Synergistic Combinations of the CCR5 Inhibitor VCH-286 with Other Classes of HIV-1 Inhibitors
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Here, we evaluated the in vitro anti-HIV-1 activity of the experimental CCR5 inhibitor VCH-286 as a single agent or in combination with various classes of HIV-1 inhibitors. Although VCH-286 used alone had highly inhibitory activity, paired combinations with different drug classes led to synergistic or additive interactions. However, combinations with other CCR5 inhibitors led to effects ranging from synergy to antagonism. We suggest that caution should be exercised when combining CCR5 inhibitors in vivo.

As more members of this class of entry inhibitors make their way through the process of development for use in HIV treatment, it is important to evaluate their interactions and rule out any antagonistic effects (4). Therefore, in this work, we aimed to evaluate the in vitro interactions of a new candidate CCR5 inhibitor, VCH-286, with other members of the same class, MVC and VVC, and also with representative candidates from other classes of HIV inhibitors.

We first established the inhibitory effects of the three CCR5 inhibitors MVC, VVC, and VCH-286 using a dose-response inhibitory assay against two HIV-1 R5 isolates, the laboratory strain HIV-1_\text{RAL} and the clinical isolate HIV-1_\text{CCR5} (18–21). Viral infections were carried out on total peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) from three HIV- and hepatitis B virus-seronegative donors (all participants were adults and signed written informed consent approved by the Centre de Recherche du Centre Hospitalier de l’Université de Montréal [CRCHUM] institutional review boards). The cells were isolated by Ficoll-Paque gradient separation and stimulated for 3 days with phytohemagglutinin (PHA) (1 mg/ml) and interleukin-2 (1 \mu g/ml) in 24-well tissue culture plates, followed by infection with 3,000 \times \text{TCID}_{50} of the HIV-1 R5 viruses. As shown in Fig. 1B and C, viral replication of both HIV strains was readily inhibited by the three CCR5 inhibitors when monitored by the production of the viral core protein p24 (measured by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay [ELISA]). The 50% inhibitory concentrations (IC_{50}) (calculated by dose-effect analysis using the CalcuSyn software [Biosoft, Cambridge, United Kingdom]) were used to determine the antiviral activities of the three drugs, as these compounds act at the cell surface and are not dependent on cellular uptake and metabolism. The IC_{50} of each inhibitor against the HIV-1_\text{RAL} strain for MVC, VVC, and VCH-286 were 1.85 nM, 3.38 nM, and 0.23 nM, respectively.
The IC\textsubscript{50} against HIV-1 CC1/85 for MVC, VVC, and VCH-286 were 4.39 nM, 3.78 nM, and 0.34 nM, respectively (Table 1). Of note, no toxicity was observed in the uninfected PBMCs with concentrations up to 1,000 nM with any of these three drugs. These results are thus consistent with earlier reports of strong antiviral activities of MVC and VVC against both HIV-1\textsubscript{BAL} and HIV-1 CC1/85 infections (12, 22). Moreover, VCH-286 showed a significant inhibition of viral replication at drug concentrations that were lower than those of the two other drugs (i.e., IC\textsubscript{50} 8- to 14-fold lower than those of MVC and VVC).
We further evaluated the impact of drug interactions through paired combinations between MVC, VVC, and VCH-286 on HIV replication, using the same experimental settings. Drug combinations using CCR5 inhibitors may represent an interesting approach, as the association and dissociation rates to the CCR5 receptor may differ between the drug candidates, thus providing a pharmacodynamic advantage in maintaining adequate receptor occupancy (23). Therefore, we opted to define whether different drug combinations would result in synergistic effects. Synergism takes place when the combination is more effective than single-agent use; one of the agents increases the actions of the second drug. Antagonism is when the combination is less effective than with the use of single agents; one of the agents counteracts the actions of the other. We also employed a multiple-drug effect analysis. This multiple-drug effect analysis is based on the median-effect principle and the isobologram technique (24). While the IC_{50}, IC_{75}, and IC_{90} are the concentrations required to inhibit 50%, 75%, and 90%, respectively, the combination indices (CI) CI_{50}, CI_{75}, and CI_{90} of any given combination of two drugs provide information on the nature and extent of drug interaction at the IC_{50}, IC_{75}, and IC_{90} of each drug, respectively. A combination was defined as synergistic when the CI value was <1, additive when the CI was 1, and antagonistic when the CI was >1, as described earlier (25). Combinations of CCR5 inhibitors showed interactions ranging from synergy to antagonism, as illustrated by the combination indices (CI) shown in Table 2. The interaction of MVC and VCH-286 was highly synergistic under all tested concentrations against both viral isolates, with IC_{50} values of 0.41 (mean, 0.47 and 0.35 from two independent experiments) and 0.43 (mean, 0.44 and 0.42) for HIV-1_{BAL}, and HIV-1_{CC1/85} respectively. In contrast, combinations of MVC with VVC showed highly antagonistic interactions against both HIV isolates under the different inhibitory concentration tested, with CI_{90} values of 5.61 (mean, 5.99 and 5.24 from two independent experiments) and 1.86 (mean, 1.37 and 2.34) for HIV-1_{BAL}, and HIV-1_{CC1/85} respectively. Meanwhile, the interaction between VVC and VCH-286 was additive, with a CI_{90} value of 1.08 (mean, 1.1 and 1.05 from two independent experiments) against HIV-1_{BAL}. However, this same combination performed in an antagonistic fashion against HIV-1_{CC1/85} with a CI_{90} value of 2.22 (mean, 2.52 and 1.92 from two independent experiments).

VCH-286 was further evaluated in dual combinations with representative drugs from each of the currently approved antiretroviral classes: the nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors azidothymidine (AZT) and lamivudine (3TC), the nonnucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors nevirapine (NVP) and efavirenz (E_FV), the protease inhibitors lopinavir (LPV) and saquinavir (SQV), the integrase inhibitor raltegravir (RTG), and the fusion inhibitor enfuvirtide (Fuzeon, T-20) (Table 3). The laboratory-adapted strain HIV-1_{BAL} and the clinical isolate HIV-1_{CC1/85} were both susceptible to almost all the antiretroviral drug combinations with VCH-286 used in this study, and synergistic or additive interactions were observed, as shown in Table 3. The synergistic and additive effects of the combination of VCH-286 with other drug candidates are consistent with our earlier observations (26) and those of others (12) on the combination of the CCR5 inhibitors in vitro. Only two exceptions with moderate and significant antagonistic effects were observed for HIV-1_{BAL} and HIV-1_{CC1/85} when combining VCH-286 with lopinavir and 3TC, respectively (Table 3). The CI_{90} for the combination of VCH-286 with lopinavir against HIV-1_{BAL} was 1.39 (mean, 1.69 and 1.09 from two independent experiments), whereas the CI_{90} for the combination of VCH-286 with 3TC against HIV-1_{CC1/85} was 2.03 (mean, 2.2 and 1.85). Although we did not study the mechanism(s) underlying the clear antagonism between the CCR5 inhibitor VCH-286 and the nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NRTI) 3TC, this might be related to a potential interference with the cell activation process. The NRTI 3TC is known to be dependent on the cellular machinery in order to be transformed from the initial monophosphate to the triphosphate active form (27), a step that might be affected by the interference with CCR5 signaling by VCH-286. On the other hand, the moderate antagonism with lopinavir might be related to an unappreciated low level of cytotoxicity mediated by the drug combination. Of note, the cytotoxicities for all single drugs and drug combinations were assessed by treating noninfected cells with the highest concentrations used in the current study. Cell viability was tested by the Trypan blue exclusion method and showed negligible effects.

Altogether, our results clearly show that the new CCR5 inhibitor VCH-286 performed well when used as a single agent, with IC_{50} 8- to 14-fold lower than those of the two other CCR5 inhibitor drugs. It also showed favorable combination indexes with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>HIV-1_{BAL}</th>
<th>HIV-1_{CC1/85}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MVC</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVC</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCH-286</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( IC_{50} \), 50% inhibitory concentration; MVC, maraviroc; VVC, vicriviroc.

### TABLE 2 Combination indices for MVC, VVC, and VCH-286 against the R5 viruses HIV-1_{BAL} and HIV-1_{CC1/85}^{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virus</th>
<th>Drug combination</th>
<th>CI_{50}</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CI_{75}</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CI_{90}</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIV-1_{BAL}</td>
<td>MVC + VCH-286</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Synergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MVC + VVC</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>Antagonism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VVC + VCH-286</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Additive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV-1_{CC1/85}</td>
<td>MVC + VCH-286</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>Synergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MVC + VVC</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>Antagonism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VVC + VCH-286</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Antagonism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a \) Data are presented as the means from two independent experiments (three replicates per condition for each experiment) \pm standard deviations (SD). The ranges of doses used for MVC, VVC, and VCH-286 were as follows: 0.0128, 0.064, 0.32, 1.6, 8, 40, 200, and 1,000 nM.

\( b \) Combination index (CI) interpretation: <1, synergy; 1, additive; and >1, antagonism.
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vicriviroc, and TAK-779), with CI values from 0.36 to 0.61, but
combination with three small-molecule CCR5 inhibitors (maraviroc,
evaluated in a clinical setting (12–14). In the present study, we also
cial in predicting which drug combination regimens should be

drug candidates from different classes of viral inhibitors. How-
ever, its interactions with other CCR5 inhibitors ranged from syn-
ergistic to antagonistic, depending on the agent with which it was
combined and the viral isolate. This variation in interactions sug-
ests that overlapping binding sites of drugs on the CCR5 protein
are likely involved in the antagonistic effects. Small-molecule in-
hibitors of CCR5 bind to the pocket formed by the transmem-
brane (TM) domain of CCR5 in helices 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7 (28).
Although all inhibitors bind to the same hydrophobic pocket, they
occupy different subcavities (29). The nature of the specific inter-
actions within this pocket is unique to each molecule, as they have
different electrostatic shapes and polarities. Interestingly, the key
residues involved in the interactions of CCR5 with MVC and VVC
are similar (Glu283 on TM7, Tyr108 on TM3, Ile198 on TM5, and
Tyr251 on TM6 [30]), and this overlapping binding is likely to
explain the antagonistic effect that we observed upon combining
these drugs in vitro. Our results are therefore consistent with ear-
erlier reports on the combination of CCR5 inhibitors. Nakata et
al. (31) reported that a combination of the CCR5 inhibitor aplaviroc
(AVC) and other members from the same class, such as TAK-779
and SCH-C, leads to mild synergism and additivity, respectively.
Similarly, Murga et al. (32) observed a significant synergy for the
humanized CCR5 monoclonal antibody (MAb) PRO 140 in com-
bination with three small-molecule CCR5 inhibitors (maraviroc,
vicriviroc, and TAK-779), with CI values from 0.36 to 0.61, but
additive effects were observed with the combination of MVC and
VVC.

In vitro studies of drug interactions have proven to be benefi-
cial in predicting which drug combination regimens should be
evaluated in a clinical setting (12–14). In the present study, we also
evaluated the interactions between VCH-286 and representatives
from each class of currently available antiretroviral agents in vitro.
We have found that in the nanomolar range, VCH-286 exerted
synergistic activity against two HIV-1 R5 viruses when it was com-
bined with AZT, NVP, SQV, RTG, and T-20.

In conclusion, our current study highlights the efficacy of
VCH-286 as a new antiviral agent inhibiting HIV-1 binding to
CCR5. It has favorable drug interactions with antiretrovirals (ARVs) used in the clinic to treat HIV/AIDS, such as reverse trans-
criptase, protease, integrase, and fusion inhibitors, thus suggest-
ing that VCH-286 may be a useful anti-HIV drug in combination
therapy. However, we raise the possibility that antagonistic effects
with the combination of CCR5 inhibitors, including this new drug
candidate, may take place in vivo; hence, caution should be exer-
cised when considering this type of combination in a potential
treatment regimen.
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