Synaptosomal Toxicity and Nucleophilic Targets of 4-Hydroxy-2-Nonenal
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4-Hydroxy-2-nonenal (HNE) is an aldehyde by-product of lipid peroxidation that is presumed to play a primary role in certain neuropathogenic states (e.g., Alzheimer disease, spinal cord trauma). Although the molecular mechanism of neurotoxicity is unknown, proteomic analyses (e.g., tandem mass spectrometry) have demonstrated that this soft electrophile preferentially forms Michael-type adducts with cysteine sulfhydryl groups. In this study, we characterized HNE synaptosomal toxicity and evaluated the role of putative nucleophilic amino acid targets. Results show that HNE exposure of striatal synaptosomes inhibited [3H]-dopamine membrane transport and vesicular storage. These concentration-dependent effects corresponded to parallel decreases in synaptosomal sulfhydryl content. Calculations of quantum mechanical parameters (softness, electrophilicity) that describe the interactions of an electrophile with its nucleophilic target indicated that the relative softness of HNE was directly related to both the second-order rate constant (k2) for sulfhydryl adduct formation and corresponding neurotoxic potency (IC50). Computation of additional quantum mechanical parameters that reflect the relative propensity of a nucleophile to interact with a given electrophile (chemical potential, nucleophilicity) indicated that the sulfhydryl thiolate state was the HNE target. In support of this, we showed that the rate of adduct formation was related to pH and that N-acetyl-l-cysteine, but not N-acetyl-l-lysine or β-alanyl-l-histidine, reduced in vitro HNE neurotoxicity. These data suggest that, like other type 2 alkenes, HNE produces nerve terminal toxicity by forming adducts with sulfhydryl thiolates on proteins involved in neurotransmission.
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structure-toxicity studies of $\alpha,\beta$-unsaturated carboxylic derivatives of the type 2 alkene class. Also shown is the line structure for the nonconjugated structural analog, allyl alcohol.

that HNE, like other type 2 alkenes, causes nerve terminal damage by forming adducts with sulphydryl thiolate groups on proteins that play critical roles in neurotransmission.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Chemicals and materials.** Unless otherwise indicated, all reagents were high-performace liquid chromatography grade or better, and water was doubly distilled and deionized. ACR, acrolein, MVK, $\beta$-alanine-$\beta$-histidine (carnosine), N-acetylimidazole (NAC), N-acetylcycteine (NAC), Krebs-Henseleit buffer, and Percoll were purchased from the Sigma/Aldrich Chemical Company (Belleville, PA). HNE was purchased from Cayman Chemical Co. (Ann Arbor, MI) and was supplied in ethanol and stored at $\sim 80^\circ$C. Aliquots of HNE were evaporated with nitrogen gas and reconstituted in Krebs-N-[2-hydroxyethyl]-piperazine-N'-[2-ethanesulfonic acid] (HEPES) buffer. The concentration of HNE was determined by UV absorbance at 224 nm with a molar absorptivity of 13,750/M. $^3$H-Dopamine ($[^3]$H-DA; specific activity 23.5 Ci/mmol) was obtained from American Radiolabeled Chemicals (St Louis, MO). Whatman GF/F filter paper and Whatman GF/B filter disc were purchased from the Brandel Company (Gaithersburg, MD).

**Animals.** All aspects of this study were in accordance with the National Institutes of Health Guide for Care and Use of Laboratory Animals and were approved by the Montefiore Medical Center Animal Care Committee. Adult male rats (Sprague-Dawley, 300–325 g; Taconic Farms, Germantown, NY) were used in this study. Rats were housed individually in polycarbonate boxes, and drinking water and Purina Rodent Laboratory Chow (Purina Mills, Inc., St Louis, MO) were available ad libitum. The animal room was maintained at approximately 22°C and 50% humidity with a 12-h light/dark cycle.

**Preparation of striatal synaptosomes and synaptic vesicles.** Rat brain striatal synaptosomes were isolated by the Percoll gradient method of LoPachin et al. (2004). In brief, bilateral striata (100–120 mg wet weight tissue) were rapidly removed from anesthetized (isoflurane inhalation) rats and minced in cold (4°C) sucrose gradient buffer (pH 7.4). The pellet (P1) was washed once, and supernatants (S1 and S2) were combined. The supernatant was layered on top of a freshly prepared four-step discontinuous Percoll gradient (3, 10, 15, and 23% Percoll in sucrose buffer, pH 7.4). Gradients were centrifuged at 32,000 $\times g$ for 6 min, and synaptosomes were collected at the last interface (15%/23%). Synaptosomes were washed twice in Kreb’s buffer (pH 7.4), pelleted, and then resuspended.

Striatal synaptic vesicles were prepared according to LoPachin et al. (2006). In brief, rat striata were homogenized in ice-cold 0.32M sucrose in a glass homogenizer using 10 strokes with a Teflon pestle. The homogenate was centrifuged at 800 $\times g$ for 12 min, and the resulting supernatant was centrifuged at 22,000 $\times g$ for 10 min. The P2 crude synaptosomal pellet was subjected to osmotic shock (5 min) by homogenization (five strokes with Teflon pestle) in 2 ml of distilled water. Osmolarity was restored by addition of one (1 ml) of a HEPES (0.25M)-potassium tartrate (1M) buffer (pH 7.5). The suspension was centrifuged at 20,000 $\times g$ for 20 min, and the supernatant was centrifuged at 55,000 $\times g$ for 60 min. MgSO$_4$ (1mM) buffer was added to the supernatant, which was then centrifuged at 100,000 $\times g$ for 50 min. The P5 pellet, which contained the isolated synaptic vesicles (20–30 $\mu$g protein), was resuspended in vesicle assay buffer.

In Vitro Effects of HNE on Synaptosomal and Vesicular Function

**Synaptosomal membrane transport.** Striatal synaptosomes (10 $\mu$g protein) were incubated with graded concentrations of HNE or Krebs-HEPES buffer for 15 min at 30°C (LoPachin et al., 2004). Synaptosomes were then washed, filter trapped by rapid filtration through a cell harvester (see above), and superfused (3 min) with Krebs-HEPES buffer containing $^3$H-D.A (0.30mM).
To correct for low-affinity Na⁺-independent transport, uptake was measured in the presence and absence (equimolar choline chloride substitution) of sodium ions. Synaptosomes were then washed, and corresponding radioactivity was measured by scintillation counting. The concentration-response data for transport were fitted by nonlinear regression analysis, and the concentration producing 50% inhibition (IC₅₀’s with 95% confidence intervals) was calculated by the Cheng-Prussof equation (Prism; GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA). To investigate nucleophilicity as a determinant of type 2 alkene amino acid targets, synaptosomes were preincubated (1 min) with either NAC (500µM), camosine (500µM), or NAL (500µM) and then exposed (15 min) to graded concentrations of HNE, acrolein, MVK, or ACR. Synaptosomal uptake of [²H]DA was determined as described above. The concentration-response data for transport were fitted by nonlinear regression analysis, and the IC₅₀’s (95% confidence intervals) were calculated by the Cheng-Prussof equation (Prism; GraphPad Software).

**Vesicular transport.** Synaptic vesicles (3 µg protein) were exposed (15 min) to graded concentrations of HNE or control assay buffer. Vesicles were then incubated in assay buffer (200 µl) containing Mg⁺²-adenosine triphosphate (ATP) (2mM) and 0.30µM [²H]-DA for 3 min at 30°C (LoPachin et al., 2006). The uptake reaction was terminated by addition of cold assay buffer (1 ml), and vesicles were collected onto Whatman GF/F glass fiber filters by rapid filtration through a Brandel cell harvester. Non-specific uptake was determined by measuring vesicular [²H]-DA transport at 4°C in the absence of Mg⁺²-ATP. Filters were washed, and trapped radioactivity was counted by scintillation spectroscopy. To determine the IC₅₀ for HNE, the concentration-response data for vesicular transport were fitted by nonlinear regression analysis (r² for all curves > 0.90). IC₅₀’s and respective 95% confidence intervals were calculated by the Cheng-Prussof equation (Prism; GraphPad Software).

**Kinetic analysis of HNE neurotoxicity: synaptosomal and vesicular transport.** In separate studies, we determined the effects of in vitro HNE on the kinetic parameters of DA transport in striatal synaptosomes and synaptic vesicles (for methodological details, see LoPachin et al., 2004, 2006, 2007a). Briefly, synaptosomes (10 µg protein) were exposed (15 min × 30°C) to the corresponding IC₅₀ of HNE (450 µM) or to Krebs-HEPES buffer. HNE-exposed and control synaptosomes were washed, filter trapped, and superfused with graded [²H]-DA concentrations (50nM–1.7M) to determine the concentration-response data for transport at 30°C. The uptake reaction was terminated by addition of cold assay buffer (1 ml), and vesicles were collected onto Whatman GF/F glass fiber filters by rapid filtration through a Brandel cell harvester. Non-specific uptake was determined by measuring vesicular [²H]-DA transport at 4°C in the absence of Mg⁺²-ATP. Filters were washed, and trapped radioactivity was counted by scintillation spectroscopy. To determine the IC₅₀ for HNE, the concentration-response data for vesicular transport were fitted by nonlinear regression analysis (r² for all curves > 0.90). IC₅₀’s and respective 95% confidence intervals were calculated by the Cheng-Prussof equation (Prism; GraphPad Software).

**Quantum mechanical parameters: LUMO, HOMO, η, μ, σ, ω, and ω⁻.** The lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO) energy (E_LUMO) and highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) energy (E_HOMO), were calculated using Spartan04 (version 1.0.3) software (Wavesfunction Inc., Irvine, CA). Single-point energies for each structure were calculated at the density functional level of theory using a B3LYP-6-31G* basis set from 6-31G* geometries. Global (whole molecule) hardness (η) was calculated as η = (E_LUMO - E_HOMO)/2, and chemical potential (μ) was calculated as μ = (E_LUMO + E_HOMO)/2 (Chattaraj et al., 2006). Softness (σ) is used as defined in Pearson (1990) and Maynard et al. (1998) and is calculated as the inverse of hardness or σ = 1/η. The electronegativity index (ω) was calculated as ω = μ² - 2η (Chattaraj et al., 2006), and the nucleophilicity index (ω⁻) as ω⁻ = n₄(μ₄ + n₄)²/(2(n₄ - n₄)²), where A = reacting nucleophile and B = reacting electrophile (Jaramillo et al., 2006). Linear regression analysis was used to assess the relationship between the calculated quantum mechanical parameters and neurotoxic potency (IC₅₀’s, Table 1) or kinetic data (k, k; Tables 1 and 3). Corresponding coefficients of determination (r²) were calculated from the Pearson correlation coefficient (InStat 3.0; GraphPad Software) and are provided in the text.

**Measurement of free sulphydryl groups.** The concentration-dependent effects of HNE analogs on total free sulphydryl content in synaptosomes were determined by the method of LoPachin et al. (2004). Following incubation (15 min) with graded concentrations of HNE or control buffer solutions, synaptosomes (200 µg protein) were solubilized with 1% SDS, 5,5'-Dithiobis(2-nitrobenzoic acid) (DTNB; 3mM) was added, and following equilibration (5 min, 25°C), absorbance was read at 412 nm using a Jenway 6305 spectrophotometer. A reagent blank without DTNB was used to zero the spectrophotometer. The concentration of 3-carboxylyato-4-nitrophenolate, the thiol anion released during addition of sulphydryl groups by the disulfide reagent DTNB, was calculated by the molar extinction coefficient, 1.36 × 10⁵/M/cm. The free sulphydryl data for HNE were fitted by nonlinear regression analysis (r² for all curves > 0.90), and respective IC₅₀’s and 95% confidence intervals were calculated by the Cheng-Prussof equation (Prism 3.0; GraphPad Software).

**RESULTS**

**Synaptosomal Function and Free Sulphydryl Content**

Figure 2A shows the in vitro effects of graded HNE concentrations on membrane synaptosomal transport. For comparative purposes, the concentration-dependent effects of acrolein, MVK, and ACR are also shown (LoPachin et al., 2007a). For each type 2 alkene, parallel measurements of synaptosomal free sulphydryl contents are also presented (Fig. 2B). Results indicate that exposure of striatal synaptosomes to HNE, acrolein, MVK, or ACR resulted in parallel concentration-dependent reductions in membrane [²H]-DA transport (Fig. 2A). As indicated by the relative IC₅₀’s, the potency of HNE was
Propanal, allyl alcohol, and ACR (expressed as mean percentage of control ± SEM based on separate experiments (n = 3–5). Calculated IC_{50}’s are provided in the parentheses. HNE and the other conjugated α,β-unsaturated carbonyl derivatives, the nonconjugated analogs, allyl alcohol and propanal, did not affect synaptosomal uptake or sulphydryl content (Table 2).

Vesicular Transport

In vitro incubation of synaptic vesicles with HNE produced concentration-dependent decreases in ^3H-DA transport (Fig. 3). Similar incubations with acrolein, MVK, or ACR produced parallel decreases in vesicular transport. The order of potency for inhibition of vesicular transport was HNE (56μM) > acrolein (213μM) > MVK (717μM) >> ACR (233mM). Kinetic analysis indicated that HNE significantly decreased the V_{max} of vesicular transport but did not alter corresponding K_{m} (Table 1). The HNE-induced reductions in V_{max} for synaptosomal (Fig. 2A) and vesicular (Fig. 3) are consistent with noncompetitive inhibition due to irreversible (covalent) protein-chemical adduct formation (reviewed in LoPachin and DeCaprio, 2005). The nonconjugated analogs, allyl alcohol and propanal, did not affect vesicular uptake (data not shown).

Softness (σ) and Electrophilic Index (ω) as Determinants of Synaptosomal Toxicity.

Because sulphydryl groups are soft nucleophiles, the ability of HNE to form a cysteine adduct should be related to the corresponding electrophilic softness of this compound. Electrophilic softness is considered the ease with which electron redistribution takes place during covalent bonding, and thus, the softer the electrophile, the more readily it will form an adduct by accepting outer shell electrons from a soft nucleophile such as the sulfur atom. To determine how electrophilic softness was related to sulphydryl reactivity, we computed softness (σ) for HNE and selected structural analogs. In addition, we calculated the “electrophilicity index” (ω) for each chemical, which is a higher order quantum mechanical parameter that combines softness with chemical potential and

### Table 2

| Type 2 alkene | E_{LUMO} (ev) | E_{HOMO} (ev) | σ (ev) | ω (ev) | Log k_2 (pH = 7.4) | Log k’ | -SH loss (log IC_{50}) | Uptake inhibition (log IC_{50}) |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Acrolein     | -1.70        | -6.98        | 0.379 | 3.57  | 2.596            | 3.417  | -4.01                     | -4.28                          |
| MVK          | -1.33        | -6.71        | 0.372 | 3.06  | 2.048            | 2.953  | -3.57                     | -3.48                          |
| HNE          | -1.56        | -6.82        | 0.380 | 3.29  | 0.938            | 1.759  | -3.50                     | -3.40                          |
| ACR          | -0.69        | -6.77        | 0.329 | 2.30  | -1.804           | 0.767  | -0.44                     | -0.36                          |
| Allyl alcohol| +0.51        | -6.93        | 0.269 | 1.38  |                  |        |                           |                                |
| Propanal     | -0.33        | -6.86        | 0.307 | 1.98  |                  |        |                           |                                |

*E_{LUMO} = energy level (ev) of the LUMO; E_{HOMO} = energy level (ev) of the HOMO. The E_{LUMO} and E_{HOMO} values were used to calculate softness (σ) and the electrophilic index (ω) of each electrophile as described in the “Materials and Methods” section.*

*Second-order reaction rates (k_2) were determined for type 2 alkene reactions with L-cysteine at pH 7.4 (n = 4–6 experiments).*

*Synaptosomal sulphydryl (-SH) loss was determined in striatal synaptosomes exposed to HNE or other type 2 alkenes (n = 4–6 experiments).*

*Inhibition of membrane ^3H-DA uptake was determined in striatal synaptosomes exposed to HNE or other type 2 alkenes (n = 4–6 experiments).*

#### FIG. 2

The concentration-dependent effects of HNE on ^3H-DA uptake (A) and free sulphydryl content (B) in synaptosomes isolated from rat striatum are presented in this figure. For comparative purposes, comparable data for acrolein, MVK, and ACR are shown (LoPachin et al., 2007a). Data are expressed as mean percentage of control ± SEM based on separate experiments (n = 3–5). Calculated IC_{50}’s are provided in the parentheses.
is, therefore, a descriptor of electrophile reactivity (Chattaraj et al., 2006). Based on the corresponding σ values, HNE, acrolein, and MVK are of comparable softness and, collectively, are softer electrophiles than ACR. The respective electrophilic index (ω), however, indicated a rank order of acrolein > HNE > MVK >> ACR (Table 2). The non-conjugated analogs, allyl alcohol and propanal, are not Michael acceptors and therefore had correspondingly lower σ and ω values (Table 2).

To establish the correspondence between these descriptors and sulfhydryl reactivity, we determined the respective second-order rate constants (k2) for the reactions of HNE and structural analogs with the sulfhydryl group of l-cysteine. Results (Table 2) show that, among the type 2 alkenes tested, the k2 value for acrolein was largest, reflecting a relatively fast rate of reaction. In contrast, the rate constants for HNE and MVK were intermediate, whereas the corresponding ACR constant was the smallest among the type 2 alkenes, indicating relatively slow kinetics. When the log k2 values for each chemical were compared by linear regression to the respective σ and ω (Table 2), a reasonable correlation existed (r² > 0.83 and 0.84, respectively). If sulfhydryl adduct formation is an initiating step in type 2 alkene neurotoxicity, the k2 rate constants should correspond to the relative ability of these chemicals to produce in vitro neurotoxicity. Indeed, our results (Table 2) show that the electrophiles with faster kinetics (HNE, acrolein, and MVK) were the most potent (lowest IC50 values) conjugated alkenes with respect to depletion of synaptosomal thiols and impairment of synaptosomal membrane transport. In contrast, ACR which formed sulfhydryl adducts slowly (lower k2 value) was least potent (higher IC50 values). Regression analysis showed that the log k2 values were highly correlated to the log of the respective IC50’s for synaptosomal uptake inhibition (r² = 0.95) and sulfhydryl loss (r² = 0.96). Together, these data suggest that the degree of softness or electrophilicity of the conjugated alkenes is related to the corresponding ability (reaction rate) to form sulfhydryl adducts and to thereby produce synaptosomal toxicity.

### TABLE 3

| Amino acid residue | E_{LUMO} (ev) | E_{HOMO} (ev) | μ (ev) | σ (ev) |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| Cysteine thiolate (−1) | 4.76 | −0.35 | 2.21 | 0.391 |
| Cysteine thiol (0) | 0.14 | −5.87 | −2.87 | 0.330 |
| Histidine (0) | 0.30 | −5.75 | −2.75 | 0.331 |
| Lysine (+1) | 2.98 | −10.39 | −6.69 | 0.270 |

For each nucleophile, quantum mechanical parameters were calculated based on the predominant ionization state (in parentheses) at pH 7.4. To model a cysteine catalytic triad, quantum mechanical parameters were also calculated for the anionic thiolate state (−1). 

### Chemical Potential (μ) and the Nucleophilic Index (ω⁻) as Predictors of Nucleophilic Targeting

HNE and other type 2 alkenes are soft electrophiles that preferentially form adducts with soft nucleophiles. Reduced cysteine sulfhydryl groups, which exist in either the thiol or the anionic thiolate states, are the principle soft biological nucleophiles. Amino groups on lysine or histidine residues are also nucleophilic and, consequently, are potential sites of HNE adduction. To investigate the relative activities of these different nucleophiles in HNE adduct formation, we calculated the corresponding softness (σ) and chemical potential (μ). This latter parameter indicates the relative ability of a nucleophilic species to transfer electron density to an electrophile. The σ values presented in Table 3 indicate that the thiolate state of the cysteine sulfhydryl group is softer (higher positive value) than the other nucleophiles. Furthermore, the respective μ values demonstrate that the thiolate state of the cysteine sulfhydryl thiol state is substantially more nucleophilic (more positive μ value) than the cysteine thiol state, the lysine ε-amino group, or the imidazole moiety of histidine. These data demonstrate that the cysteine thiolate state is a better nucleophile than lysine, histidine, or the sulfhydryl thiol state. The molecular orbital energy was also used to calculate the nucleophilicity index (ω⁻), which is a recently developed higher order parameter that considers the respective hardness (σ) and chemical potential (μ) of both the electrophilic (type 2 alkene) and nucleophilic (cysteine, histidine, or lysine) reactants (Jaramillo et al., 2006). This parameter is, therefore, a measure of the likelihood of subsequent adduct formation. As suggested by the respective ω⁻ values (Table 4), HNE and the type 2 alkenes preferentially form adducts with cysteine thiolate sites (higher ω⁻ value) as opposed to histidine, lysine, or thiol residues (lower ω⁻ values).
If, as the calculated nucleophilic descriptors suggest, the thiolate state is the preferred HNE target, this should be reflected in corresponding chemical reaction rates. The thiol-thiolate equilibrium of L-cysteine is a function of $pK_a$ (8.15), and therefore, we measured sulfhydryl loss at pH 7.4 and pH 8.8 (Fig. 4). At pH 8.8, the thiolate concentration will increase relative to that at pH 7.4, and if the thiolate is the preferred adduct target, the respective reaction rate for HNE and L-cysteine will increase in proportion to the enlarging thiolate concentration as determined by the $pK_a$. Accordingly, results show that at pH 8.8 the reaction of HNE and cysteine is considerably increased relative to pH 7.4 (Fig. 4). Corroborative studies showed that this pH-dependent rate increase occurred for all type 2 alkenes evaluated (data not shown). The $k_2$ values at a given pH can be corrected for the corresponding thiolate concentrations using the formula: $\log(k_2) = \log k_2 + pK_a - pH$. For each $\alpha,\beta$-unsaturated carbonyl derivative, the corresponding thiolate rate constants at either pH were similar and were well correlated to $\mu$ ($r^2 = 0.96$; Table 3) and $\omega^-$ ($r^2 = 0.91$; Table 4).

**Application of Quantum Mechanical Descriptors to In Vitro Neurotoxicity**

As a practical demonstration of nucleophilic targeting, we determined the relative abilities of NAC (cysteine analog), carnosine (histidine analog), and NAL (lysine analog) to scavenge HNE and thereby modify in vitro neurotoxicity. Preliminary studies showed that the selected nucleophiles did not affect synaptosomal function at the concentrations used (data not shown). Results (Fig. 5) indicate that NAC significantly reduced HNE neurotoxicity; for example, the IC$_{50}$ for HNE inhibition of synaptosomal uptake (Fig. 5A) was 441 $\mu$M, which increased to 2.25mM in the presence of NAC. In contrast, neither NAL nor carnosine affected the in vitro neurotoxicity of HNE (Fig. 5A). Similarly, in a recent study (LoPachin et al., 2007a), we showed that NAC (500 $\mu$M), but not NAL (500 $\mu$M), decreased the in vitro neurotoxicity of acrolein and other type 2 alkenes. We did not, however, assess the protective effects of carnosine. Here we report that carnosine (500 $\mu$M) also did not affect the in vitro neurotoxicity of other type 2 alkenes (Fig. 6). These data are consistent with corresponding quantum mechanical computations since NAL ($\mu = -2.58$) and carnosine ($\mu = -2.17$) are less nucleophilic than NAC ($\mu = 5.97$) and are, therefore, less capable of scavenging HNE and other $\alpha,\beta$-unsaturated carbonyl derivatives.

**FIG. 4.** This figure shows a plot of $\log[SH/SH_0]$ versus time (s) for the reaction of HNE with L-cysteine at pH 7.4 or pH 8.8, where $SH_0$ is initial sulfhydryl concentration at time zero. The respective second-order rate constants ($k_2$) for these reactions are provided in the figure.

**FIG. 5.** The effects of NAC, NAL, and carnosine on the inhibition of $^3$H-DA transport (A) and loss of free sulfhydryl groups (B) in HNE-exposed striatal synaptosomes ($n = 4–6$ experiments) are presented in this figure. Control data are as follows: synaptosomal transport = 17 ± 2 nmol/mg protein/min; synaptosomal free sulfhydryl content = 132 ± 4 pmol/mg protein. Data are expressed as mean percentage control ± SEM. Calculated IC$_{50}$’s are provided in the parentheses.
**DISCUSSION**

The results of this study show that, like other type 2 alkenes, *in vitro* HNE exposure produced concentration-dependent decreases in the *H*-DA membrane transport and vesicular storage of striatal synaptosomes (see also Casteaga et al., 2004; Keller et al., 1997a,b; Pocernich et al., 2001; Subramaniam et al., 1997). These neurotoxic effects were closely correlated to graded decreases in synaptosomal free sulfhydryl content. The respective IC₅₀’s are comparable to data from previous *in vitro* neurotoxicity studies (Morel et al., 1999) and are consistent with intracellular HNE concentrations that occur during cell injury (Dalle-Donne et al., 2007; Poli and Schaur, 2000). Relative to other type 2 alkenes, HNE was comparable to MVK, whereas both were significantly less potent (lower IC₅₀’s) than acrolein (Figs 2 and 3). ACR was the weakest neurotoxicant tested in this synaptosomal model. The respective neurotoxic potencies indicated a rank order (i.e., acrolein > MVK > HNE >> ACR) that corresponded (*r*² = 0.90–0.96) to the respective second-order rate constants (log *k*₂) and quantum mechanical parameters, *σ* and *ω*. These results support prior studies (LoPachin et al., 2007a), which demonstrated that *α,β*-unsaturated aldehydes and ketones such as acrolein and MVK were more reactive and more potent synaptotoxicants than amide and ester derivatives such as ACR and methyl acrylate, respectively. These relative differences in synaptotoxicity are directly related to corresponding differences in electrophilic reactivity. As the respective quantum mechanical parameters indicate (Table 2), ACR is a weaker electrophile that slowly forms Michael-type adducts with soft nucleophilic sulfhydryl groups on cysteine residues, whereas HNE is a stronger (softer) electrophile that rapidly forms such adducts (Friedman et al., 1965; LoPachin et al., 2007a,b). Thus, within the short incubation time of this study (15 min), higher ACR concentrations must be used to achieve the previously determined minimal synaptosomal adduct concentration (0.50 ng cysteine adduct/µg protein; see Barber and LoPachin, 2004) needed to cause toxicity (compare respective IC₅₀’s in Fig. 2). Whereas differences in potency exist, it is important to note that corresponding neurotoxic efficacies (maximal effects) among the tested type 2 alkenes are equivalent (Fig. 2). This means that, despite their slow rate of formation, ACR adducts have the same neurotoxicological impact as the more rapidly forming HNE or acrolein adducts.

Predictably, HNE, an *α,β*-unsaturated aldehyde, possessed considerable *in vitro* neurotoxic potency and exhibited a relatively fast reaction rate. However, within the aldehyde/ketone subgroup, there existed significant differences in correlation among the quantum mechanical, kinetic, and neurochemical parameters. Specifically, the rate constants (log *k*₂) for this subgroup were well correlated to the respective *in vitro* IC₅₀’s, although these kinetic data were less correlated to *ω* and poorly correlated to *σ* (Table 2). The lack of correspondence among this subgroup is attributable to HNE and the consequent slowing of the adduct reaction due to steric hindrance imposed by the alkane tail (Friedman and Wall, 1966). Since neither *σ* nor *ω* account for steric factors, such disagreement among the aldehyde/ketone type 2 alkenes is expected.

Growing evidence suggests that the molecular neurotoxic mechanism of HNE and other type 2 alkenes involves a twostep process: that is, initial addition of protein nucleophiles and subsequent loss of function (reviewed in LoPachin et al., 2008a). Our structure-toxicity analyses (the present study, LoPachin et al., 2007a) indicate that the nucleophilic target of the type 2 alkenes is determined by the *α,β*-unsaturated carbonyl structure of these chemicals. This structure is a conjugated system, characterized by mobile *π*-electrons and, because the carbonyl oxygen atom is electron withdrawing, a localized area of electron deficiency develops at the *β* carbon of HNE. The *α,β*-unsaturated carbonyl structure is, therefore, a soft electrophile according to the hard and soft acids and bases theory (Pearson, 1990). Electrophile-nucleophile interactions are not absolute but rather occur along a continuum of relative reactivity according to the principal of “like reacts with like” (reviewed in LoPachin and DeCaprio, 2005; LoPachin et al., 2008a). Thus, as a soft electrophile, HNE will preferentially form adducts with comparably soft nucleophiles. The softness of a nucleophile is determined by the polarizability of corresponding valence electrons. Sulfur, as opposed to nitrogen or oxygen atoms, has a large atomic radius...
with highly polarizable valence electrons and is, by definition, the softest nucleophile in biological systems.

Biological free sulfhydryl groups can exist in the thiol state (-SH) or in the anionic thiolate state (-S\(^{-}\)). Calculations of corresponding softness (\(\sigma\)) and chemical potential (\(\mu\)) indicate that, relative to sulfhydryl thiols, the thiolate state is significantly more nucleophilic (Table 3) and is, consequently, the preferential target of HNE. The close correspondence of the neurotoxic potencies (IC\(_{50}\)’s; Table 2; see also Fig. 4) to the second-order rate constants (\(k_2\)) corrected for the actual thiolate concentration (\(k\)) provides direct kinetic evidence for thiolate targeting by HNE and the type 2 alkenes (LoPachin et al., 2007b). The p\(K_a\) of the sulfhydryl side chain is 8.5, and therefore, the anion concentration should be low (\(\leq 10\%\)) at pH 7.4. However, the thiolate state is more prevalent than predicted due to the existence of low p\(K_a\) cysteine sulfhydryl groups within highly specialized amino acid sequences known as catalytic triads (reviewed in LoPachin and Barber, 2006; Stamler et al., 1997, 2001). Proton shuttling between flanking or proximal (\(\leq 6\) Å) basic amino acid residues (histidine, arginine, lysine) and their acidic counterparts (aspartate, glutamate) can deprotonate the sulfhydryl group and, thereby, lower the corresponding p\(K_a\) by several units (e.g., see Britto et al., 2002; Sfakianos et al., 2002). Adduct formation between HNE and sulfhydryl thiolate groups occurs via a 1,4-Michael-type addition reaction, that is, nucleophilic attack at the \(\beta\)-carbon with subsequent addition across the carbon-carbon double bond. The resulting intermediate product, a saturated aldehyde, then undergoes an intramolecular reaction with the hydroxyl group to form a cyclic hemiacetal, which is the predominant adduct form (reviewed in Esterbauer et al., 1991; Petersen and Doorn, 2004; Witz, 1989). That HNE and the type 2 alkenes preferentially form stable 1,4-adducts with cysteine sulfhydryl groups has been demonstrated by the isolation of these adducts and subsequent quantitation using mass spectrometry and other proteomic approaches (Aldini et al., 2005; Barber and LoPachin, 2004; Dalle-Donne et al., 2007; Doorn and Petersen, 2002, 2003; Ishii et al., 2003; LoPachin et al., 2006, 2007a; Uchida and Stadtman, 1993a; Uchida et al., 1998a; van Iersel et al., 1997; also see early studies by Friedman and Wall, 1966; Friedman et al., 1965).

Amino groups on lysine or histidine residues are also nucleophiles and are, therefore, potential sites for HNE adduction via 1,4-Michael-type reactions. However, the imidazole moiety of histidine and the \(\varepsilon\)-amino group of lysine are significantly harder nucleophiles than the relatively soft thiolate state of cysteine, that is, compare respective \(\sigma\) and \(\mu\) data in Table 3. Consequently, these harder nucleophiles are kinetically unfavorable targets for HNE and other soft electrophiles (reviewed in Hinson and Roberts, 1992; Esterbauer et al., 1991; LoPachin and DeCaprio, 2005; LoPachin et al., 2008a). Furthermore, at physiological pH (7.4), the secondary amine of histidine is mostly deprotonated based on a corresponding p\(K_a\) of 6.0. As reflected in the \(\mu\) and \(\omega^{-}\) values (Tables 3 and 4), the nucleophilicity of this neutral state (0) is substantially lower than that of the sulfhydryl anionic state (\(-1\)). Also at physiological pH, the primary amine side chain of lysine (p\(K_a\) = 10.5) is protonated (\(+1\)) and is, as the respective \(\mu\) and \(\omega^{-}\) values indicate (Tables 3 and 4), a very poor nucleophile. These electronic characteristics do not, however, mean that HNE is incapable of forming Lys or His adducts (e.g., see Bruenner et al., 1995; Nadkarni and Sayre, 1995; Uchida and Stadtman, 1993b), rather the kinetics of adduct formation are extremely slow. Determinations of second-order rate constants (mean \(k_2\) ± SD \(M^{-1} s^{-1}\)) of Lys (1.33 ± 0.083) was significantly more reactive toward HNE than His (2.14 ± 0.312 \(\times\) 10\(^{-3}\)) or Lys (1.33 ± 0.050 \(\times\) 10\(^{-3}\); Doorn and Petersen, 2002, 2003; see also Lin et al., 2005; van Iersel et al., 1997).

As an alternative to 1,4-Michael addition, the carbonyl carbon atom of HNE could form adducts with primary amines (e.g., Lys) via a 1,2-addition. Nadkarni and Sayre (1995) have provided indirect evidence that HNE forms such adducts with primary amines and that subsequent Schiff base formation is prevalent in solvent-isolated (buried) hydrophobic protein microenvironments. However, the corresponding kinetics are inherently slow, and the Schiff base product is reversible (reviewed in Petersen and Doorn, 2004). That this reaction might not be neurotoxicologically relevant is suggested by recent in vitro studies, which showed that graded exposure of striatal synaptosomes to propanal (an aldehyde) did not affect neurotransmitter release, reuptake, or vesicular storage (Table 2; see also LoPachin et al., 2007a). If, as the preceding data imply, soft-softer interactions govern the adduct kinetics of HNE and other type 2 alkenes, then a soft nucleophilic cysteine analog (NAC) should modify the development of in vitro synapostomal toxicity by rapidly scavenging HNE. In contrast, neurotoxicity should not be influenced by incubation with harder lysine (NAL) or histidine (carnosine) analogs that react more slowly with HNE and are, therefore, slower scavengers. Corroborative studies (Figs 5 and 6) showed that NAC significantly retarded the development of synapostomal dysfunction induced by HNE and other type 2 alkenes, whereas neither NAL nor carnosine were effective.

Our findings thus far indicate that HNE and the type 2 alkenes preferentially and rapidly form Michael-type adducts with sulfhydryl groups. This is in contrast to Lys or His adduction, which is kinetically unfavorable and, therefore, slower. However, the rate of amino acid adduct formation does not determine which residue is the toxicologically significant target. Instead, it is the role of that residue in protein structure or function and the disruptive consequences of adduction that determine significance. Thus, although HNE adducts of Lys and His residues are associated with several chronic neuropathological states (Montine et al., 2002; Uchida, 2003) and can be isolated from certain in vitro conditions (Nadkarni and Sayre, 1995; Uchida and Stadtman, 1993b), the toxicological relevance of these adducts has not been established. In contrast, anionic thiolates within cysteine catalytic...
triods are found in the active sites of many proteins (e.g., vacuolar ATPase, NSF) that participate in critical presynaptic processes such as neurotransmitter storage and release (reviewed in Barford, 2004; LoPachin and Barber, 2006; LoPachin et al., 2008a; Stamler et al., 2001). Not only are these catalytic thiolates targets for the type 2 alkenes, they are also acceptors for endogenous nitric oxide (NO; Forman et al., 2004; Stamler et al., 2001). NO is a biological electrophile that reversibly forms adducts with thiolate groups and thereby modulates cellular processes by transiently regulating the activities of proteins (Esplugues, 2002; Kiss, 2000; LoPachin and Barber, 2006). We have recently demonstrated that the type 2 alkenes inhibit neurotransmitter release by forming adducts with Cys 264 of NSF. This cysteine is located within a catalytic triad that regulates the rate-limiting ATPase function of NSF in the synaptic vesicle cycle (Barber and LoPachin, 2004; Barber et al., 2007; LoPachin et al., 2007a). Thus, irreversible adduction of essential NO-targeted thiolates by HNE and the type 2 alkenes has toxicological significance.

How does thiolate adduction relate to in vivo mechanisms of type 2 alkene toxicity? HNE and acrolein are by-products of lipid peroxidation that develops secondary to cellular oxidative stress. A growing body of evidence suggests that neurodegenerative conditions such as AD are characterized by early neuronal oxidative damage and nerve terminal dysfunction. Although the mechanism of AD synaptotoxicity has not been determined, numerous studies have reported elevated levels of HNE, acrolein, and their respective protein adducts in relevant brain regions (e.g., amygdala, hippocampus) of AD patients and transgenic animal models (reviewed in LoPachin et al., 2008a,b). Our data, therefore, offer a causal connection between regional synaptic impairment and the endogenous liberation of type 2 alkenes in the neurodegenerative brain; that is, acrolein and HNE form irreversible adducts with NO thiolate acceptors on presynaptic proteins, the resulting loss of NO neuromodulation disrupts neurotransmission, and promotes memory and cognitive deficits. Nerve terminals, due to the exceptionally slow turnover rates of many resident proteins, are selectively vulnerable to damage by low-level exposure to electrophiles. Slower protein turnover promotes adduct accumulation and progressive (cumulative) impairment of presynaptic processes (reviewed in LoPachin and Barber, 2006; LoPachin et al., 2008a,b). However, our studies (LoPachin et al., 2007a,b) suggest that chemicals in the type 2 alkene class share a common ability to cause synaptotoxicity through adduction of sulfhydryl thiolate groups. Whereas neurotoxicity is a well-documented outcome of in vivo ACR intoxication, peripheral exposure (e.g., oral) to acrolein or MVK is associated with systemic toxicity. As we have recently discussed (LoPachin et al., 2008a), this apparent toxicological conundrum is due to relative differences in electrophilic reactivity. Thus, acrolein and MVK are highly electrophilic and rapidly form adducts with sulfhydryl groups. Following systemic intoxication, this rapid adduct formation essentially limits tissue distribution of these reactive type 2 alkenes. As a result, the peripheral site of absorption determines the corresponding toxic manifestations, which are also mediated by a thiolate-based mechanism (see references in LoPachin et al., 2008a). As a weak water-soluble electrophile, ACR is less susceptible to the limiting influence of systemic “adduct buffering” and has a correspondingly larger volume of distribution that encompasses central nervous system nerve terminals. Because synaptotoxicity is a type 2 alkene characteristic, exposure to ACR and other weak electrophilic derivatives (e.g., acrylonitrile, methyl acrylate), for example, through environmental pollution or food contamination, might accelerate the endogenous neurodegenerative cascade of HNE/acrolein production and subsequent nerve terminal damage (reviewed in LoPachin et al., 2008a,b).
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