipid membranes may involve electrodynamic alignment of the dipoles of bound water molecules, as well as the dipoles of charged drugs.

The importance of the membrane dipole potential for charged, zwitterionic, or highly polar neutral molecules (phloretin) in permeating the BBB membrane indicates an important feature of CNS drugs may be the dipole moment in water. Also it has been recently shown that the free energy of solvation is a dominant factor in deciding the ability of statins to cross the BBB. [26] The binding strengths of water molecules to the BBB membrane and the drug is expected to be crucial, if desolvation of charged or highly polar species are required before permeation can occur. Both passive diffusion and active transport processes through the membrane cells would be affected, particularly if the aqueous hydration strengths are energetically significant. Active transport processes require carrier proteins, so desolvation would be required to facilitate protein-drug interaction.

#### Objects of this study:

1. To examine the molecular basis of BBB permeability focussing on the characteristics of both molecules that can potentially permeate, and models of the BBB membrane itself such as DPPC (dipalmitoylphosphatidylcholine), DPHYPC (diphytanoyl phosphatidylcholine), DLPC (dilauroyl phosphatidylcholine), DOPSE (1,2-dioleoyl phosphatidylserine), and POPC (1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphatidylcholine) etc.
2. The permeability characteristics of molecules will be examined by quantum mechanical (QM) methods are: the free energies of solvation, molecular volumes, atomic electrostatic charges, dipole moments, and measures of hydrogen bond

donor / acceptor and cavity effects in water. Both passive and active transport processes will be examined.

3. An examination of the membrane potential of the model PC lipid bilayer membranes DPPC, DPHYPC, DLPC and POPC will be undertaken using QM methods to probe how the membrane dipole potential affect the dipole and desolvation of molecules, and hence permeability through the BBB.
4. LogPS experimental data will be used as the kinetic measure of BBB permeability. While there have been many QSAR investigations of logBB with variables such as lipophilicity, PSA, hydrogen bonding etc, logBB is an equilibrium measure which can be confounded with variables such as drug-blood protein interactions, metabolic disposal, etc. LogPS as a kinetic measure is less affected by these variables.

### **Experimental**

All calculations were carried out using the Gaussian 09 package on optimised structures. Electrostatic potential at nuclei for solutions were calculated using the CHELPG method in Gaussian 09. The atomic charges produced by CHELPG are not strongly dependant on basis set selection. Using the B3LYP level of theory, calculated atomic charges were almost invariant amongst the basis sets 6-31G(d), 6.311(d,p), 6-311+(2d,2p), 6-311G++(3df,3dp) [57,58]. Errors between calculated and experimental dipole moments were 3%. All solvent calculations were at the B3LYP/6-31G\*(6d, 7f) level of theory, using optimised geometries, as this level has been shown to give accurate electrostatic atomic charges, and was used to optimize the IEFPCM/SMD solvent model. Where a solvent study was carried to compare different solvents, the same optimised solute geometry was used. With the 6-31G\* basis set, the SMD model achieves mean unsigned errors of 0.6 - 1.0 kcal/mol in the

solvation free energies of tested neutrals and mean unsigned errors of 4 kcal/mol on average for ions [59]. It has been found that the B3LYP / 6.31G+\* combination gives reasonably accurate PCM and SMD solvation energies for some highly polar polyfunctional molecules, which are not further improved using higher level basis sets [60]. Adding diffuse functions to the 6-31G\* basis set (ie 6-31+\*) had no significant effect on the solvation energies with a difference of ca 1% observed, which is within the literature error range for the IEFPCM/SMD solvent model.

It should be noted that some very low correlation coefficients  $R^2$  are shown in some of the regression equations. These low values are associated with very low slopes, ie the relationships with logPS are quite insensitive, which is a known statistical issue with regression correlations. The standard error of the estimate (logPS), SEE, is a better indicator of the precision of regression equations. In most cases examined, a lack of sufficient logPS observed data make the multiple regression equations less robust than desirable.

Compounds analysed by Liu 2004 [15]: Antipyrine, Caffeine, Threophylline, Threobromine, CP-141938\*, Fluoxetine, Chloroambucil, Colchicine\*, DPDPE\*, Daunomycin\*, Digoxin\*, Dopamine, Glycine, Hypoxanthine, Xanthine, Levodopa\*, Methotrexate, Morphine\*, NFPS, Phenylalanine\*, Phenytoin, SR141716, Quinidine\*, Salicylic Acid, Taurocholic Acid, Valproic Acid, Testosterone. Nine compounds\* were identified as being actively transported across the BBB.

## **Results and Discussion**

It is clear from the many reviews of BBB permeability that drug and physiologically important compounds are primarily dependant on lipophilicity, polarity or charge, hydrogen bonding, and molecular size. In this study, these measures are calculated by QM solvent effects using the solvation free energy  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  for n-octanol as a measure

of lipophilicity, the dipole moments or the calculated atomic charges (CHELPG charges) in water as measures of polarity or molecular charge, and the calculated molecular volumes. This approach has been previously applied to statins. [26]

Unfortunately, even though logP or logD in water–n-octanol (or other partitioning solvent combinations) is widely used to define drug lipophilicity, n-octanol contains 2.18M water in partitioning experiments at equilibrium, so most polar solutes would be solvated by this water, indicating that the log P, or log D values may be suspect. Calculated ClogP values are based on experimental logP values. There are also significant errors in obtaining experimental logP values. It is also clear that n-octanol has significant hydrogen bonding capability, whereas n-octane has none. However, n-octanol has been widely accepted as a membrane bilayer mimicking solvent, where the 2.18M equilibrium water concentration is consistent with the known water levels in cell membrane bilayer cores because of trans-bilayer transport. [27]

It has been previously shown [26] that desolvation effects (as measured by  $\Delta G$ ) can be dominant in BBB permeability of statins. There have been previous QSAR studies of the linear relationship between the free energy of solvation and logBB [28,29] which have suggested that compounds with  $\log BB > 0.3$  cross the BBB, while those with  $\log BB < -1.0$  do not. Importantly, from a screening survey of 8700 CNS drugs, it was found that 96% of CNS active drugs had a  $\Delta G$  higher than -12 kcal/mol. This study examines the desolvation of a wide range of drugs and their logPS permeability, but also concomitantly examines variables such as dipole moment or atomic charge, molecular volume, hydrogen bonding, and solvent cavity effects at the same time.

To gain mechanistic insight into the molecular basis of passive diffusion based permeability through the BBB, a closely related series of alcohols has been examined. Unfortunately the QSAR approach of using a widely diverse range of compounds

does not lend itself to mechanistic interpretation by linear free energy analysis (only statistical inference), as there is no control of molecular variability or transport processes. These results are shown in Table 1. It is clear that there are strong relationships between logPS and  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  (positive), a strong positive relationship with membrane lipophilicity as measured by  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$ , a negative relationship with dipole moment  $D_{\text{water}}$ , and a weaker negative relationship with molecular volume. It is clear that the value for water (and ethylene glycol to a lesser extent) is a clear outlier for the  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  and volume relationships, which is consistent with the known anomalous properties of this unique highly polar solvent. All molecules were geometry optimised to give the lowest energy conformations. There is a weaker negative relationship between logPS and CDS in water. The CDS term is included in the overall  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  term, and is a measure of hydrogen bonding (based on Abraham's coefficients) and cavity effects (creation of a "hole" in the solvent in which to place the solute, plus other cavity interaction effects).

The data is consistent with the following model for BBB permeability:

1. *Desolvation*, the reverse of solvation, of the permeating drug is a dominant negative factor, in view of the large  $\Delta G$  values, and is probably the rate determining step (RDS). ***LogPS = -0.54  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  - 2.96 with  $R^2$  0.79, SEE 0.98 where  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  is the water desolvation free energy (equation 1)***
2. *Lipophilicity* as measured by  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  is significant and highly positively correlated with the permeation through the lipid bilayer. As n-octanol is a proxy for the membrane bilayer, this relationship implies that once desolvation of water has occurred, and the alcohols start to permeate the lipid bilayer, lipophilicity determines the rate of diffusion. ***LogPS = 1.28  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  - 2.83 with  $R^2$  0.80, SEE***



**1.24 where  $\Delta G_{octanol}$  is the solvation free energy in n-octanol, or lipophilicity (equation 2)**

3. The *dipole moment*  $D$  in water is negative correlated, probably due to the effect of the membrane dipole potential as the drug approaches the cell wall. This effect is much smaller than desolvation or lipophilicity.  **$LogPS = -1.40 D + 2.25$  with  $R^2$  0.71, SEE 1.04 where  $D$  is the dipole moment in water (equation 3)**
4. *Molecular volume*  $V$  is negative correlated to permeability, probably due to how well the drug can physically (sterically) enter the lipid bilayer and diffuse through.  **$LogPS = -0.82 V - 41.96$  with  $R^2$  0.41, SEE 1.62 where  $V$  is the molecular volume in n-octanol (water excluded as an outlier) (equation 4).** It should be noted that the alcohols studied here are relatively small in size, which might be expected to favour passive diffusion.

The multiple regression model (**equation 5**) for BBB permeation is:

**$LogPS \sim 0.20 \Delta G_{water} + 1.03 \Delta G_{octanol} - 0.044 D + 0.006 V$  where  $R^2$  0.855, SEE 1.04, F 4.43**

This relationship is only indicative, since there are insufficient data points to be statistically robust. *The linear relationships in 1. to 4. above are more statistically meaningful.*

The model is consistent with previous QSAR models, but puts together the four factors for the first time, particularly using the free energy of desolvation and the dipole moment which have not been previously considered. Hydrogen bonding properties are captured in the solvation/desolvation terms. A dependency on lipophilicity and molecular size is consistent with previous QSAR models. This approach is unique in using a full in silico QM approach.

It should be noted that this model applies to BBB diffusion processes, where the molecular volumes are relatively small (12-77.4 cm<sup>3</sup>/mol), and all compounds are neutral species. If active transport processes are involved, [38] desolvation must still occur prior to any carrier protein-drug interaction, based on the magnitude of  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$ . It is unlikely on energy grounds that a *large* charged molecule could permeate a cell membrane in a manner that smaller ions (eg Na<sup>+</sup>) can enter ATP driven ion pores. Lipophilicity and molecular volume are also likely factors, based again on energy considerations and previous QSAR results. [16,30,38] The dipole moment of the drug is a vector measure of the molecular charge separation, and since protein-drug interaction is essentially an electrostatic interaction, it seems intuitively likely that the dipole of the drug should be an important factor in any drug-protein carrier interaction. Charged and zwitterionic molecules will be influenced by the membrane dipole potential which has a negatively charged PC head group with a positively charged lipid bilayer tail (see section 7 below). So the membrane dipole potential can exert a force on larger charged molecules that might facilitate desolvation processes prior to passive or active transport into the cell membrane, as shown previously shown. [43]

Active transport processes involve a protein-drug interaction where a neutral drug species can electrostatically interact with the carrier protein. Desolvation of water from the drug, which may be in a charged or zwitterionic state in blood plasma at pH 7.4 has to first occur, which is energy expending. Passive transcellular or paracellular diffusion are also favoured by lower charge which increases lipophilicity, so desolvation of charged or zwitterionic species to give a *neutral* species in a lipophilic environment favours passive permeation. By examining the effect of pH on the (active) permeability of D-glucose, L- and D-lactate, and nicotine (passive) it was

found that it is the uncharged species that exhibits much higher permeation rates for both active transport and passive transport. [48]

To test this model, some comparisons have been made with *closely related compounds or series of compounds* which are known to show significant differences in permeability. These tests include:

- 1) **Xanthines**: Xanthine, caffeine, theophylline, theobromine are very closely related drugs structurally differing only in methyl groups substituting hot H atoms, and hypoxanthine is also closely related, but having only one carbonyl group instead of two as in the other xanthines. An analysis shows the following linear relationships exist:

***LogPS = -0.30  $\Delta G_{water}$  + 2.08 with  $R^2$  0.64, SEE 0.48 where  $\Delta G_{water}$  is the water desolvation free energy (equation 6)***

***LogPS = 0.24  $\Delta G_{octanol}$  + 0.24 with  $R^2$  0.64, SEE 0.55 where  $\Delta G_{octanol}$  is the solvation free energy in n-octanol, or lipophilicity (equation 7)***

***LogPS = -0.41 D - 1.11 with  $R^2$  0.30, SEE 0.67 where D is the dipole moment in water (the D of hypoxanthine is an outlier, but is still included in the analysis) (equation 8)***

***LogPS = 0.03 V - 6.22 with  $R^2 = 0.915$ , SEE 0.23 where V is the molecular volume in n-octanol (equation 9)***

These equations 6-9, using only 5 logPS data points and consequently of low statistical robustness, are similar to those equations using the alcohol data (equations 1-4). The main difference is that the relationship with molecular volume (which range from 85 to 147 cm<sup>3</sup>/mol) shows an inverse relationship from that of the much smaller alcohols (which range from 12 to 77.4 cm<sup>3</sup>/mol). This is

consistent with the observation that the relationship between permeability and molecular size has a parabolic relationship. [14]

Despite the less than rigorous statistical basis (because of insufficient logPS data), the *model performs reasonably well in closely related series of compounds being transported by facilitated and passive diffusion processes*. Caffeine, theophylline and hypoxanthine are known to be transported by both active and passive modes. [44-46]

- 2) **Morphine and related derivatives**: Morphine, heroin, codeine and morphine-6-glucuronide (M6G) are all related: heroin has the two hydroxyls of morphine replaced by acetyl groups, but shows a 31-100 fold penetration rate of the BBB compared to morphine. M6G has a glucuronide group substituted for the 6 hydroxyl group of morphine and has a decreased BBB penetration rate of 57 times compared to morphine under *identical* conditions. [39] M6G is the major active metabolite of morphine, and thus heroin, and is responsible for much of the analgesic effect. Codeine which has the phenol hydroxyl group of morphine replaced by a methoxy group penetrates the BBB 10 times faster than morphine. Morphine is actively transported across the BBB by P-glycoprotein. [15] Codeine crosses the BBB by passive paracellular diffusion. [41] The logPS values of morphine, heroin, codeine and M6G are -2.7, -1.2, -1.7, -4.5 respectively. These compounds all exist predominantly as the cations or as a zwitterion (M6G) at physiological pH levels.

Examination of the  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$ ,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$ , D, and V values reveals that the zwitterionic M6G has larger desolvation  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  value (49.0 kcal/mol greater) and lower lipophilicity for the neutral species as measured by  $-\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  (18.7 kcal/mol) but larger D (by 2.36 times) and larger V (by 1.65 times) which appears to explain

why it permeates 57 times as slow as the morphine ion under identical conditions. M6G also is also 187 times less lipid soluble than morphine as measured by octanol/water partitioning. [39]

Examination of the difference between morphine ion and heroin ion does not reveal such large differences as seen for M6G. Morphine is more soluble in water, and has a smaller desolvation energy 0.4 kcal/mol, a higher neutral lipophilicity by 0.6 kcal/mol, a lower D by 12.4% and a smaller V by 33% than the heroin ion. All these factors suggest that morphine should permeate faster than heroin.

However heroin is *more soluble* than morphine in lipids because of the two acetyl groups. [41] These data suggest the 30.6 (to 100) times faster permeation rate for heroin [15,40] is dominated by the heroin-lipophilic protein solubility.

Comparison of the morphine ion with the codeine ion shows that codeine has a smaller desolvation energy by 1.9 kcal/mol, a higher neutral lipophilicity by 0.7 kcal/mol, a higher D by 6.1% and a larger V by 2.5%, which is consistent with the observed difference in logPS.

In summary, morphine, heroin, codeine and M6G which are transported across the BBB by active and passive processes appear to be consistent with the developed transport model when solubility is taken into account.

- 3) **Antipyrine and iodoantipyrine** have experimental logPS values of -2.0 and -1.1 respectively, although the difference is only an I atom substituting for a H atom. The  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for antipyrine is lower by 0.9 kcal/mol (therefore requiring a lower desolvation energy, which is a positive factor for permeation),  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  is lower by 0.4 kcal/mol (therefore less lipophilic which is a negative factor for permeation), the dipole moment in water is lower by 0.3D (which is a positive factor for permeation), and the molecular volume is larger by 19% in n-octanol

(which is a negative factor for permeation) compared to iodoantipyrine.

Apparently the greater molecular volume in octanol and increased lipophilicity override the desolvation and dipole effects to make iodopyrine permeate faster..

- 4) **Urea and thiourea** have experimental logPS values of -3.8 and -3.4 respectively, although the difference is only an S atom substituting for a O atom. The  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for urea is higher by 2.2 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  is lower by 0.3 kcal/mol, the dipole moment in water is lower by 0.2D, and the molecular volume is larger by 16% in n-octanol compared to thiourea. The large difference in  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  is due to a greater  $\Delta G_{\text{CDS}}$  for urea, probably due to a greater hydrogen bonding interaction. It appears that the larger desolvation for urea is the main cause of its lower permeation rate.
- 5) **Nicotine** (logPS -1.0) in its protonated form shows a greatly decreased brain uptake index (BUI) from 109 (pH 7.2) to 49 (pH 4.7). [48] The difference in  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for nicotine and the protonated species is 57.5 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  is 53.4 kcal/mol, the dipole moment in water differs by 7.7D, though the molecular volume of nicotine is larger by 12.8% in n-octanol. Similarly, the two N-methyl salts of nicotine (quaternized at either the pyridine or pyrrole N atoms) showed BUI values in rats of 3 compared to nicotine 120 at pH 7.4. The differences in  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for nicotine and the N-methyl species are 59.9 or 45.8 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  are 52.2 or 43.6 kcal/mol, the dipole moments in water differs by 6.6D or 6.5D, and the molecular volumes of nicotine are smaller by 18.5% (pyrrole N-methyl) or larger by 6.6% (pyridine N-methyl) in n-octanol respectively. Overall these data are consistent with the higher passive diffusion uptake index for the neutral nicotine species, clearly demonstrating large desolvation, lipophilicity and dipole factors are operating.

6) **Stereoselectivity of transport across the BBB**: there are many examples of the chirality of drugs affecting their pharmacology, [30] ranging from enantiomeric differences in binding to plasma proteins to transport across the BBB. As these enantiomers have almost identical physical and chemical properties, they represent a good test of any theory being developed for BBB permeability. It is generally thought that the origins of stereoselectivity are electrostatic in origin, possibly during protein binding which involves conformational selectivity in the active transport process. [30] Several examples of stereoselective permeation have been investigated:

I. 4-Fluoro-L-phenylalanine has a logPS -1.7 compared to 4-fluoro-D-phenylalanine log PS -2.9: The  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for 4-fluoro-L-phenylalanine (zwitterion at pH 7.4) is higher by 0.6 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  neutral species is lower by 1.9 kcal/mol, the dipole moment in water is almost the same, and the molecular volume is smaller by 6.4% in n-octanol than the 4-fluoro-D-phenylalanine zwitterion. These data do not appear consistent with the log PS data, unless the molecular volume term dominates. The  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  value has been used as a proxy for lipophilicity of the membrane bilayer in passive diffusion permeation. However for active transport (by the large amino acid transporter, LAT1 [38]) where a drug-carrier protein interaction is involved, it is unclear whether the carrier protein-drug interaction is hydrophobic driven, or hydrophilicly driven where hydrogen bonding dominates. The experimental result could be explicable if the positive desolvation and smaller molecular volume is supported by a positive contribution to the permeability rate by a lower  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  implying that the protein-drug interaction has a dominant hydrophilic rate determining effect.

- II. D & L amino acids: The transport of amino acids across the BBB are by active transport processes, [31-32] Using the brain uptake index (BUI) as a rate measure of BBB permeability, it was found that the L-enantiomers of aspartic and glutamic showed higher BUI than the D-enantiomers. The  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for L-aspartic acid (anion) is higher by 1.1 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  for the neutral species is lower by 2.4 kcal/mol, the dipole moment in water is identical, and the molecular volume is virtually the same in n-octanol than the D-aspartic acid anion. The  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for L-glutamic acid (anion) is lower by 0.3 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  (neutral species) is the same, the dipole moment in water is higher by 1.3D, and the molecular volume is smaller by 18% in n-octanol than the D-glutamic acid anion. As an organic anion transporter is the active transporter, these data appear inconsistent with the simple model, and show the same pattern as that for 4-fluoro-phenylalanine. It appears that active transport of neutral amino acids by LAT1 is clearly more complex than for passive diffusion transport.
- III. Lactic acid: the L-enantiomer of lactic acid showed higher BUI than the D-enantiomers. [31] Lactic acid is predominantly transported across the BBB by the monocarboxylic acid transporter type 1, MCT1. [38] The  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for L-lactic acid (anion) is higher by 3.2 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  (neutral species) is higher by 1.0 kcal/mol, the dipole moment in water is lower by 2.8D, and the molecular volume is smaller by 3% in n-octanol than the D-lactic acid anion. These data are consistent with the model, and the smaller molecular size is consistent with *facilitated* diffusion transport. It has been previously shown that the neutral species that penetrates the BBB fastest [48] which is



consistent with desolvation being an important “preorganization” factor for facilitated transport, before permeation initiates.

IV. Glucose: D-glucose is transported across the BBB by the GLUT-1 transporter about 100 times faster than its stereoisomer L-glucose (logPS 2.5 versus 5.0 respectively). The only differences between the stereoisomers are a larger molecular volume in water and octanol by 34.4 and 8.6% for the open chain forms of D- and L-glucose. This situation is reversed for the D- and L-pyranose form. This apparent anomaly must be due to a stereospecific glucose-GLUT-1 interaction as it is not explainable on the basis of any “preorganization” processes related to changes from the bulk solvent (blood serum) or prior interaction between glucose-BBB before permeation of the BBB start to occur (eg desolvation, lipophilic solubility, or dipole). Glucose transport at the BBB appears to be dependent on and regulated by a serial chain of membrane-bound and intracellular transporters and enzymes (permeases that change their conformations during the transport processes). [47]

V. Baclofen: R-Baclofen (a CNS muscle relaxant) was shown to have a rat BBB transport rate 4.3 times as fast as the S-isomer, probably by using the large neutral amino acid carrier, since it is a zwitterion at pH 7.4 and has low lipophilicity. [34] The  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for R-baclofen (zwitterion) is higher by 0.7 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  neutral is higher by 2.5 kcal/mol, the dipole moment in water is higher by 3.5D, and the molecular volume is higher by 4% in n-octanol than the S-baclofen zwitterion. As active transport (large neutral amino acid transporter) is involved, these data are difficult to interpret unambiguously using the passive transport model.

- VI. Mefloquine: Mefloquine is a chiral neurotoxic antimalarial agent showing stereoselective brain uptake in humans and rats. It is a substrate and an inhibitor of the efflux protein P-glycoprotein. (-)Mefloquine had a lower blood and brain apparent volume of distribution and a lower efflux clearance from the brain, resulting in a larger brain-blood ratio compared to (+)mefloquine. [35] The  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for (-) mefloquine (cation at pH 7.4) is higher by 2.2 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  neutral is higher by 1.0 kcal/mol, the dipole moment in water is lower by 0.5D, and the molecular volume is smaller by 13% in n-octanol than the (+)-mefloquine cation. The data is ambiguous as the higher desolvation energy and smaller volume favour the faster permeation by the (+) stereoisomer, but the  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  and D support a faster rate for the (-) stereoisomer.
- VII. Ritalin: Ritalin is widely prescribed for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). The d-threo isomer is the pharmacologically active species, but the l-threo isomer crosses the BBB faster by a factor of about 2:1 to 5:1. [36] The  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for l-threo isomer (cation at pH 7.4) is lower by 1.0 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  (neutral) is lower by 1.0 kcal/mol, the dipole moment in water is higher by 0.4D, and the molecular volume is larger by 15% in n-octanol than the d-threo isomer cation. As the active monoamine transporter is involved [32] the data is ambiguous in terms of which stereoisomer should permeate faster.
- VIII. Quinine (an antipyretic, anti-inflammatory, antimalarial) logPS -2.6 and quinidine (an antirhythmic) logPS -3 are stereoisomers. The  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  for quinine (cation at pH 7.4) is lower by 0.2 kcal/mol,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  neutral is almost identical, the dipole moment in water is lower by 0.3D, and the

molecular volume is larger by 3% in n-octanol than the quinidine cation.

Active transport is probably involved in view of the large molecular sizes.

- IX. It is apparent from the experimental data above (6.I to 6.VIII) that there are relatively small differences in the desolvation  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$ , lipophilicity  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$ , dipole moment in water, and molecular volume in n-octanol for all the stereoisomers examined. *There is no consistent pattern since all these examples involve active transport processes, where there are differences in the trans-membrane proteins and their interactions with different drugs.* In the case of glucose, it is clear that a specific stereoselective active transport process prevails, which is not dependent at all on any “pre-organisation” of the permeant prior to commencement of permeation into the BBB. The test data where *facilitated diffusion* is involved for smaller sized permeants (xanthines, ureas, antipyrines, lactic acids) appear to support the four factor passive diffusion model (equations 1-5).
- 7) The permeability model developed above assumes that *n-octanol is a proxy for the lipid bilayer membrane of the BBB*, and is a measure of lipophilicity of the BBB. For charged or zwitterionic species, it has been assumed that it is the *neutral species* that passively permeates or is actively transported by a carrier protein, and so  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  is calculated for the neutral species. Also it has been shown above that the dipole moment of the drug is one of the four critical factors in the permeation model for the BBB. To test the assumption about n-octanol as a valid proxy for lipophilicity in the BBB, and to explore physical mechanisms that explain why the dipole moment should be a critical factor in permeation, the model lipid bilayer membranes, DPPC (dipalmitoylphosphatidylcholine), DPHYPC (diphytanoylIPC), dilauroyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (DLPC), 1,2-dioleoyl

phosphatidylserine (DOPSE) and 1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphatidylcholine, (POPC) and their interactions with various compounds have been examined.

- I. DPHYPC was constrained to a structure whereby the two parmitoyl ester chains are as close to parallel as possible (after molecular mechanics optimisation) and pointing away from the phosphatidylcholine (PC) head group, to resemble as closely as possible the PC lipid bilayer of a cell membrane. The relationship between  $\Delta G$  for the DPHYPC and n-octanol for the range of alcohol solvents used to develop the permeation model, plus other alcohols up to 1-decanol, shows that a strong linear relationship is observed:

$$\Delta G_{DPHYPC} = 9.34 \Delta G_{Octanol} - 6.98 \quad (R^2 \ 0.976, \ SEE \ 0.75) \quad (equation \ 10)$$

Water, and to a lesser extent, ethylene glycol, are outliers, presumably related to multiple hydrogen bonding effects. This result indicates that n-octanol is a good proxy for a cell membrane bilayer.

- II. The electrical properties of the BBB have been examined by calculating the charge distribution of the model membranes in water, all of which have a zwitterionic phosphatidylcholine PC head group and long bilayer fatty acid tails. It is known that DOPSE which has a negatively charged PC head group moves against the direction of an applied electric field. [23] Conversely, the model zwitterionic lipid bilayer membrane DLPC in the zwitterionic buffer 3-(N-morpholino)propanesulfonic acid (MOPS) at pH 7, becomes positively charged in an applied electric field. The addition of the ion  $Br^-$  to DLPC vesicles resulted in a negative charge on DLPC. Using X-ray techniques, it was found that the buffer solutes (MOPS etc) enter the inter-lamellar space

and modify (possibly by binding) interlayer interactions. [23] These experimental results are consistent with electrostatic atomic charge models of DOPSE, DLPC and DLPC-MOPS which clearly show that the PC head group is overall negatively charged, and the bilayer lipid tail is slightly positively charged. For example, DOPSE has a overall -1.115V PC charge, and a 0.04V lipid tail. The DOPSE PC group has a charge of -3.69V on the zwitterionic N and PO<sub>4</sub> atoms. (Similarly, the negatively charged DLPC-Br where the Br<sup>-</sup> ion interacts with the P atom at a distance of 3.3Å has charge of -3.60V on the zwitterionic N and PO<sub>4</sub> atoms.) It is likely that charge in an electric field would be determined by this charge. DLPC-MOPS interacting through a weak electrostatic bond 2.6Å between the P atom of DLPC and the O of the SO<sub>3</sub> group of MOPS has an overall -1.38V PC charge, and 0.35V lipid tail. The DLPC-MOPS PC group has a charge of -1.89V on the zwitterionic N and PO<sub>4</sub> atoms. It appears that the difference of -1.8V between the DOPSE and DLPC-MOPS zwitterion charges is instrumental in deciding the overall movement in an electrical field. Movement in an electrical field would be a complex interplay of charge driven ionic factors for all cationic and anionic species present in solution. The dipole moments in water of DOPSE, DLPC-Br and DLPC-MOPS are 38.5D, 31.0D and 37.1D respectively. These data all suggest that the BBB membrane would electrically interact with charged species and hence affect trans-membrane transport.

- III. It has been shown that organic ions such as tetraphenylborate TPB<sup>-</sup> and tetraphenylphosphonium TPP<sup>+</sup> can adsorb to and permeate lipid membranes owing to their hydrophobic nature and the strong delocalisation of charge to

the phenyl rings. [24]  $\text{TPB}^-$  permeates about  $10^6$  times faster than  $\text{TPP}^+$  and the difference in the free energy of binding to the membrane is about -5 kcal/mol. Hydrophobic anions generally bind more strongly than hydrophobic cations, and permeate through membranes faster. [17,19,24] The positive dipole potential of the mouse BBB restrict the permeability of cationic compounds by active transport mechanisms, but neutral compounds like phloretin or anionic species like  $\text{TPB}^-$  can enhance the permeability of cationic species. [19] DPHYPC- $\text{TPB}^-$  (where the B weakly interacts with the P at  $4.3\text{\AA}$ ) has been compared to DPHYPC- $\text{TPP}^+$  (where the P of  $\text{TPP}^+$  weakly interacts with the O of the  $\text{PO}_4$  group at  $2.6\text{\AA}$ ): the dipole moments are 39.9D and 50.4D respectively, and  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  are -117.4 and -115.9 kcal/mol respectively. The DPHYPC- $\text{TPB}^-$  PC group has a charge of -4.67V on the zwitterionic N and  $\text{PO}_4$  atoms, compared to DPHYPC- $\text{TPP}^+$  -5.1V. These data support the experimental greater permeation rate and of  $\text{TPB}^-$  since the charge separation (as per the D values) is far greater for the DPHYPC- $\text{TPP}^+$ , as well as the lower salvation energy and N and  $\text{PO}_4$  charges of the DPHYPC- $\text{TPB}^-$ . These data support the importance of an electrostatic relationship affecting the interaction between drugs and other permeants with the membrane potential, and consequently BBB permeability. Certain polar neutral compounds, like phloretin, and ionic compounds that have a high lipophilicity (and highly dispersed formal charge) can facilitate and permeate PC lipid membranes, so it is likely that similar relationships may apply to the BBB.

An important aspect of how the membrane potential can interact with permeants is the concept of *voltage sensing*. [21] Charged molecules can

reorient in the electric field of the membrane (particularly at the negatively charged PC head of the membrane), as has been found in voltage gated ion channels. Such a process might facilitate desolvation of permeants, as previously discussed above. [26, 43] *This process is particularly important for active transport processes.*

Carpenter et al [61] have shown from molecular dynamics studies that an initial stabilizing interaction of up to 3 kcal/mol occurs as the drug moves from the bulk solvent to the PC headgroup in the model membrane DOPC (about 2.5-3.0 nm from the bilayer centre). The most stabilising region is about 1.0-1.5 nm from the bilayer centre, which reflects the hydrophobic stabilization as the drug penetrates the bilayer. Solvation energies were not explicitly investigated.

IV. Adamantidine has been used in the treatment of Parkinson's disease and influenza. It crosses the BBB  $\log PS -3.1$ . Molecular dynamics modelling of the interaction of adamantidine with the model membrane POPC, 1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphatidylcholine, has shown that adamantidine firstly interacts with the negatively charged PC head group via the charged ammonium group, and is deprotonated as it penetrates the centre of the lipid bilayer. [43] This work has focussed on the desolvation of charged or zwitterionic species in blood serum at pH 7.4 *before* permeants enter the cell membrane, so the neutral species is the permeating species. This is based on energy considerations since the desolvation of charged or zwitterionic species is highly energy intensive. The interaction of the dipole moment of permeants is also critical to the process of desolvation and hence permeation. A QM study of the adamantidine-POPC interaction shows:

(a) the difference in desolvation energy between the protonated species and neutral species is 60 kcal/mol in water.

(b) the zwitterionic species in water can interact with the phosphate group via an ionic  $\text{NH}_3^+ \cdots \text{OP}(\text{O})^-$  interaction or with the carbonyl group of the ester fatty acid via a  $\text{NH}_3^+ \cdots \text{O}=\text{C}$ - hydrogen bonding interaction. The dipole moment of the {adamantidine-POPC} complex in water increases from 28.9D to 49.4D, (compared to the value for uncomplexed POPC of 27.3D). This dramatic change indicates that the dipole of POPC (and all the PC membrane models studied here) which is oriented from the negatively charged PC head group towards the positively charged lipid bilayer, has a greatly increased negatively charged PC head group upon complexing with the adamantidine zwitterion. Such a large energy change could electromechanically distort the membrane to facilitate permeation [21-25,43], as well as facilitate desolvation, since shedding hydrogen bonded water molecules is a means of lowering the energy and stabilising the complex.

(c) permeation of the neutral adamantidine species into the lipid bilayer was studied by inserting the adamantidine molecule between the two lipid chains in two orientations, one with the  $-\text{NH}_2$  moiety facing towards the PC head group, and the other with the  $-\text{NH}_2$  group facing away from the PC head group. The dipole moments for the orientations are 23.9D and 30.4D respectively in octanol, (or 20.7D and 24.9D no solvent). This large difference of 6.5D clearly illustrates the energy gradient as adamantidine permeates the lipid bilayer of POPC and then flips orientation and starts to interact with the charged head group of the other lipid leaflet that comprises



the cell membrane. This finding is in accord with the previous MD study of POPC-adamantidine permeation. [43] The magnitude of the change in dipole is large illustrating substantial energy changes to the lipid bilayer structure during permeation, presumably by electromechanical forces. [17-25,43]

(d) Adamantidine and other positively charged species can interact with either or both of the phosphate group of the PC head group or the carbonyl group of the lipid ester chain. It is also possible that interaction with the carbonyl could be via the neutral species, as the carbonyl group is directly attached to the lipid chains, so close to being in a hydrophobic environment. The dipole moments for the neutral species are 27.2 and 27.3D in water and octanol, and for the charged species are 28.9 and 28.3D respectively. These small differences suggests that the neutral species preferentially with the carbonyl group. However the change in membrane potential by interaction with the carbonyl is clearly far smaller than the interaction with the phosphate group, so significant electromechanical changes in the membrane are probably not induced by permeant-carbonyl group interaction.

V. The diffusion of small nonelectrolytes through planar lipid bilayer membranes (egg phosphatidylcholine-decane) has been measured. [20] It was found by using an *electrical (membrane voltage) technique* to measure permeability that very small molecules (MW<50) diffused much faster than those with higher molecular weights, and the overall data was consistent with a solubility-diffusion model in the lipid bilayer (acting as a soft polymer), as the permeabilities were inversely related to molecular weight and strongly related to hydrophobicity of the solvent. In so far as the egg phosphatidylcholine-decane is a reasonable proxy for the BBB cell

membranes, this experimental technique provide support to the notion that membrane potentials are important for BBB permeation.

- VI. Given the importance of zwitterions (amino acids, some drugs etc) at physiological pH 7.4 levels, and the known effect of the membrane dipole potentials on permeation of cell membranes, **it can be concluded that the dipole moment is an important characteristic of the ability of drugs (or other physiologically important molecules) to cross the BBB.** To date there appears to be no consideration in the literature of this factor.
- 8) The passive diffusion model (equations 1-5) developed above was derived for alcohols and glycols from methanol to 1-butanol, as the logPS data for higher alcohols is not available. However there have been extensive studies of the effects of alcohols on cell membranes and the CNS of rats. [50-55] There is no dispute that alcohols modulate lipid bilayer properties. There is a chain length effect on alcohol-induced modulation of lipid bilayers, often referred to as a “cut-off” effect (where the increasing potency with increasing chain length effects eventually levels off, or decreases). These modulations can be temporary or permanent. These “cut-off” effects are observed for many systems, from the formation of the photoactivated form of rhodopsin in 1-palmitoyl-2-oleyl-phosphatidylcholine lipid vesicles which occurs at chain length <6, the anaesthetic effects on tadpoles which reaches a maximum at C10, *to the ataxia (intoxication) effects on rats which maximizes at C6-C7.* [50] To understand the molecular mechanisms which underpin equation 5, several studies using the PC lipid bilayer model membrane DPHYPC have been undertaken:
- I. A physiochemical modification of the membrane protein-lipid interface is known to occur which is based on a hydrogen bonding interaction between

the alcohols and the phosphate moiety of the PC head of the membrane bilayer. [51,52,54,55] A strong inverse relationship was found between the effective dose that produced ataxia and the membrane buffer partition coefficient (or logP) up to the cut-off point. [52,52] The “cut-off” effect could also be due to steric effects between the alcohol and membrane bilayer. It was found that short-chain alcohols (1-hexanol and shorter) cause volume increases when partitioning into dimyristoylphosphatidylcholine bilayers, whereas longer alcohols cause volume decreases. These cut-off effects tend to appear when the alcohol chain length is approximately equal to half the acyl chain length of the bilayer-forming lipids. [56]

II. The vesicle-forming lipid 1,2-dierucoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (DCPC) was used with a fluorophore to determine the bilayer-modifying potency ( $D^*$ ) of a series of alcohols (where  $D^*$  is the concentration at which the alcohol doubled the quenching rate). [52] The data are shown in Table 2 along with the calculated  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  values for DPHYPC (DPHYPC is similar to DCPC but has a saturated C20 acyl chain instead of the C22 acyl chain with a double bond at C13-C14). *A linear relationship exists between  $-\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  and  $D^*$  up to the “cut-off” at 1-heptanol.* Conversely a linear relationship exists between  $-\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  and  $\log D^*$  :

$$-\Delta G_{\text{octanol}} = -0.40 \log D^* - 8.16 \quad (R^2 \ 0.881, \text{SEE } 0.18) \quad (\text{equation } 11)$$

It is also clear that steric effects are active for the 3 alcohols which are not straight chain alcohols with a terminal hydroxyl group (2-propanol, 2-butanol, and t-butyl alcohol), which are outliers to the 1-alcohol series. These data are consistent with a steric effect being responsible for the “cut-off” behaviour.

III. In a study of the ability of alcohols to toxically break down or create reversible graded increases in cell membrane permeability in rat liver epithelial cells, it was found that a linear QSAR relationship existed between  $\log(1/LDH50)$  and  $\log P$  as the measure of hydrophobicity. LDH or lactate dehydrogenase release is correlated with the breakdown or change in membrane permeability. The LDH50 values are defined as the concentrations which elicited a 50% increase of LDH50 release relative to the untreated control. [51] These data are shown in Table 2 along with  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  values for DPHYPC. *A linear relationship exists between  $-\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  and LDH50 up to the “cut-off” at 1-pentanol.* Conversely, a linear relationship exists between  $-\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$  and  $\log LDH50$ :

$$-\Delta G_{\text{octanol}} = -0.32 \log LDH50 - 6.99 \quad (R^2 \ 0.938, \text{SEE } 0.09) \quad (\text{equation } 12)$$

IV. The passive diffusion model (equations 1-5) was developed for alcohols up to C5 in length. It is clear from 8.II and 8.III above that the “cut-off” point for alcohols permeating, or structurally modulating, the model PC lipid bilayer membranes is about C5 – C6 in chain length. The  $\log PS$  data are usually derived from rats, and the data discussed above, are all consistent with the experimental ataxia finding in rats which showed a “cut-off” at C6 – C7 in alcoholic chain length. These data are also consistent with the  $\log PS$  model for the xanthines (see 1. above) which permeate the BBB by both passive and facilitated diffusion, and which showed an inverse relationship with molecular volume, (see equation 9) compared to that found for the smaller alcohols (see equation 4). This is consistent with the “cut-off” point seen for alcohols which is controlled by steric forces.

V. These “cut-off” change of mechanism effects for the alcohols-DPHYPC series could possibly be due to a dipole effect, rather than a steric effect which increases as the aliphatic chain length increases. To eliminate this possibility, the relationship between the atomic charges on the phosphate group of the PC moiety and the -C(O)O- of the acyl chain have been examined. The following linear relationships were observed:

The straight chain aliphatic alcohols varied from methanol by one carbon at a time up to 1-decanol. Non-linear aliphatic chains such as 2-propanol, 2-butanol, tertiary-butanol and 2-methyl-1-propanol were clear outliers from the straight chain alcohol relationship. Sum(+) PC charges are the atomic charges in volts on the N and P atom of the PC head group.

Sum(+/-) charges are the sum of atomic charges on the N, PO<sub>4</sub>, and the two oxygens of the two -OC(O)- groups of the acyl chains of DPHYPC. *The sum (+/-) charges is proportional to the dipole moment of DPHYPC in the various alcohols.*

Equation 13:

***Length carbon chain = -203.29 Sum(+) PC charges + 267.69 (R<sup>2</sup> 0.864, SEE 1.19)*** or by omitting methanol as an outlier (probably due to its capacity to form multiple solvation interactions because of its smaller size)

***Length carbon chain = -305.25 Sum(+) PC charges + 398.61 (R<sup>2</sup> 0.942, SEE 0.33)***

Equation 14:

***Length carbon chain = -0.0015 Sum(+/-) charges + 6.0 (R<sup>2</sup> 0.273, SEE 2.74)*** or

***Length carbon chain = 270.27 Sum(+/-) charges + 921.77 (R<sup>2</sup> 0.991, SEE 0.28)*** if methanol is omitted as an outlier

Equation 15:

A linear relationship exists between the straight chain alcohols from ethanol to 1-decanol and the  $\Delta G_{CDS}$  value in kcal/mol (which include hydrogen bonding interactions between the alcohols and DPHYPC, the energy to create a cavity for the solute DPHYPC and other non-electrostatic solute-solvent interactions [59]).

***Length carbon chain = 0.73  $\Delta G_{CDS}$  + 7.59 (R<sup>2</sup> 0.050, SEE 3.13)***

*Or by omitting methanol as an outlier*

***Length carbon chain = 3.90  $\Delta G_{CDS}$  + 17.96 (R<sup>2</sup> 0.969, SEE 0.52)***

These relationships clearly demonstrate that no dipolar interaction nor hydrogen bonding, nor cavity effects between the model membrane and the alcohols is responsible for the “cut-off” effect. The outliers (which all involve alcohols with known steric hindrance solvent effects) to equations 13-15 also reinforce the conclusion that steric effects from incrementally increasing the aliphatic chain length (by one carbon at a time) are clearly responsible for the “cut-off” effect in these alcohols.

### **Analysis of literature logPS QSAR relationships**

Recent studies of BBB permeability relationships [62, 63] have been reanalysed using the four factors identified in this study,  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$ ,  $\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$ , D, and V. Liu 2005 examined how caffeine, theophylline, theobromine, fluoxetine, NFPS and CP-141938 permeated (logPS) the rat BBB and equilibrated in plasma. A physiologically based pharmacokinetic model was used to correlate an in vivo logPS with in situ Log PS (R<sup>2</sup> 0.83). The following relationships were found using Liu’s 2005 data:

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.11 \Delta G_{\text{water}} - 0.89 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.683, \text{SEE } 0.52)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.11 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} - 0.836 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.434, \text{SEE } 0.69)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.002 V - 2.09 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.032, \text{SEE } 0.91)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.28 D - 1.15 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.588, \text{SEE } 0.59)$$

$$\log\text{PS} \sim 0.18 \Delta G_{\text{water}} + 0.36 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} - 0.37 D + 0.02 V - 1.58 \quad (\text{R}^2 = 0.754, \text{SEE } 0.73)$$

Gratton [15] examined the relationship between logPS and antipyrine, 2-propanol, 95005, erythritol, mannitol, sucrose, thymine, ethanol, estradiol, thiourea, urea, and ethylene glycol. The following relationships were found:

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.085 \Delta G_{\text{water}} - 1.49 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.592, \text{SEE } 0.94)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.097 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} - 1.43 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.434, \text{SEE } 1.10)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.002 V - 3.10 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.012, \text{SEE } 1.47)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.08 D - 2.53 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.012, \text{SEE } 1.47)$$

$$\log\text{PS} \sim 0.14 \Delta G_{\text{water}} + 0.38 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} - 0.12 D + 0.02 V - 1.34 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.900, \text{SEE } 0.56)$$

Murikami [15] examined the relationship between logPS and digoxin\*, hypoxanthine, methotrexate, phenylalanine\*\*, quinidine\*, theophylline, valproic acid, mannitol, sucrose, alanine\*\*, cyclosporine A\*, glibencamide, glucose\*\*, iodoantipyrine, quinine, tolbutamide, vinblastine\*, warfarin, cimetidine, vincristine\*, and thiourea.

The compounds\* were considered to be transported by P-gp, and the compounds \*\* were transported by uptake mechanisms. The following relationships were found, but actively transported cyclosporine, digoxin, vinblastin were excluded as clear outliers.

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.041 \Delta G_{\text{water}} - 2.29 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.346, \text{SEE } 0.69)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.043 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} - 2.39 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.247, \text{SEE } 0.74)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.001 V - 3.27 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.001, \text{SEE } 0.86)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.078 D - 3.58 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.053, 0.84)$$

$$\log\text{PS} \sim 0.13 \Delta G_{\text{water}} + 0.27 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} - 0.11 D + 0.01 V - 2.67 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.564, \text{SEE } 0.63)$$

By excluding all the 8 compounds that were identified as being actively transported, the following relationships were found:

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.051 \Delta G_{\text{water}} - 2.14 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.518, \text{SEE } 0.67)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.060 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} - 2.03 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.410, \text{SEE } 0.75)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.001 V - 3.50 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.005, \text{SEE } 0.97)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.157 D - 4.20 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.197, 0.87)$$

$$\log\text{PS} \sim 0.15 \Delta G_{\text{water}} + 0.33 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} + 0.13 D + 0.01 V - 2.84 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.895, \text{SEE } 0.37)$$

The multiple regression relationship has improved significantly with the exclusion of the 8 actively transported compounds. (See experimental section regarding the low  $\text{R}^2$  values)

Liu 2004 [15] examined the relationship between logPS and 28 compounds (see experimental).

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.036 \Delta G_{\text{water}} - 2.09 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.314, \text{SEE } 0.71)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.037 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} - 2.10 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.237, \text{SEE } 0.75)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.002 V - 2.42 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.073, \text{SEE } 0.82)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.06 D - 2.49 \quad (\text{R}^2 = 0.060, \text{SEE } 0.83)$$

$$\log\text{PS} \sim -0.128 \Delta G_{\text{water}} - 0.124 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} - 0.001 D - 0.002 V - 2.26 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.374, \text{SEE } 0.72)$$

By excluding the 9 compounds that were identified as being actively transported, the following relationships were found:

$$\log\text{PS} = -0.054 \Delta G_{\text{water}} - 1.82 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.399, \text{SEE } 0.72)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.046 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} - 1.96 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.196, \text{SEE } 0.83)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.001 V - 2.42 \quad (\text{R}^2 0.073, \text{SEE } 0.82)$$

$$\log\text{PS} = 0.075 D - 2.94 \quad (\text{R}^2 = 0.017, \text{SEE } 0.91)$$



$$\log PS \sim -0.055 \Delta G_{\text{water}} + 0.038 \Delta G_{\text{octanol}} + 0.101 D + 0.006 V - 2.77 \quad (R^2 \text{ 0.678, SEE } 0.58)$$

The multiple regression relationship has improved significantly with the exclusion of the 9 actively transported compounds. (See experimental section regarding the low  $R^2$  values)

By comparing the regression equations derived for the alcohols (equations 1-5), the xanthines (equations 6-9) with those derived from using the Liu 2005, Gratton, Murikama, and Liu 2004 data, it can be seen that a similar pattern emerges. The linear regression equations are more accurate than the multiple regression equations which have less than the optimal data points to be robust. There is a negative dependence on the desolvation from water, a positive dependence on the lipophilicity, and smaller dependencies on molecular volume and dipole moment. The literature relationships are for a diverse and wide range of permeants that tend to cloud systematic structural change (similar to those in linear free energy relationships) which is seen for the alcohols and xanthines series which are more closely structurally comparable. It is clear that including actively transported species in the regression relationships lowers the correlations, indicating that these species are really outliers, or at best increase scatter. Based on the observations above for the actively transported stereoisomers (section 6 above) *it is clear that where any significant binding interaction with transport proteins in the BBB occurs, then no simple relationship with logPS is easily distinguishable.*

It should be noted that some of the literature logPS values are for compounds which exist as charged ions or zwitterions at physiological pH 7.4: these compounds were treated as the solvated neutral species in deriving the regression equations. This implies that it is the desolvation of the neutral species that controls the kinetics, since

the very large  $\Delta G_{\text{water}}$  values for these charged species would effectively preclude any initiation of the permeation process. This situation is possible since there would be both solvated charged and neutral species at pH 7.4.

### **Conclusions**

The permeability of the BBB is dependant on desolvation, lipophilicity, molecular volume and dipole moment. Previous models for BBB permeability have not considered desolvation and dipole moment as critical factors. The model applies to passive diffusion processes, and some facilitated diffusion processes. Passive diffusion transport processes for many common drugs appear to be less common than active transport processes, so BBB permeability models for passive transport may not apply to active transport processes, particularly where complex membrane protein binding processes (eg stereoselectivity) are involved. Model phosphatidylcholine (PC) lipid bilayer membranes have been used to evaluate how charged or polar neutral compounds can interact through their molecular dipoles with the cell membrane to induce electromechanical changes in the cell membrane which facilitate permeation. The free energy of solvation in n-octanol has been shown to be a good measure of membrane lipophilicity by calculating the solvation free energy of a model PC lipid membrane in a series of closely related alcohols. The passive diffusion model for alcohols has been shown to correlate with previous studies of the modulation of membrane bilayers by alcohols which showed a “cut-off” point in potency, which is related to molecular size. The dominant species at physiological pH levels in blood serum is integrated into the model, and particularly affects desolvation energies for charged and zwitterionic species. For most drugs and related molecules, the neutral species are the permeating species.

## **References**

- [1] Pardridge WM. Blood-brain barrier delivery. *Drug Discov. Today* 2007,12, 54.
- [2] Mangas-Sanjuan V. González-Alvarez M. Gonzalez-Alvarez I. Bermejo M. Drug penetration across the blood-brain barrier; an overview, *Therapeutic Delivery*, 2010, 1, 1.
- [3] Nau R. Sorgel F. Eiffert H. Penetration of Drugs through the Blood-Cerebrospinal Fluid/Blood-Brain Barrier for Treatment of Central Nervous System Infections, *Clinical Microbiol. Revs*, 2010, 23, 858.
- [4] Gabathuler R. Approaches to transport therapeutic drugs across the blood-brain barrier to treat brain diseases, *Neurology of Disease*, 2010, 37, 48.
- [5] Banks WA. Characteristic of compounds that cross the blood-brain barrier, *BMC Neurology* 2009, 9(Suppl 1):S3.
- [6] Pajouhesh H. Lenz GR. Medicinal chemical properties of successful central nervous system drugs, *J. Am. Soc. Expt. NeuroTherapeutics*, 2005, 2, 541.
- [7] Fischer H. Gottschlich R. Seelig A. Blood-brain barrier permeation: molecular parameters governing passive diffusion. *J. Membrane Biol.* 1998, 165, 201.
- [8] Jouyban A. Soltani S. Blood Brain Barrier Permeation, in *Toxicity and Drug Testing*, W. Acree, ed, Intech, 2012, Ch. 1.
- [9] Vilar S. Chakrabarti M. Costanzi S. Prediction of passive blood-brain partitioning: straightforward and effective classification models based on in silico derived physicochemical descriptors, *J Mol Graph Model.* 2010, 28, 899.
- [10] Goodwin JT. Clark DE. In silico prediction of blood-brain barrier penetration, *J. Pharmacol. Expt. Therap.*, 2005, 315, 477.
- [11] Abraham MH. Takacs K. Novak A. Mitchell RC. On the partition of ampholytes: Application to blood-brain distribution. *J. Pharm. Sci.* 1997;86:310–315.
- [12] Mehdipour AR. Hamidi M. Brain drug targeting: a computational approach to overcoming blood-brain barrier, *Drug Discov. Today*, 2009, 14, 1030.
- [13] Kaznessis YN. A review of method for predicting blood-brain partitioning, *Curr. Med. Chem. - Central Nervous Systems Agents*, 2005, 5, 1.
- [14] Garg P. Verma J. Roy N. In silico modelling of blood-brain barrier permeability predictions, in *Drug Absorption Studies, Biotechnology Pharmaceutical Aspects*, AAPS, 2008, volume 7, 510.
- [15] Liu X. Tu M. Kelly RS. Chen C. Smith BJ. Development of a computational approach to predict blood-brain barrier permeability. *Drug Metab. Dispos.* 2004, 32, 132.
- [16] Suenderhauf C. Hammann F. Huwyler J. Computational Prediction of Blood-Brain Barrier Permeability Using Decision Tree Induction, *Molecules* 2012, 17, 10429.
- [17] Stowasser C. “The dipole potential of lipid membranes – an overview”, 2008, [http://www.membranes.nbi.dk/thesis-pdf/2008\\_ProjectReport\\_C.Stowasser.pdf](http://www.membranes.nbi.dk/thesis-pdf/2008_ProjectReport_C.Stowasser.pdf)
- [18] Peterson U. Mannock DA. Ruthven L. Pohl P. McElhaney RN. Pohl EE. Origin of membrane dipole potential: Contribution of the phospholipid fatty acid chains, *Chemistry and Physics of Lipids*, 2002, 117, 19.
- [19] Cattelotte J. Tournier N. et al, Changes in dipole potential at the mouse blood-brain barrier enhance the transport of technetium sestamibi, *J. Neurochemistry*, 2009, 108, 767.

- [20] Walter A., Gutknecht J., Permeability of small nonelectrolytes through lipid bilayer membranes, *J. Membrane Biol.* 1986, 90, 207.
- [21] Bezanilla F. How membrane proteins sense voltage, *Nature Revs, Molec, Cell Biol.*, 2008, 9, 323.
- [22] Heimburg T. The capacitance and electromechanical coupling of lipid membranes close to transitions: the effect of electrostriction, *Biophysical J.*, 2012, 103, 918.
- [23] Koerner MM. Palacio LA. Wright JW. Schweitzer KS. Ray BD. Petrache HI. Electrostatics of lipid membrane interactions in the presence of zwitterionic buffers, *Biophysical J.*, 2011, 101, 362.
- [24] Cafiso DS. "Influence of Charges and Dipoles on Macromolecular Adsorption and Permeability", Ch. 9, *Permeability and Stability of Lipid Bilayers*, Disalvo EA. and Simon SA. eds, CRC Press, 1995, Boca Raton, Florida,
- [25] Trauble H. The movement of free molecules across lipid membranes: a molecular theory, *J. Membrane Biol.*, 1971, 4, 193.
- [26] Fong CW. Statins in therapy: Understanding their hydrophilicity, lipophilicity, binding to 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-CoA reductase, ability to cross the blood brain barrier and metabolic stability based on electrostatic molecular orbital studies, *Europ. J. Med. Chem.*, 2014, 85, 661.
- [27] Balaz S. Modelling kinetics of subcellular disposition of chemicals, *Chem. Revs.*, 2009, 109, 1753.
- [28] Lombardo F. Blake JF.. Curatolo WJ Computation of brain-blood partitioning of organic solutes via free energy calculations, *J. Med. Chem.* 1996, 39, 4750.
- [29] Keseru GM. Molnar L. High-throughput prediction of blood-brain partitioning: a thermodynamic approach, *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.* 2001, 41, 120.
- [30] Hutt AJ. Drug chirality and its pharmacological consequences, Ch. 5, in *Smith and Williams' Introduction to the Principles of Drug Design and Action*, H. John Smith, Hywel Williams, 4<sup>th</sup> ed CRC Press Boca Raton 2006.
- [31] Oldendorf WH. Szabo J. Amino acid assignment to one of three blood-brain barrier amino acid carrier, *Am. J. Physiol.*, 1976, 230, 94
- [32] (a) Hawkins RA. O'Kane RL. Simpson IA. Vin~a JR Structure of the Blood–Brain Barrier and Its Role in the Transport of Amino Acids, *J. Nutrition*, 2006, 14, 218S. (b) Smith QR., Transport of Glutamate and Other Amino Acids at the Blood-Brain Barrier, *J. Nutrition*, 2000, 130, 1016S.
- [33] E.G. Torres, R. Raul. M.G. Gainetdinov, G. Caron, Plasma Membrane Monoamine Transporters: Structure, Regulation and Function, *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 2003, 4, 13.
- [34] van Bree J. et al, *Pharm. Res.*, Stereoselective transport of Baclofen across the blood-brain barrier in rats as determined by the unit impulse response method, 1991, 8, 259.
- [35] Barraud de Lagerie S. Comets E. Gautrand C. Fernandez C. Auchere D., Singlas E. Mentre F. Gimenez F. Cerebral uptake of mefloquine enantiomers with and without the P-gp inhibitor elacridar (GF1210918) in mice, *Brit. J. Pharmacol.*, 2004, 141, 1214.
- [36] Ding Y. et al Brain kinetics of Methylphenidate (Ritalin) enantiomers after oral administration, *Synapse*, 2004, 53, 168.
- [37] Spector R. Myo-inositol transport across the blood-brain barrier, *Neurochem. Res.*, 1988, 13, 785.
- [38] Pardridge WM., Drug transport across the blood-brain barrier, *J. Cerebral Blood Flow and Metabolism*, 2012, 32, 1959.

- [39] Wu D. Kang Y. Bickel U. Pardridge WM. Blood-Brain Barrier Permeability to Morphine-6-Glucuronide is Markedly Reduced Compared with Morphine, *Drug Metab. Dispos.*, 1997, 25, 768.
- [40] Oldendorf WH. Hyman S. Braun L. Oldendorf SZ. Blood-brain barrier: penetration of morphine, codeine, heroin, and methadone after carotid injection, *Science.*, 1972, 178, 984. LogPS calculated from Oldendorf's results for heroin, codeine and methadone based on morphine (-2.7, ref 15) as a base are -0.7, -1.15 and -0.9 respectively.
- [41] Jenkins AJ. Pharmacokinetics of specific drugs, in Karch SB. (*Ed*), *Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of abused drugs*, 2008, CRC Press: Boca Raton.
- [42] McCaffrey G. Davis TP. Physiology and Pathophysiology of the Blood-Brain Barrier: P-Glycoprotein and Occludin Trafficking as Therapeutic Targets to Optimize Central Nervous System Drug Delivery, *J. Invest. Med.*, 2012, 60, 1.
- [43] Chew CF. Guy A.. Biggin PC Distribution and Dynamics of Adamantanes in a Lipid Bilayer, *Biophysical J.* 2008, 95, 5627.
- [44] McCall AL. Millington WR.. Wurtman RJ. Blood-brain barrier transport of caffeine, *Life Science*, 1982, 31, 2709.
- [45] Habgood MD. Knott GW. Dziegielewska KM. Saunders NR. Permeability of the developing and mature blood-brain barriers to theophylline in rats, *Clin. Exp. Pharmacol. Physiol.*, 1998, 25, 361.
- [46] Spector R. Hypoxanthine transport through the blood-brain barrier, *Neurochem. Res.* 1987, 12, 791.
- [47] McAllister MS. et al Mechanisms of glucose transport at the blood-brain barrier, *Brain Research*, 2001, 409, 20.
- [48] Oldendorf WH. Braun L. Cornford E. pH dependence of blood-brain permeability to lactate and nicotine, *Stroke*, 1979, 10, 577.
- [49] Oldendorf WH. Stoller BE. Harris FL. Blood-brain penetration abolished by N-methyl quaternization of nicotine, *PNAS*, 1993, 90, 307.
- [50] Ingo 'lfsson HI. Andersen OS. Alcohol's Effects on Lipid Bilayer Properties, *Biophysical J.*, 2011, 101, 847.
- [51] Lyon RC. McComb JA., Schreurs J. Goldstein DB. A relationship between alcohol intoxication and the disordering of brain membranes by a series of short-chain alcohols, *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 1981, 218, 669.
- [52] McKarns SC. Hansch C. Caldwell WS. Morgan WT. Moore SK, Doolittle DJ. Correlation between hydrophobicity of short-chain aliphatic alcohols and their ability to alter plasma membrane integrity, *Fundam. Appl. Toxicol.* 1997, 36, 62.
- [53] McCreery MJ. Hunt WA. Physico-chemical correlates of alcohol intoxication, *Neuropharmacology*, 1978, 17, 451.
- [54] Chiou JS. Kuo CC. Lin SH. Kamaya H, Ueda I. Interfacial dehydration by alcohols: hydrogen bonding of alcohols to phospholipids, *Alcohol*, 1991, 8, 143.
- [55] Ho C. Williams BW Kelly MB. Stubbs CD. Chronic ethanol intoxication induces adaptive changes at the membrane protein/lipid interface, *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Biomembranes*, 1994, 1189, 135.
- [56] Aagaard TH. Kristensen MN. Westh P. Packing properties of 1-alkanols and alkanes in a phospholipid membrane, *Biophys. Chem.*, 2006, 119, 61.
- [57] Martin F. Zipse H. Charge Distribution in the Water Molecule - A Comparison of Methods, *J. Comp. Chem.* 2005, 26, 97.

- [58] Kubelka J. Population Analysis, [www.uwyo.edu/kubelkachempopulation\\_analysis.pdf](http://www.uwyo.edu/kubelkachempopulation_analysis.pdf)
- [59] Marenich AV. Cramer CJ. Truhlar DJ. Universal Solvation Model Based on Solute Electron Density and on a Continuum Model of the Solvent Defined by the Bulk Dielectric Constant and Atomic Surface Tensions, *J. Phys. Chem B*, 2009, 113, 6378.
- [60] Rayne S. Forest K. Accuracy of computational solvation free energies for neutral and ionic compounds: Dependence on level of theory and solvent model, *Nature Proceedings*, (2010) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/npre.2010.4864.1>
- [61] Carpenter T.S. Kirshner DA. Lau EY. Wong SE. Nilmeier JP. Lightstone FC. A Method to Predict Blood-Brain Barrier Permeability of Drug-Like Compounds Using Molecular Dynamics Simulations, *Biophysical J.* 2014, 107, 630.
- [62] Liu X. et al Use of a Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic Model to Study the Time to Reach Brain Equilibrium: An Experimental Analysis of the Role of Blood-Brain Barrier Permeability, Plasma Protein Binding, and Brain Tissue Binding, *J. Pharmacol. Exptl. Therapeut.*, 2005, 313, 1254.

**Table 1** Selected logPS and input data used to derive equations 1-9 and to analyse closely related test compounds

	LogPS	$\Delta G_{\text{water}}$	$-\Delta G_{\text{octanol}}$	$V_{\text{octanol}}$	$D_{\text{water}}$	$\Delta G_{\text{CDS}}$
Water	-2.1	8	-6.7	12	2.4	1.5
Methanol	-1.6	3.6	-4.2	30.5	2.2	2.5
Ethanol	-1.5	4.8	-5.1	53	2.2	2.4
2-Propanol	-1.7	4.5	-5.5	56.9	2.2	2.7
Ethylene Glycol	-3	10.1	-8.8	54.7	3	2.5
Propylene Glycol	-2.5	8.8	-8.5	63.3	3.1	2.9
1,4-Butanediol	-3	10.9	-10.7	77.4	3.1	3
1-Butanol	-2.4	4.5	-6.2	71.5	2.2	2.9
Xanthine	-3.8	18.3	-14.6	85	4.8	2.4
Caffeine	-2	15.2	-12	147.3	4.3	0
Threophylline	-2.9	16.5	-13.2	112.7	4	0.8
Threobromine	-3	15.1	-11.9	126.9	4.4	0.9
Hypoxanthine	-3.5	19.1	-16.8	102	6.3	1.8
Morphine	-2.7	17.7	-17.2	4.7	233.4	2.5
Morphine Ion		70.1	-66.7	17.8	204	6.4
Heroin	-1.2	8.2	-17.8	4.9	286.6	5.9
Heroin Ion		69.7	-66.6	20	256.4	9.7
Codeine	-1.7	16.8	-16.5	4.6	204.2	3.5
Codeine Ion		68.2	-65	18.9	209.2	7.3
Morphine-6-Glucuronide	-3	42.2	-35.9	4.8	292.3	5.8
Morphine-6-Glucur Zwitterion		119.1	-103.5	42.1	337.7	9.6
Methadone	-1.3	6.1	-12.6	6.7	287.8	8.9
Methadone Ion		52.4	-54.5	12	248.7	8.9
Antipyrine	-2.0	11.4	-12.6	173.1	8.1	5.0
Iodoantipyrine	-1.1	12.3	-12.2	140.1	8.4	4.6
Urea	-3.8	13.6	-11	37.5	5.7	3.3
Thiourea	-3.4	11.4	-10.7	31.6	5.9	1.6

Nicotine	-1.0	6.0	-7.7	136.3	3.0	1.4
Nicotine Ion	negligible	63.5	-61.0	120.8	10.7	3.9
N-MeNicotine Ion						
Pyrrrole	negligible	65.9	-59.9	111.1	9.6	2.3
N-MeNicotine Ion						
Pyridine	negligible	51.8	-61.0	120.8	9.5	3.5

**Footnotes:**

LogPS values from [10,11,15,16] and reference therein.

$\Delta G$  values in kcal/mol, molecular volume  $V$  values in  $\text{cm}^3/\text{mol}$ , dipole moment values in D

$\Delta G_{\text{CDS}}$  in kcal/mol, include hydrogen bonding interactions, solute-solvent cavity interactions, and other non-electrostatic solute-solvent effects

Log PS data for nicotine and derivatives from [48,49].

**Table 2 Comparison of DPHYPC (diphytanolphosphatidylcholine) and n-Octanol properties in a series of alcohols.**

	$\Delta G_{\text{s}}$ DPHYPC	$\Delta G_{\text{s}}$ Octanol	$D^*$ Ref 52	LDH50 Ref 51	Sum(+) Charges DPHYPC	Sum(+/-) Charges DPHYPC	$\Delta G_{\text{CDS}}$ DPHYPC
Gas	0	0			1.154		
Water	-71	-3.79					24.4
Methanol	-93.9	-9.21	666	3.4			
Ethanol	-91.7	-9.04	147	1.7	1.298	-3.402	-4.1
1-Propanol	-90.3	-8.89	35.5	0.47	1.295	-3.399	-3.9
2-Propanol	-89.9	-8.94	93.3	0.16			
1-Butanol	-88.5	-8.65	11.9	0.16	1.293	-3.396	-3.3
2-Butanol	-88	-8.72	23.7	0.36			
t-Butanol	-86.6	-87.2	47.3	0.19			
1-Pentanol	-87.4	-85.5	4.7	0.047	1.291	-3.392	-3.3
1-Hexanol	-85.5	-8.37	1.2	0.012	1.287	-3.389	-3.2
1-Heptanol	-84.1	-8.20	0.4	0.0045	1.284	-3.386	-2.8
1-Octanol	-82.3	-8.03	0.4	0.00089			-2.7
1-Nonanol	-80.1	-7.81	0.2		1.280	-3.382	-2.3
1-Decanol	-77.8	-7.61	0.6		1.276	-3.377	-2.0
1,2-Ethanediol	-76.1	-56.5			1.272	-3.372	

**Footnotes:**

$\Delta G$  values in kcal/mol

See equation 10 which defines the relationship between  $\Delta G_{\text{DPHYPC}}$  and  $\Delta G_{\text{Octanol}}$

Sum(+) Charges DPHYPC are the atomic charges in volts on the N and P atom of the PC head group.

Sum(+/-) charges are the sum of atomic charges on the N,  $\text{PO}_4$ , and the two oxygens of the two -OC(O)- groups of the acyl chains of DPHYPC. See equations 13 and 14.

$D^*$  is the concentration at which the alcohol doubled the quenching rate of the fluorophore /1,2-dierucoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (DCPC) system used to determine the bilayer-modifying potency ( $D^*$ ) of a series of alcohols [52]; see equation 11

LDH or lactate dehydrogenase release is correlated with the breakdown or change in membrane permeability. The LDH50 values are defined as the concentrations which elicited a 50% increase of LDH50 release relative to the untreated control [51]; see equation 12

$\Delta G_{\text{CDS}}$  in kcal/mol, include hydrogen bonding interactions, solute-solvent cavity interactions, and other non-electrostatic solute-solvent effects: see equation 15.