A Pan-Respiratory Antiviral Chemotype Targeting a Host Multi-Protein Complex

Authors: Maya Michon[1], Andreas Müller-Schiffmann[2], Anuradha F. Lingappa[1], Shao Feng Yu[1], Li Du[3],

Fred Deiter[4], Sean Broce[1], Suguna Mallesh[1], Jackelyn Crabtree[5], Usha F. Lingappa[1], Amanda Macieik[1],

Lisa Müller[6], Philipp Niklas Ostermann[6], Marcel Andrée[6], Ortwin Adams[6], Heiner Schaal[6], Robert J.

Hogan[5], Ralph A. Tripp[5], Umesh Appaiah[1], Sanjeev K. Anand[7], Thomas W. Campi[7], Michael J. Ford[8],

Jonathan C. Reed[9], Jim Lin[1], Olayemi Akintunde[1], Kiel Copeland[1], Christine Nichols[1], Emma Petrouski[1],

A. Raquel Moreira[1], I-ting Jiang[1], Nicholas DeYarman[1], Ian Brown[1], Sharon Lau[1], Ilana Segal[1], Danielle

Goldsmith[1], Shi Hong[1], Vinod Asundi[1], Erica M. Briggs[1], Ngwe Sin Phyo[1], Markus Froehlich[1], Bruce

Onisko[10], Kent Matlack[1], Debendranath Dey[1], Jaisri R. Lingappa[9], M. Dharma Prasad[1], Anatoliy

Kitaygorodskyy[1], Dennis Solas[1], Homer Boushey[11], John Greenland[4,11], Satish Pillai[3,11], Michael K. Lo[12],

Joel M. Montgomery[12], Christina F. Spiropoulou[12], Carsten Korth[2], Suganya Selvarajah[1], Kumar

Paulvannan[1], and Vishwanath R. Lingappa[1,11]*

Affiliations:

[1] Prosetta Biosciences, San Francisco, CA, USA.

[2] Institute of Neuropathology, Heinrich Heine University, Düsseldorf, Germany.

[3] Vitalant Research Institute, San Francisco, CA, USA.

[4] Veterans Administration Medical Center, San Francisco, CA, USA

[5] University of Georgia, Animal Health Research Center, Athens, GA, USA.

[6] Institute of Virology, Heinrich Heine University, Düsseldorf, Germany.

[7] Santo Biotech, LLC., Pendleton, IN, USA.

[8] MS Bioworks, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.

[9] Dept. of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA.

[10] Onipro LLC., Kensington, CA, USA.

[11] University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA.

[12] Viral Special Pathogens Branch, US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA

* To whom correspondence should be addressed: vlingappa@prosetta.com

<u>Abstract</u>

We present a novel small molecule antiviral chemotype that was identified by an unconventional cell-

free protein synthesis and assembly-based phenotypic screen for modulation of viral capsid assembly.

Activity of PAV-431, a representative compound from the series, has been validated against infectious

virus in multiple cell culture models for all six families of viruses causing most respiratory disease in

humans. In animals this chemotype has been demonstrated efficacious for Porcine Epidemic Diarrhea

Virus (a coronavirus) and Respiratory Syncytial Virus (a paramyxovirus). PAV-431 is shown to bind to the

protein 14-3-3, a known allosteric modulator. However, it only appears to target the small subset of 14-

3-3 which is present in a dynamic multi-protein complex whose components include proteins implicated

in viral lifecycles and in innate immunity. The composition of this target multi-protein complex appears

to be modified upon viral infection and largely restored by PAV-431 treatment. Our findings suggest a

new paradigm for understanding, and drugging, the host-virus interface, which leads to a new clinical

therapeutic strategy for treatment of respiratory viral disease.

Background

The current SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has been characterized by waves of infection. Emerging

mutants, with varying degrees of resistance to current vaccines and waning immune responses within

the population, have contributed to the seemingly-unending surges of disease (1,2). Furthermore, the

risk of a new pandemic, from avian influenza, respiratory syncytial virus (RSV), or another virulent

pathogen known to exist in animal reservoirs, is ever present (3). Given how rapidly SARS-CoV-2 spread

across the globe once it had been transmitted to humans, concern about highly pathogenic respiratory

viruses should not be considered as an abstract, hypothetical threat (4). A technical solution is needed

which can account for the degrees of uncertainty and variation inherent to pandemic preparedness and

response efforts. Otherwise, antiviral countermeasures will continue to aim at an ever-moving target

and always be one step behind. In this paper we will propose a novel solution—one small molecule

compound with potent activity against all six families of viruses that cause most respiratory viral disease

in humans.

Viruses in *Adenoviridae*, *Coronaviridae*, *Herpesviridae*, *Orthomyxoviridae*, *Paramyxoviridae*, and

Picornaviridae families cause over 95% of respiratory disease in humans (5). Diversity between these

viral families, which include both DNA and RNA viruses, and viruses that are both enveloped and not, is

extremely broad (5). The drugs which are available to treat some of these viruses target the varying

proteins encoded by the different viral genomes (6–8). Oseltamivir (Tamiflu) and zanamivir (Relenza)

work on influenza by inhibiting neuraminidase, a viral enzyme that propagates infection by facilitating

the spread of viral particles throughout the host (8). Acyclovir, a treatment for herpes simplex virus,

inhibits viral DNA polymerase (6). Paxlovid, the new drug for SARS-CoV-2, is a protease inhibitor that

blocks viral enzymes responsible for catalyzing critical maturation steps within the virus's lifecycle (7).

But since any one of these viral families represents a small minority of respiratory viral cases, a diagnosis

must be made before potentially effective treatment is initiated. Yet considerable evidence suggests

that the earlier the treatment, the greater is the efficacy (9).

Host-targeted antiviral drugs have been proposed as a new strategy for antiviral drug

development (10–14). Viruses can only reproduce successfully if they are able to redirect host

machinery to suit viral needs (e.g. by building its capsid, blocking immune response, etc.) rather than the

needs of the host, which is to maintain homeostasis (15). The viral generation time is several orders of

magnitude shorter than the host's, making it likely that the host-virus interactome has been highly

selected by viral evolution to provide the best way to reprogram host machinery (16,17). While viruses

employ a range of strategies for hijacking host machinery, "high value" sites of host-viral interface are

likely to be exploited by more than one family of virus. Those sites would make ideal targets for pan-

family antiviral drugs, but identifying them is a challenge.

We hypothesized that it would be possible to identify these high-value host-viral interface sites,

and develop drugs which target them, using cell free protein synthesis and assembly (CFPSA) systems

(13,18,19). Cell free systems have been used to observe and understand critical molecular-level

processes since 1897 when Eduard Buchner demonstrated that cell-free extracts could carry out the

same fermentation reactions as living cells (20). More recently, cell-free protein synthesis has been a

critical tool used to decipher the genetic code, deconvolute protein trafficking, and functionally

reconstitute the transient virus-host-protein interactions that culminate in viral capsid formation (21–

25). The last of these applications, which gave rise to the observation that viral capsid assembly in the

cell-free system is dependent on both host machinery and metabolic energy, and thus cannot be due to

spontaneous self-assembly, provided the rationale for developing our antiviral drug screen. Our

hypothesis was that if viral capsid assembly is a host-catalyzed process, then antiviral therapeutics could

be developed by inhibiting the critical host enzymes co-opted by a virus to catalyze assembly of its

capsid. To test this hypothesis, we set up a phenotypic screen for compounds that could block viral

capsid formation in the CFPSA system, without inhibiting protein synthesis (13,19).

There are several advantages of a CFPSA-based drug screen. First, it uniquely serves to magnify

early events in protein biogenesis that would otherwise be obscured by events in the rest of a protein's

life within the cell. Second, it recreates the reality of protein heterogeneity, including with respect to

post-translational modifications (PTMs, (26–28) and multi-protein complex formation (29–31). Finally, it

exploits the recent appreciation that critical events in protein-protein interactions may occur co-

translationally, that is, while a protein is nascent (32–36). While in principle such a screen could detect

direct binders of the translated viral protein(s), we suspected that the effect of binding a catalytic host

target would be much greater, since blocking one enzyme affects many substrate molecules and in this

case, the viral capsid monomer would effectively be the substrate for catalyzed capsid assembly.

There is an presumption that drugs which target host proteins pose an inherent risk of toxicity

(14). However, one implication of the burgeoning literature in favor of "moonlighting" functions of

proteins is that only a small subset of any given protein participates in any particular MPC (37–39). Once

a hit compound was identified by the CFPSA screen it should then be possible to drive its structure-

activity relationship to selectivity for the relevant subset of the target protein. We therefore anticipated

the need to defer full assessment of toxicity until after structure-activity relationship (SAR) advancement

of initial hits. Thus, once an antiviral compound targeting the host were identified by CFPSA, it could

subsequently be advanced, first for efficacy, and then to moderate toxicity. This could be achieved

either by virtue of the target being a small subset of the full complement of that protein in the cell, or if

the virus modified the host target for its needs, SAR might be selectively tuned to the form of the target

needed by the virus.

The results, to be provided in this paper, focus on the advancement of one novel chemical series

identified as a viral assembly modulator in the CFPSA screen, that appears to show pan-family antiviral

efficacy in cells and animals. Experiments were performed to advance the potency of this antiviral

chemical series and better understand its target and mechanism of action, to provide an understanding

of this new host-viral interface.

<u>Results</u>

Identification and assessment of early assembly-modulating hit compounds PAV-773 and PAV-835

A cell-free protein synthesis and assembly (CFPSA) based phenotypic screen was established for

influenza (FLUV) analogous to what has been done for rabies, HIV, and other viruses (13,19,40,41).

Unlike conventional phenotypic screens, this screen was carried out in cellular extracts rather than in

living cells. The phenotype being screened was the ability of newly synthesized viral capsid protein for

form multimers. In the CFPSA system, faithful formation of multimeric capsid protein complexes is a

quantifiable, functional endpoint (see diagram in **Figure 1A**).

From a library of 150,000 drug-like small molecules, 30,400 compounds were screened and

compounds that interfere with the biochemical pathways of host-catalyzed FLUV capsid assembly were

identified as hits. PAV-773 and PAV-835 were early compounds from a chemical series identified in the

screen as inhibitors of FLUV capsid assembly (see **Figures 1B** and **1C** for their respective chemical

structures). Both compounds blocked assembly of FLUV nucleoprotein into a completed capsid in a

dose-dependent manner, relative to control (see **Figures 1D** and **1E** for their respective activity against

FLUV capsid assembly).

Figure 1. Identification of PAV-773 and PAV-835 as FLUV assembly inhibitors. **Figure 1A** shows a

schematic of the CFPSA phenotypic drug screen indicating steps and readouts. CFPSA reactions carried out

in a 384 well plate format **(1)** result in synthesis of encoded FLUV proteins, with co-expression of eGFP to

distinguish compounds that lower fluorescence readout due to a trivial effect on a protein synthesis **(2)**.

Assembled products are transferred to a capture plate **(3)** which is coated with antibodies to the FLUV

nucleoprotein, capturing and immobilizing synthesized FLUV proteins. As a function of multimerization,

unoccupied epitopes will exist on bound assembly Intermediates and completed viral structures.

Secondary antibodies with fluorescent tags bind those exposed epitopes **(4)**, generating a fluorescent

readout specific to multimeric assembly. Drug action that directly or indirectly blocks multimer formation

results in a diminution of signal **(5)**. **Figure 1B** shows the chemical structure of PAV-773 and **Figure 1C**

shows the chemical structure of PAV-835, early hits in the CFPSA screen. **Figure 1D** and **Figure 1E** show

the effects of PAV-773 and PAV-835 respectively at 3.3uM, 10uM, and 30uM doses on assembly of FLUV

NP in the screen, compared to DMSO and a mock negative control. Average relative fluorescent units

(RFU) detected from quadruplicate-repeat samples are graphed with standard deviation shown as error

bars and statistical significance calculated on GraphPad Prism using an ordinary one-way ANOVA test is

indicated by asterisks.

The FLUV antiviral activity of PAV-773 and PAV-835 was validated against infectious virus in

MDCK cells by TCID$_{50}$ determination (see **Figures 2A**). The effective concentration for half maximal

activity (EC50) against infectious FLUV for both PAV-773 and PAV-835 were lower than 1uM (see **Figure**

2A).

Figure 2. Validation of PAV-773 and PAV-835 antiviral activity in cell culture and evidence for a barrier

to resistance development. Figure 2A shows activity of PAV-773 and PAV-835 against infectious FLUV

(A/WSN/33) in MDCK cells by $TCID_{50}$ determination. Averages and standard error of triplicate samples are

graphed, and statistical significance calculated by one-way ANOVA on GraphPad Prism is indicated with

asterisks. **Figure 2B** shows activity of PAV-835 or oseltamivir against FLUV (A/WSN/33) in MDCK cells after

7 passages in the presence of compound. **Figure 2C** shows activity of PAV-773 and PAV-835 against

infectious coronavirus (BRCV-OK-0514-2) in HRT-I8G cells by $TCID_{50}$ determination. **Figure 2D** shows

activity of PAV-773 and PAV-835 against infectious rhinovirus (HRV-16) in HI-HeLa cells by $TCID_{50}$

determination. **Figure 2E** shows activity of PAV-773 and PAV-835 against infectious herpesvirus (MHV-68)

in BHK-21 cells by $TCID_{50}$ determination. PAV-773 and PAV-835 both displayed EC50s of less than 1uM for

all four viruses studied. Statistical significance for Figures 2C-E were calculated by ordinary one-way

ANOVA tests on GraphPad Prism and are indicated with asterisks.

The emergence of viral resistance is a common challenge for the development of effective

antiviral therapeutics (42). Oseltamivir (Tamiflu), an antiviral small molecule targeting FLUV

neuraminidase, is known to select for viral resistance mutants (43). To assess the propensity for FLUV to

gain resistance to our chemotype, MDCK cells were infected with serial passages of FLUV in the

presence of PAV-835. With each passage, the infected media was used to infect fresh MDCK cells. Higher

concentrations of compound were added with each passage to drive resistance (93.5nM to 3uM). After

7 passages with compound, PAV-835 retained the same activity against FLUV as it did against a naive

strain which had been passaged for 7 times without compound, demonstrating a barrier to the

development of resistance (see **Figure 2B**). In parallel, the same experiment was conducted using

Oseltamivir (ranging from 935nM to 30uM) , antiviral resistance developed and the compound lost

activity by passage 7 (see **Figure 2B**).

We counter-screened PAV-773 and PAV-835 for activity against other viral families by

assessment of viral titer in cell culture by $TCID_{50}$ (see **Figures 2C**-**E**). Both compounds were found to have

EC50s of less than 1uM against bovine coronavirus (BoCoV), human rhinovirus (HRV), and murine

herpesvirus (MHV). These data led us to refer to these compounds as *pan-respiratory viral assembly*

modulators based on their initial identification as modulators of FLUV capsid assembly and subsequent

demonstration of efficacy against multiple respiratory-disease causing viruses.

Validation of the antiviral activity of PAV-773 and PAV-835 in animals

At the time we were characterizing the activity of these early compounds, an outbreak of

Porcine epidemic diarrhea virus (PEDV) led to the loss of more than 10% of the pig population in the

United States (44). Since PEDV is a member of the coronavirus family, we predicted that while the

chemical series was early in the drug-development process, the compounds would likely show antiviral

activity against PEDV. PAV-773 and PAV-835 were assessed in outbred pigs randomized within each

litter into control and treatment groups and infected with PEDV. Both compounds significantly increased

likelihood of survival, relative to the control (see **Figures 3A** and **3B**).

B						
	control	PAV-835	PAV-773	control	PAV-835	PAV-773
% survival	32.3%	56.7%	56.7%	0.0%	57.1%	66.7%
survivors	10	17	17	0	8	10
deaths	21	13	13	15	7	5

Figure 3. Validation of PAV-773 and PAV-835 antiviral activity in pigs. Pigs were randomized into control

and treatment groups then infected with PEDV, a pig coronavirus. **Figure 3A** Left is shown the percent

survival for all animals in the study. The p-value was calculated on GraphPad Prism using Fisher's exact

test. Right is shown the percent survival in the subset of litters in which all animals in the randomized

control (vehicle) treatment group died. As can be seen, compound treatment is equally efficacious in this

severe disease subset. **Figure 3B** shows the breakdown of survival for PAV-773 and PAV-835.

Characterizing the antiviral activity of PAV-431, a more advanced analog from the Pan-Respiratory

Assembly Modulator chemical series

A structure-activity-relationship (SAR) was pursued to advance the pan-respiratory assembly

modulator chemical series emerging from the early hits, and to understand how changes to the

chemical structure altered activity against infectious FLUV (see **Supplemental Figure 1**). PAV-431 was

identified as a chemical analog with improved efficacy (see **Figure 4A** for its chemical structure and

Supplemental **Figure 2A** for its synthetic scheme).

PAV-431 was assessed by TCID50 for activity against multiple viral families. PAV-431 displayed

an EC50 between 25nM and 100nM (depending on the virus) against members of *Orthomyxoviridae*,

Coronaviridae, *Paramyxoviridae*, *Adenoviridae*, *Herpesviridae*, and *Picornaviridae*—all six families of

viruses which cause respiratory disease in humans (see **Figure 4B**). Within *Coronaviridae*, PAV-431

showed efficacy against the WA 1/2020, delta, and omicron strains of SARS CoV-2 (see **Figure 4C**).

Finally, PAV-431 was assessed against Nipah virus, a BSL-4 member of the *Pneumoviridae* family with

pandemic potential should it ever jump species and become capable of human-to-human aerosol

transmission and shown comparably potent (see **Supplementary Figure 3**).

In addition to demonstrating efficacy in transformed cells, PAV-431 showed activity against the

gamma variant of SARS CoV-2 in primary human bronchial epithelial cells cultured to an air-liquid

interface (ALI) (see **Figure 4D**). 100nM PAV-431 eliminated approximately 90% of more of viral load

compared to vehicle treatment in three ALI studies derived from three different human lung donors

without inflicting significant toxicity to the cells, as measured by levels of RNASe P (see **Figure 4D** and

4E). Notably, PAV-431 did not show significant activity at those doses against rabies virus, indicating

that even though the compound displays broad pan-family efficacy, there is some selectivity for a target

present in some, but not all, viral families (see **Figure 4B**).

cell line	virus (family)	PAV-431 EC$_{50}$
MDCK	influenza A/WSN/33 (*Orthomyxoviridae*)	25 nM
MDCK	swine influenza virus SIV/SK WT (*Orthomyxoviridae*)	25 nM
GBK	bovine coronavirus (*Coronaviridae*)	50 nM
Vero E6	SARS-CoV-2 WA1/2020 (*Coronaviridae*)	100 nM
HEp2	respiratory synctial virus strain A-2 (*Paramyxoviridae*)	< 25 nM
HSAEC1-KT	Nipah virus rNiV-ZsG (*Paramyxoviridae*)	≤ 50 nM
A549	adenovirus serotype 5 strain adenoid 65 (*Adenoviridae*)	< 100 nM
H1-Hela	human cytomegalovirus strain AD69 (*Herpesviridae*)	25 nM
H1-Hela	human rhinovirus 16 (*Picornaviridae*)	< 20 nM
MNA	rabies virus CVS-11 (*Rhabdoviridae*)	> 400 nM

G

Figure 4. Antiviral activity of PAV-431 against all viral families which cause respiratory disease in humans. Figure

4A shows the chemical structure of PAV-431, an analog from the pan-respiratory assembly modulator chemical

series. **Figure 4B** shows the efficacy of PAV-431 against multiple viruses in cell culture by $TCID_{50}$ where and EC50 of

100nM or lower is observed for every family of virus causing human respiratory disease. **Figure 4C** shows dose

dependent antiviral activity of PAV-431 compared to a DMSO control against multiple SARS-CoV-2 strains:

(Wa/2020, lineage A) in Vero E6 cells, determined by plaque assay, delta variant (lineage B.1.617.2) and omicron

variant (lineage B.A.1) in Calu-3 cells determined by qPCR of the SARS-CoV-2 N gene and/or $TCID_{50}$. Data shown are

the averages of three biological replicates where error bars indicate standard error. Statistical significance was

calculated on GraphPad Prism using an ordinary one-way ANOVA test for each dataset. **Figures 4D and 4E** show

efficacy and nontoxicity of PAV-431 in primary human airway epithelial cells at air-liquid interface. Bronchial

epithelial cells from three lung donors were culture to an air-liquid interface, infected with SARS-CoV-2 (gamma

variant, lineage P.1) and treated with either PAV-431 or vehicle. **Figure 4D** shows average of two replicates with

error bars indicating standard error where viral replication was determined by qPCR measurement of the SARS-

CoV-2 N gene. **Figure 4E** shows a lack of observed toxicity assessed by levels of RNase P. **Figure 4F** shows results of

PAV-431 in an animal efficacy trial against RSV in cotton rats. Averages are shown where error bars indicate

standard error. A significant drop in viral titer was observed with PAV-431 treatment, relative to vehicle (unpaired

t-test p=0.016). The statistical significance for 4D-F was calculated on GraphPad Prism using unpaired t-tests.

Figure 4G shows the efficacy of PAV-431 against Nipah virus, a BSL-4 member of the *Pneumoviridae* family in

human telomerase reverse-transcriptase immortalized primary-like small airway epithelial cells (HSAEC1-KT, ATCC

CRL-4050) cultured in Airway Epithelial Basal Medium (ATCC) supplemented with Bronchial Epithelial Cell Growth

Kit (ATCC). For infections and cell viability assays (done in duplicate) by both Alamar Blue and Cell Titer glo,

HSAEC1-KT cells were cultured with growth medium with 5 mM of D-glucose solution (Gibco). PAV-431 was added

prior to infection as described in methods. As shown, CC_{50} of PAV-431 by Alamar Blue is > 10uM and by Cell titer

glo is > 5uM, under these conditions.

We assessed the degree to which the chemical properties of PAV-431 meet the standard criteria

for advancement into a drug candidate. PAV-431 displayed promising properties including being

negative for hERG channel inhibition, and without substantial Cerep panel enzyme inhibition (see

Supplemental Figure 3). When administered to rats, a dose of 5mg/kg administered intraperitoneally

(IP) was found to be safe, reaching a concentration of 293 ng/ml in plasma and 452 ng/nl in lungs (see

Supplemental Figure 3A).

Given the respectable PK properties, PAV-431 was tested in cotton rats infected with respiratory

syncytial virus (RSV), a paramyxovirus, to assess animal efficacy for a more advanced compound in the

series against a second family of respiratory disease-causing viruses. A small but statistically significant

drop in RSV titer was observed with PAV-431 treatment, relative to the vehicle-only control (see **Figure**

4F).

Identifying the molecular target of the Pan-Respiratory Assembly Modulators

Since the pan-respiratory viral assembly modulator chemical series had been validated as

significantly active in cellular or animal models for seven viral families, we sought to understand the

molecular target being acted upon by the compound in order to achieve the results. To identify the

target, PAV-431 was coupled to an Affi-gel resin from a position on the molecule unrelated to the

activity based on SAR exploration. Once bound to a resin, it could serve as a target-binding ligand for

drug resin affinity chromatography (DRAC) (see **Supplemental Figure 2B** for synthetic scheme of a PAV-

431 resin).

In the DRAC protocol, extracts were prepared from MRC-5 cells which were uninfected, infected

with either FLUV or BoCoV, and treated with 400nM PAV-431 or an equivalent amount of DMSO. The

extracts were applied to the PAV-431 resin or a control resin containing an Affi-gel matrix bound to

itself, washed with 100 bed volumes of buffer, eluted with 100uM PAV-431, then stripped with 1% SDS.

In the course of these studies, we discovered that providing metabolic energy substrates in the form of

nucleotide triphosphates greatly enhanced target formation (45). We established conditions for energy-

dependent drug resin affinity chromatography (eDRAC) by supplementing the extract and the elution

buffer with a "energy cocktail" of ribonucleotide triphosphates 1mM rATP, 1mM rGTP, 1mM rCTP, 1mM

UTP) and 5 ug/mL creatine kinase, with the binding, washing, and eluting steps conducted at 22°C.

When eDRAC eluates from the PAV-431 resins and the control resin were collected and analyzed

by silver stain compared to the starting extract, several striking observations were made. While the

protein profile in the starting extracts for uninfected, FLUV, and BoCoV infected cells appeared similar,

the PAV-431 resin eluates were strikingly different, with a protein pattern not observed for free drug

eluates from control resin (lacking the drug as an affinity ligand, see **Figure 5A**).

Figure 5. Protein composition of the PAV-431 eluate. eDRAC experiments were performed where

uninfected, infected, or infected/PAV-431 treated cellular extract was incubated on a resin coupled to

either PAV-431 or a 4% agarose matrix lacking the covalently bound drug. **Figure 5A** shows silver stain of a

SDS-PAGE gel comparing protein composition of the starting cellular extract and the PAV-431 eluate for

uninfected, FLUV infected and BoCOV infected MRC5 cells. **Figure 5B** shows MSMS analysis indicating

protein composition and comparing log2 fold change and p-values in protein in triplicate repeated

uninfected, FLUV infected, and FLUV/PAV-431 treated conditions. **Figure 5C** shows MSMS analysis

indicating protein composition and comparing log 2 fold change in protein in triplicate-repeated

uninfected, BoCoV infected, and BoCoV infected/PAV-431 treated conditions. Green indicates log2 fold

change >1. Yellow indicates log2fold change between -1 and 1 (no change). Red indicates log2 fold change

>-1. P values indicate significance of the findings. Where the gene product has been listed in bold font,

indicates the protein is implicated in the literature as part of the host-virus interactome. Where the gene

product has been listed in italic font, indicates the protein is implicated in the literature as related to

innate immune system function. **Figure 5D** shows quantitation of the protein band detected by western

blot analysis of the uninfected, infected, and FLUV infected/PAV-431 treated eluates for the protein

p62/SQSTM1. **Figure 5E** shows quantitation of the protein band detected by western blot analysis of

eDRAC from pig lung extract where starting extract and eluate were compared side-by-side and the

amount of protein in the eluate is graphed as a percentage of the total amount of that protein present in

the cell extract. Approximately 2% of the cellular VCP, 3% of the cellular CAPN2, 2.5% of the cellular 14-3-

3 and 0.5% of the cellular p62 was found in the PAV-431 eluate.

Triplicate-repeat samples of eDRAC eluates generated from MRC-5 cell extract were sent for

analysis by tandem mass spectrometry (MS-MS) to determine their protein composition. To analyze the

data, LFQ intensity values for proteins identified in each condition were measured and compared

against each other to generate log2 fold change values for each protein and each combination of

conditions to provide a clear description of the differences observed under treatment conditions. Of 64

proteins identified by LFQ as increased in eluates upon FLUV infection, 41 are restored to uninfected

levels after treatment with PAV-431 (see **Figure 5B**). All 13 proteins lost from eluates upon FLUV

infection are restored to uninfected levels after treatment with PAV-431 (see **Figure 5B**). Of 56 proteins

found increased in eluates upon BoCoV infection, 51 are restored to uninfected levels after treatment

with PAV-431 (See **Figure 5C**). Of 7 proteins lost from eluates with BoCoV infection, 5 are restored to the

uninfected levels after treatment with PAV-431 (See **Figure 5C**).

Proteins found to be significantly enriched or depleted by infection and/or treatment were

searched in databases for known virus-host interactions and implication in the innate immune system

interactome and many such proteins were identified (See **Figures 5B-5D**) (46–51). P62/SQSTM1, a

regulator of innate immunity, was identified in the PAV-431 eluate by western blot. As with changes in

protein composition observed by MS-MS, the amount of P62 decreased with FLUV infection but was

restored with PAV-431 treatment (See **Figure 5D**).

The eDRAC protocol was also conducted with extract prepared from uninfected pig lung

homogenate, rather than MRC-5 cells, and samples were analyzed by western blot. When analyzed side-

by-side with an aliquot of the total starting material, it was determined that for particular proteins

found in the eluate including VCP, CAPN2, 14-3-3, and P62, only a single digit percent, or less, of the

total amount of specific proteins present in the extract was found in the PAV-431 eluate (See **Figure 5E**).

The large majority of the component proteins did not bind to the resin, or bound nonspecifically such

that they were removed with washing, with no significant further binding of drug resin flowthrough

applied to a second copy of the drug resin.

To determine the relationship the proteins identified in the eluate had to one another, and to

the compound, the eDRAC protocol was modified for photocrosslinking. An analog of PAV-431 was

synthesized with diazirine and biotin moieties added to the same position at which the resin had

previously been attached (See **Supplemental Figure 2C** for synthetic scheme and chemical structure of

photocrosslinker analog). The photocrosslinker analogs were designed so that after an incubation with

cell extract that would allow the compound to bind its target, exposure to ultraviolet light would form a

covalent bond between the diazirine moiety of the compound and the nearest protein neighbor (52).

The sample could then be solubilized and precipitated with streptavidin beads (which bind biotin with

extremely high affinity) to identify the covalently crosslinked drug-binding proteins. The streptavidin

precipitation (SAP) could be done using a native sample, which would pick up the direct drug binding

protein(s) and with it, co-associated proteins that were part of an MPC. Alternatively, the SAP could be

done using a crosslinked sample that was then denatured by treatment with SDS to 1% and DTT to 1mM

with heating to 100oC for 3 minutes to denature all proteins, after which excess 1% Triton-X-100 buffer

was added to take free SDS into Triton micelles. Use of this material for SAP would, by virtue of the

covalent bond to the biotin containing diazirine-drug conjugate, identify only the direct drug-binding

protein(s), with all other associated proteins lost upon denaturation and washing.

Uninfected pig lung was incubated on the PAV-431 resin under eDRAC conditions, washed 100x,

eluted with the PAV-431 crosslinker analog, then exposed to ultraviolet light. The samples were then

divided into two equal parts where one was left native and the other denatured, then both were

adjusted to non-denaturing conditions and incubated with streptavidin beads. Blots of the SAP samples

for VCP, CAPN2, and P62 showed those proteins in the native but not denatured samples, indicating that

they were non-covalently co-associated with the compound, and therefore were not its direct binding

partner (see **Figures 6A, B,** and **D**). Blots of the SAP samples for 14-3-3 showed nearly equal amounts of

protein in both the native and denatured conditions, indicating that PAV-431 directly binds to 14-3-3

(See **Figure 6C**).

Figure 6. A cellular sub-fraction of 14-3-3 as the direct binding partner in an MPC drug target. eDRAC

was conducted with pig lung homogenate extract eluted from the PAV-431 resin with the PAV-431

crosslinker analog. Eluates were exposed to UV light and precipitated with streptavadin in native and

denaturing conditions then analyzed by western blot. **Figures 6A-D** shows quantitation of the protein for

VCP, CAPN2, 14-3-3, and P62.

<u>Discussion</u>

The antiviral chemotype studied here exhibits several notable features. These include activity

across a broad range of respiratory viral families, a demonstrated barrier to development of viral drug

resistance, different forms of the target present in uninfected vs infected cells, and substantial

restoration of the target to the uninfected form with drug treatment. In all cases, a subset of the host

protein 14-3-3 appears to be the direct drug-binding protein and is present within a large multiprotein

complex notable for its transience and energy-dependence. PAV-431 binds both forms of the target, i.e.

that present in uninfected cells and that present in infected cells, roughly equally well. Elsewhere a

more advanced compound will be described that appears to be selective for the form present only in

infected cells which includes, for SARS-CoV-2, the viral nucleoprotein, which is subsequently lost from

the target upon drug treatment (53, 54).

Two general approaches can be taken for discovery of chemical compounds with therapeutic

potential— target-based and phenotypic methods (55). Target-based methods of drug discovery involve

screens that measure a small molecule's interaction with a particular disease-implicated protein.

Phenotypic methods involve screens that monitor how small molecules affect particular biochemical or

physiologic readouts within model systems without requiring any prior knowledge of the protein target.

It has recently been observed that most drugs have been discovered by variations on phenotypic

screening (56). Most phenotypic screens involve whole cell assays (57). Such screens, while often

successful, face significant drawbacks. The presence of confounding events in the complex milieu of a

living cell can mask detection of potentially interesting targets. Moreover, feedback effects are typically

complex and multifaceted (58–63). This can create a signal-to-noise problem for detection of potential

contributors to a particular phenotypic effect. If multiple contributors are involved in creating a

phenotype it may be hard to de-convolute the relationship of any given one to the behavior of the

compound.

By contrast, the CFPSA-based phenotypic screening approach taken here focuses attention on

those events set into motion early in protein biogenesis (during and immediately after protein

synthesis). This results in an improved signal-to-noise ration by excluding much of the rest of the

lifecycle of most proteins, for both viruses and cells, as confounding variables. A growing literature

supports the notion that protein assembly is co-translational (32,64). Thus, CFPSA reveals aspects of the

viral lifecycle not easily discernable by other methods.

14-3-3, the protein identified as PAV-431's direct target (see **Figure 6**) is known to regulate

multiple signaling pathways, including cell cycle progression, apoptosis, autophagy, and glucose

metabolism, through protein-protein interactions (65–69). However, it has been difficult to convert

these insights on 14-3-3 biology into therapeutic successes, perhaps because of this "promiscuity" of 14-

3-3 (67–75).

The 14-3-3 targeting antiviral chemotype identified through CFPSA is promising precisely

because it does *not* target all of 14-3-3, but rather a tiny subset found within a particular transient,

energy-dependent MPC. For this reason, most 14-3-3 in the cell is not perturbed by these drugs. The

data from eDRAC experiments provides compelling evidence that the 14-3-3 targeted by PAV-431

comprises only a single-digit percent of the total amount of 14-3-3 present in the cellular extract (see

Figures 5 and **6**). The data from photocrosslinking experiments provides evidence that this targeted

subfraction of 14-3-3 is present in an MPC (see **Figures 5** and **6**). PAV-431 was determined to directly

bind 14-3-3 but it also was found to indirectly bind multiple other proteins including p62/SQSTM1, VCP,

and CAPN2 that are present in the MPC (see **Figures 6A-D**). Since 14-3-3 is known to regulate an array of

cellular functions, data showing that PAV-431 targets a particular MPC provides a plausible explanation

for why some but not all functions of 14-3-3 are regulated by the compound. The selectivity of PAV-431

to a small subset of 14-3-3 that is specific to a particular MPC or biochemical pathway makes the

possibility of developing the chemical series as a 14-3-3 targeting therapeutic increasingly viable.

We originally termed hit compounds identified by our CFPSA screen as 'assembly modulators'

because they blocked the assembly of viral proteins. However, based on the eDRAC and

photocrosslinking results we would propose a more nuanced model for understanding the mechanism

of action of assembly modulating compounds. Our data suggests that viral infection modifies a multi-

protein complex with catalytic activity to serve multiple alternate needs for the virus. This includes both

promoting viral propagation through capsid assembly and blocking innate immune defenses, such as

p62/SQSTM1-mediated autophagy (see **Figures 5** and **6**). This model is supported by the changes

observed to the MPC targeted by PAV-431 under different conditions which indicate that the target's

composition is dynamic (see **Figure 5**). When cells are infected by viruses, certain proteins appear to be

recruited and others appear to be expelled from the targeted multi-protein complex. When infected

cells are treated with PAV-431, the reverse happens and the protein composition of the multi-protein

complex appears to be largely restored to what was observed in uninfected cells.

Figure 7. Cartoon diagram of proposed mechanism of action of assembly modulating compounds.

Figure 7 A illustrates the proposed model where a "normal" MPC with catalytic activity that plays a role in

carrying out cellular events in the service of homeostasis is modified to an "aberrant" MPC by a viral

infection. The aberrant MPC carries out a reaction which does not serve homeostasis (e.g. building a viral

capsid) and perhaps fails to conduct a key event that it should (e.g. inform innate immune mechanisms

that the cell is under attack). **Figure 7B** illustrates the proposed mechanism in which treatment with a

assembly modulating compound, such as PAV-431, normalizes the complex and its homeostatic functions.

The protein 14-3-3 is included in the diagram because it is the protein which the compound appears to

directly bind. Its known role as an allosteric regulator may provide insight into how this normalization is

achieved.

The significance of 14-3-3 as the direct binding partner of PAV-431 may be found in its known

roles as an allosteric modulator of protein-protein interactions (67) and in its known participation in host

anti-viral defenses (**Figure 7B)** (76). This may also, at least in part, account for the antiviral activity

observed for PAV-431 against six diverse families of viruses causing human respiratory disease. The

drug-binding site within 14-3-3 may represent a 'high value' site which multiple viruses have found and

exploited over deep evolutionary time. The relationship between particular proteins which comprise the

targeted MPC and 14-3-3 as the direct drug-binding partner is unknown besides the evidence that they

are transiently co-associated, and the observation that many of these proteins are implicated in the

literature as being part of disease-relevant protein-protein interactomes (46–49). While more data is

needed, the potential significance of these early results involving the PAV-431 drug target is

underscored by the loss upon viral infection, and return upon drug-treatment of infected cells, of p62, a

known regulator of autophagy (50,51,66). An inability to trigger innate immune responses after viral

infection would be to the virus's benefit and the host's detriment. Conversely, restoration of this

function would bolster the host's ability to fend of infection. Thus these compounds appear to have a

dual mechanism of action: blockade of viral replication (capsid assembly) and restoration of autophagy,

a branch of the innate immune system.

While the identification of the pan-respiratory assembly modulating chemotype was achieved

through unconventional methods, and its novel mechanism of action remains poorly understood, the

antiviral activity of compounds from the series have been validated against infectious viruses in both cell

culture and animals (see **Figures 2-4**). Cell culture studies, including in primary bronchial epithelial cells

cultured at an air-liquid interface and infected with SARS-CoV-2, a model considered as the gold

standard for translatability into human therapeutics (77), confirmed antiviral potency of these

compounds (see **Figure 4**). Animal studies validated efficacy for survival in an actual pig coronavirus

disease and viral load reduction in the cotton rat model of RSV infection (see **Figures 3** and **4**). The path

to develop this chemical series to a clinical drug-candidate and conducting IND enabling studies, IND

filing, and human clinical trials on the lead compound is straightforward, especially since a more

advanced chemical analog displaying substantial improvement in antiviral activity has already been

identified (53, 54). If validated in humans, the assembly modulating compounds presented here may

have transformative implications for the treatment of respiratory viral disease, applicable to everything

from seasonal influenza, common 'winter viruses' (HRV, etc), emerging variants of SARS-Cov-2, and any

other particularly virulent strains of respiratory disease-causing viruses such as avian influenza.

Future studies with advanced analogs will address the question of whether it is possible to

identify analogs that show selectivity for the form of the target observed in viral infection and avoid the

form present in the healthy (uninfected) host. Such compounds would be ideal for human therapeutics

and predicted to display striking diminution in toxicity.

A

B

compound	R_1	R_2	R_3	R_4	R_5	R_6	R_7	R_8	EC_{50}(µM)
PAV-770	Me	t-Bu	H	O-CH2-	CH2-O-	H	F	H	1 - 3
PAV-868	Me	t-Bu	H	OMe	OMe	OMe	H	H	> 3
PAV-858	Me	t-Bu	H	OMe	H	OMe	OMe	H	> 3
PAV-772	Me	t-Bu	H	OMe	F	H	F	H	3
PAV-736	CH2CH2OH	t-Bu	H	OMe	OMe	H	H	H	> 3
PAV-869	Me	t-Bu	H	OPr	OMe	H	H	H	> 3
PAV-773	Me	t-Bu	H	OMe	OMe	H	H	H	< 1
PAV-1866	Me	t-Bu	Me	OMe	OMe	H	H	H	> 3
PAV-834	Me	Me	H	OMe	OMe	H	H	H	3
PAV-854	Me	Cy-hex	H	OMe	OMe	H	H	H	> 1
PAV-530	Me	iPr	H	OMe	OMe	H	H	H	1
PAV-835	Me	cyPr	H	OMe	OMe	H	H	H	< 1
PAV-895	Me	cyPr	H	OMe	Me	H	H	H	2
PAV-039	Me	cyPr	H	OMe	OMe	H	H	F	1
PAV-896	Me	cyPr	H	Me	OMe	H	H	H	1.5
PAV-700	Me	cyPr	H	Cl	OMe	H	H	H	2
PAV-235	Me	cyPr	H	F	OMe	H	H	H	0.2
PAV-944	Me	cyPr	H	OMe	CF3	H	H	H	0.2
PAV-901	Me	cyPr	H	CF3	OMe	H	H	H	0.3
PAV-671	Me	cyPr	H	H	Cl	OCF3	H	H	0.05
PAV-774	Me	cyPr	H	Cl	OCF3	H	H	H	0.2
PAV-431	Me	cyPr	H	OMe	OCF3	H	H	H	< 0.1
PAV-528	Me	cyPr	H	OCHF2	OCHF2	H	H	H	< 0.1
PAV-877	Me	cyPr	H	H	Me	OCHF2	Me	H	> 2

488   **Supplemental Figure 1**. **Early SAR exploration within hit chemical series. Supplemental Figure 1A** shows

489   a Markush structure for the initial hit chemical series in the CFPSA flu capsid assembly screen.

490   **Supplemental Figure 1B** shows the initial structure-activity-relationship pursued to characterize how

491   changes to different parts of the molecule affect activity of the series. EC50 for each compound was

492   determined by $TCID_{50}$ with infectious FLUV in MDCK cells.

Supplemental Figure 2. Synthetic scheme for PAV-431 and its resin and photocrosslinker analogs.

Supplemental Figure 2A shows the synthetic scheme for PAV-431. **Supplemental Figure 2B** shows the

synthetic scheme for attachment to a resin by the pyrazole position, which was used in the eDRAC

experiments described in Figure 5 and Supplemental Figure 4. The eDRAC experiments described in Figure

6 were conducted with a resin attached from the benzyl ring. **Supplemental Figure 2C** shows the synthetic

scheme for the PAV-431 photocrosslinker analog used in the experiments described in Figure 6.

A

Compounds Parameters		PAV-431		
EC$_{90}$ (nM)		100		
MW		369.3		
Mouse MTD	Route- Dosage, mg/kg Safe dose	-	IP-5	-
Rat PK	Route- Dosage, mg/kg	IV-1	IP-5	PO-5
	AUC$_{last}$, h.ng/mL	307	910	
	AUC$_{inf}$, h.ng/mL	342	923	
	C$_{max}$, ng/mL	253	293	
	T$_{max}$, h	0.08	0.25	
	t$_{1/2}$, h	12	5	Low conc.
	CL, mL/min	49	-	
	V$_z$, L/Kg	32	-	
	F, %	-	59	
Rat Uptake	Route- Dosage, mg/kg	-	IP-5	-
	Conc. In Lungs, ng/g, 0.5h, 2h	-	452, 131	-
	Conc. in Brain, ng/g, 0.5h, 2h	-	593, 177	-
	Conc. in Plasma, ng/mL, 0.5h, 2h	-	308, 123	-

Supplemental Figure 3. **Supplemental Figure 3A** shows the drug-like properties of PAV-431 including in

vivo and in vitro assessments of toxicity as well as pharmacokinetic properties. Maximum tolerated dose

(MTD) studies in mice were conducted using female Balb/c mice where randomized groups containing 3

mice were dosed with a single dose of vehicle or compound and monitored for 48 hours for symptoms of

toxicity. Pharmacokinetic (PK) studies were conducted in male Sprague Dawley rats where randomixed

groups of four animals were administered compound and plasma was collected before dosing then after 5

minutes, 15 minutes, 30 minutes, 1 hour, 2 hours, 4 hours, 8 hours, 12 hours, and 24 hours to determine

concentration of the compound in plasma over time. In the uptake studies, animals were euthanized after

30 minutes or 2 hours to determine concentration of the compound in the lung and brain. **Supplemental**

Figure 3B shows the results of PAV-431 in an in vitro Cerep panel, a commercial screen for potential to

bind to a broad panel of receptors, enzymes, and ion channels, reported as percent inhibition of control

specific binding. PAV-431 was tested at 50uM, a concentration ~500x higher than antiviral EC50. Data

shown are the averages of replicates, error bars indicate standard error.

Materials and methods

Lead contact and Materials Availability

Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled

by the Lead Contact Vishwanath R. Lingappa (vlingappa@prosetta.com).

Use of unique compound PAV-431 may be available upon request by the Lead Contact if sought for

experimental purposes under a valid completed Materials Transfer Agreement.

The number of replicates carried out for each experiment is described in the figure/table legends.

Chemical Synthesis (see **Supplemental Figure 2**)

Synthesis of PAV-431

Synthetic schemes are illustrated in Figure S6. To a solution of 2-methoxy-3-trifluoromethoxy-

benzaldehyde 1 (2.14 g, 9.71 mmol, 1.0 eq) in toluene (20 mL) was added 2,4-dimethoxybenzyl amine 2

(1.78 g, 10.68 mmol, 1.1 eq) and the reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 24 hours.

Toluene was removed to give a residue, which was taken in MeOH (20 mL) and then NaBH4 (735 mg,

19.42 mmol, 2.0 eq) was added slowly. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 6

hours. The solvent was removed and the residue was extracted in ethyl acetate and stirred with

saturated aq NaHCO3 for 1 hour. The organic layer was collected, dried, and the solvent was removed to

give the crude amine 3, which was used in the next step without further purification. To a solution of the

crude amine 3 (4.86 mmol, 1.0 eq) in DMF (20 mL) were added the acid 4 (888 mg, 5.35 mmol, 1.1 eq),

DIEA (3.13 g, 24.3 mmol, 5eq) and HBTU (2.22 g, 5.83 mmol, 1.2 eq) and the reaction mixture was stirred

at room temperature for 12 hours. The reaction mixture was then diluted with ethyl acetate (75 mL) and

washed with 10% aq HCl (1 x 50 mL), sat NaHCO3 (1 x 50 mL) and water (4 x 50 mL). The organic layer

was collected, dried (MgSO4) and evaporated to give a crude product, which was purified by column

chromatography (EtOAc:Hexane 25%:75%)) to give the amide 5, which was directly used in the next

step. The amide 5 was treated with 95% TFA:H2O for 12 hours. TFA was removed and azeotroped with

toluene to give a residue, which was purified by column chromatography (EtOAc:Hexane 10%:50%) to

give PAV-431 (985 mg, > 95% purity).

Synthesis of PAV-431 Resin

To a solution of amine 3 (5.85 g, 15.77 mmol, 1.0 eq) in DMF (30 mL) were added the acid 6

(2.38 g, 15.77 mmol, 1.0 eq), DIEA (10.2 g, 78.85 mmol, 5eq) and HBTU (7.17 g, 18.92 mmol, 1.2 eq) and

the reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 12 hours. The reaction mixture was then

diluted with ethyl acetate (75 mL) and washed with 10% aq HCl (1 x 50 mL), sat NaHCO3 (1 x 50 mL) and

water (4 x 50 mL). The organic layer was collected, dried (MgSO4) and evaporated to give a crude

product, which was purified by column chromatography (EtOAc/Hexane) to give compound 7. To a

stirred solution compound 7 (0.8 g, 1.77 mmol, 1.0 eq) and cesium carbonate (1.15 g, 3.54 mmol, 2.0 eq)

in DMF (10 mL) was added chloride 8 (0.55 g, 2.66 mmol, 1.5 eq) and the reaction mixture was stirred at

room temperature for 24 hours. The reaction mixture was diluted with ethyl acetate and washed with

water (4x) and aq NaCl solution. The organic layer was collected, dried (MgSO4) and evaporated to give

a crude product, which was purified by column chromatography (EtOAc/Hexane) to give compound 9.

The amide 9 (1.0 g, 1.6 mmol) was taken in 95% TFA: H2O and the reaction mixture was for 12 hours.

TFA was removed and azeotroped with toluene to give a residue. The residue was taken in DCM and sat.

NaHCO3 solution added and stirred for 30 min. The aqueous layer was washed with DCM (2x) and the

combined organic layer, dried (MgSO4) and evaporated to give a crude amine, which was used in the

next step without purification. To a solution of the crude amine (1.6 mmol, 1.0 eq) and DIEA (412.8 mg,

3.2 mmol, 2.0 eq) in DCM (20 mL), was added boc anhydride (523.2 mg, 2.4 mmol, 1.5 eq) and the

reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 8 hours. The solvent was removed and the residue

was purified by column chromatography (EtOAc/Hexane) to give compound 10. Compound 10 (100 mg,

0.19 mmol) was in 5 mL of DCM and then 4 M HCl in dioxane (3 mL, 12 mmol) was added and the

reaction mixture was stirred for 12 hours. Solvents were removed to give compound 11 as a HCl salt,

which was used in the next step without further purification. To a solution of Affi-Gel 10 (Bio-Rad, 2 ml,

0.03 mmol, 1.0 eq) in a solid phase synthesis tube with frit was added a solution of compound 11 (27.7

mg, 0.06 mmol, 2.0 eq) and DIEA (1.0 mL) in isopropyl alcohol (4 mL) and the tube was put in a shaker

for 12 hours. Excess reagents were drained and the resin was washed with isopropyl alcohol (3x) and

then saved in isopropyl alcohol.

Synthesis of PAV-431 Photocrosslinker

To 6-(tert-Butoxycarbonylamino)-2-(9H-fluoren-9-ylmethoxycarbonylamino)hexanoic acid 12

[468mg (1mmol)] in a 40ml screw top vial was added 4N HCl in Dioxane (3ml). The vial was sealed and

gently agitated for 20 minutes at room temperature. The mix was then rotary evaporated to dryness

and the residue placed under high vacuum overnight. The dried residue was taken up into 4ml of DMF

(anhydrous) and then sequentially treated with 3-(3-Methyldiazirin-3-yl)propanoic acid [128mg

(1mmol)](42), and DIEA [695ul (4mmol)]. With rapid stirring, under Argon atmosphere, was added

dropwise HATU [380mg (1mmol)] dissolved in 1ml of DMF. After stirring for 30 minutes the mixture was

quenched with 10ml of sat. NH4Cl solution and then extracted 2 x with 10ml of EtOAc. The combined

organic extracts were washed once with sat. NaCl, dried (Mg2SO4) and then rotary evaporated to

dryness. The residue was purified by flash chromatography, using a gradient of Ethyl acetate and

Hexane, affording 2-(9H-fluoren-9-ylmethoxycarbonylamino)-6-[3-(3-methyldiazirin-3-

yl)propanoylamino]hexanoic acid 13 (293mg) in 61% yield.

To tert-Butyl N-[3-[3-cyclopropyl-5-[[2-methoxy-3-

(trifluoromethoxy)phenyl]methylcarbamoyl]pyrazol-1-yl]propyl]-N-methyl-carbamate 14 [16mg (0.03

mmol)] in a 40ml screw top vial was added 4N HCl in Dioxane (0.5ml). The vial was sealed and gently

agitated for 20min at room temperature. The mix was then rotary evaporated to dryness and the

residue placed on high vacuum overnight. The dried residue was taken up into 1ml of DMF (anhydrous)

and then sequentially treated with compound 13 [14.5mg (0.03mmol)], and DIEA [32ul (0.18mmol)].

With rapid stirring, under Argon atmosphere, was added dropwise HATU [14.6mg (0.038mmol)]

dissolved in 300ul of DMF. After stirring for 30 min the mixture was quenched with 5ml of sat. NH4Cl

solution and then extracted 2 x with 5ml of EtOAc.

The combined organic extracts were washed once with sat. NaCl, dried (Mg2SO4) and then

rotary evaporated to dryness. The residue was purified by flash chromatography, using a gradient of

Ethyl acetate and Hexane, affording 9H-fluoren-9-ylmethyl N-[1-[3-[3-cyclopropyl-5-[[2-methoxy-3-

(trifluoromethoxy)phenyl]methylcarbamoyl]pyrazol-1-yl]propyl-methyl-carbamoyl]-5-[3-(3-

methyldiazirin-3-yl)propanoylamino]pentyl]carbamate 15 (28mg) in quantitative yield.

To compound 15 [28mg (0.03 mmol)] in a 40ml screw top vial was added 50/50 Diethylamine /

DMF (0.5ml). The vial was sealed and gently agitated for 60min at room temperature. The mix was then

rotary evaporated to dryness and the residue placed on high vacuum overnight. The residue was

triturated 2 x with 3ml of Hexane to remove the Dibenzofulvene amine adduct. The residue was again

briefly placed on high vacuum to remove traces of Hexane. The dried residue was taken up into 1ml of

DMF (anhydrous) and then treated with Biotin-PEG2-NHS [15mg (0.03mmol)] (purchased from

ChemPep), and DIEA [16ul (0.09mmol)] and then purged with Argon. After stirring overnight at room

temperature, the mixture was rotary evaporated to dryness. The residue was purified by reverse phase

prep chromatography, using a gradient of 0.1% TFA water and Acetonitrile, affording 5-cyclopropyl-N-

[[2-methoxy-3-(trifluoromethoxy)phenyl]methyl]-2-[3-[methyl-[6-[3-(3-methyldiazirin-3-

yl)propanoylamino]-2-[3-[2-[2-[5-(2-oxo-1,3,3a,4,6,6a-hexahydrothieno[3,4-d]imidazol-4-

yl)pentanoylamino]ethoxy]ethoxy]propanoylamino]hexanoyl]amino]propyl]pyrazole-3-carboxamide

(26mg) in 80% yield. All compounds were confirmed by LCMS.

Method and Analysis Details

In vitro studies

CFPSA screen

Coding regions of interest were engineered behind the SP6 bacteriophage promoter and the

Xenopus globin 5' UTR63. DNA was amplified by PCR and then transcribed in vitro to generate mRNA

encoding each full-length protein. Translations were carried out in wheat germ extracts supplemented

with energy and amino acids, as previously described(7). Moderate-throughput small molecule

screening was carried out in 384-well plate format by translation of eGFP and FLUV NP and M mRNA in

the presence of small molecules from the Prosetta compound collection (Figure S2). Reactions were run

at 26°C for 1-2 hours for synthesis, followed by assembly at 34°C for 2 hours. eGFP fluorescent readout

was measured at 488/515 nm (excitation/emission) to assess protein synthesis. Assembly products were

captured on a second 384-well plate precoated with affinity-purified FLUV NP antibody. Plates were

washed with PBS containing 1% Triton X-100, decorated with biotinylated affinity-purified FLUV NP

antibody, washed, detected by NeutraAvidin HRP, washed again, and then incubated with a fluorogenic

HRP substrate Quanta Blue for 1 hour. FLUV assembly fluorescent readout was measured at 330/425 nm

(excitation/emission).

FLUV assay in MDCK cells

MDCK.2 cells were seeded at 3x104 cells/well in Eagle's minimal essential medium (MEM)

supplemented with fetal bovine serum (FBS) in a 96-well plate and incubated overnight at 37°C. The

next day, cells were washed with phosphate buffered saline (PBS) and infected with FLUV A/WSN/33 at

an MOI of 0.01-0.001 for 1 hour, after which the virus containing media was removed and fresh media

containing dilutions of compound or DMSO as a vehicle control was added to the cells. After 24 hours,

media was removed, cells were washed with PBS, and fresh media was added for a 2 hour incubation

and then collected for TCID50 determination. Seven replicates of 10-fold serial dilutions of collected

media were added to new cells and incubated at 37°C for 3 days. The number of infected wells for each

dilution was determined by visual inspection, and TCID50/mL was calculated using the Reed and

Muench method. Infection experiments were conducted in a BSL2 laboratory.

BoCoV assay in HRT-18G cells

HRT-18G cells were seeded at 3x104 cells/well in Dulbecco's modified Eagle medium (DMEM) in

a 96-well plate and incubated overnight at 37°C. The next day, cells were infected with BoCoV BRCV-OK-

0514-2 (ATCC VR-2460) at an MOI of 1 for 2 hours, after which the virus containing media was removed,

cells were washed with PBS, and fresh media containing dilutions of compound or DMSO as a vehicle

control was added to the cells. After 42-48 hours, media was removed, cells were washed with PBS, and

fresh media was added for a 4 hour incubation and then collected for TCID50 determination. Infection

experiments were conducted in a BSL2 laboratory.

HRV assay in H1-HeLa cells

H1-HeLa cells were seeded at 7x104 cells/well in MEM in a 96-well plate and incubated

overnight at 37°C. The next day, cells were infected with HRV-16 at an MOI of 5 for 1.5 hours, after

which the virus containing media was removed, cells were washed with PBS, and fresh media containing

dilutions of compound or DMSO as a vehicle control was added to the cells. After 72 hours, media was

collected for TCID50 determination. Infection experiments were conducted in a BSL2 laboratory.

MHV assay in BHK-21 cells

BHK-21 cells were seeded at 2.5x105 cells/well in MEM in a 96-well plate and incubated

overnight at 37°C. The next day, cells were infected with MHV-68 at an MOI of 0.5 for 1.5-2 hours, after

which the virus containing media was removed, cells were washed with PBS, and fresh media containing

dilutions of compound or DMSO as a vehicle control was added to the cells. After 24 hours, media was

removed, cells were washed with PBS, and fresh media was added for a 4 hour incubation and then

collected for TCID50 determination. Infection experiments were conducted in a BSL2 laboratory.

SARS-CoV-2 assay in Vero cells

Vero clone E6 (CRL-1586) cells were plated at 3x105 cells/well in DMEM in 6-well plates and

incubated overnight at 37ºC. The next day, cells were washed once with PBS and then infected with

SARS-CoV-2 WA1/2020 (MN985325.1, BEI resources) at a MOI of 0.01 for 1 hour after which the virus

containing media was removed and the compounds were added to the cells and incubated for 72 hours

at 37ºC at 5% CO_2. The cells were then fixed and stained with crystal violet to determine plaque

numbers(38). Infection experiments were conducted in a BSL3 laboratory. Data shown in Figure 4B are

the averages of two biological replicates; error bars indicate standard error; DMSO is included as the

vehicle control.

SARS-CoV-2 (delta) assay in Calu-3 cells

Calu-3 cells were seeded at a density of 3x104 cells/well in DMEM in 96-well plates and

incubated overnight at 37°C. The next day, cells were pre-incubated with compounds for 4 hours before

they were infected with SARS-CoV-2 delta SL102 (EPI_ISL_4471559) at a MOI of 0.01-0.05. After 24

hours the viruses within 50 µl of the supernatants were lysed with 200 µL AVL-buffer (Qiagen) and 200

µL 100% ethanol was added for complete inactivation. RNA was extracted from 200 µL of the lysates

using the EZ1 Virus Mini-Kit (Qiagen), and analyzed by qPCR as described(39). Infection experiments

were conducted in a BSL3 laboratory. Data shown are the averages of three biological replicates; error

bars indicate standard error; DMSO is included as the vehicle control.

Recombinant ZsGreen-expressing Nipah virus infection

HSAEC1-KT cells were seeded at 10,000 cells per well the day prior to infection in 96-well black

plates with clear bottoms (Costar 3603). The following day, cells were infected with recombinant Nipah

virus expressing ZsGreen fluorescence protein (rNiV-ZsG) (Lo et al., 2014, 2018, 2020 AVR: Welch et al.,

2020 JID) at multiplicity of infection 0.01 with ~ 100 50% tissue culture infectious dose (TCID50). Levels

of rNiV-ZsG replication were measured at 72 hour post-infection based on mean ZsGreen fluorescence

signal intensity (418ex/518em) using a Biotek HD1 Synergy instrument (Aglilent). Fluorescence signal

intensity assayed in DMSO-treated, virus-infected cells were set as 100% ZsGreen fluorescence. Data

points and error bars for all reporter assays indicate the mean value and standard deviation of 4

biological replicates, and are representative of at least 2 independent experiments in HSAEC1-KT cells.

Concentrations of compound that inhibited 50% of the green fluorescence signal (EC50) were calculated

from dose response data fitted to the mean value of experiments performed for each concentration in

the 10-point, 3-fold dilution series using a 4-parameter non-linear logistic regression curve with variable

slope using GraphPad Prism 9 (GraphPad Software, La Jolla, CA, USA).

CellTiterGlo cell viability assay

Cell viability was assayed using CellTiter-Glo 2.0 assay reagent (Promega) according to

manufacturer's recommendations, with luminescence measured at 72 hours post-compound treatment

using a Biotek HD1 Synergy instrument. Luminescence levels (indicative of cellular ATP levels as a

surrogate marker of cell viability) assayed in DMSO-treated, uninfected cells were set as 100% cell

viability. Dose response curves were fitted to the mean value of experiments performed for each

concentration in the 10-point, 3-fold dilution series using a 4-parameter non-linear logistic regression

curve with variable slope. All CellTiter-Glo cell viability assays were conducted in 96-well opaque white

plates (Costar 3917). Concentrations of compound that inhibited 50% of the luminescence signal (CC50)

were calculated from dose response data fitted to the mean value of experiments performed for each

concentration in the 10-point, 3-fold dilution series using a 4-parameter non-linear logistic regression

curve with variable slope using GraphPad Prism 9 (GraphPad Software, La Jolla, CA, USA).

Primary airway epithelial cell culture

Human bronchus was harvested from 3 explanted lungs. The tissue was submerged and agitated

for 1 minute in PBS with antibiotics and 5mM dithiothreitol to wash and remove mucus. After 3 washes,

the tissue was placed in DMEM with 0.1% protease and antibiotics overnight at 4°C. The next day the

solution was agitated and remaining tissue removed. Cells were centrifuged at 300g/4°C for 5 minutes,

then resuspended in 0.05% trypsin-EDTA and incubated for 5 minutes at 37°C. The trypsinization

reaction was neutralized with 10% FBS in DMEM, then cells were filtered through a cell strainer and

centrifuged at 300g/4°C for 5 minutes. The cell pellet was resuspended in 10% FBS in DMEM and a 10uL

aliquot was stained with trypan-blue and counted on a hemocytometer. 7.5×10^4 cells were plated onto

each 6mm/0.4mm FNC-coated Transwell air-liquid interface (ALI) insert. 10% FBS in DMEM and ALI

media were added in equal volumes to each basal compartment and cultures were incubated at

37°C/5% CO_2. The next day, media was removed and both compartments were washed with PBS and

antibiotics. ALI media was then added to each basal compartment and changed every 3 days until cells

were ready for use at day 28.

All studies involving SARS-CoV-2 infection of primary airway epithelial cells were conducted in

the Vitalant Research Institute BSL3 High-Containment Facility. 6 hours prior to infection, ALI medium

containing dilutions of drugs (100nM) or DMSO was added to the basal compartment. For infection, ALI

medium containing drugs was removed, and SARS-CoV-2 diluted in ALI-culture medium containing drugs

(100nM, MOI=0.1) was added on to the apical chamber of inserts (250 µl) and the basal compartment

(500 µl). The cultures were incubated for 2 hours at 37℃/5% CO_2 to allow for virus entry, then washed,

and 500 µl of fresh ALI medium containing drugs (100 nM) was added to the basal compartment. Drugs

were maintained in the medium for the duration of the experiment. Cells were incubated at 37℃/5%

CO_2 and harvested for analysis at 36 hours post-infection.

Total RNA was extracted from mock and SARS-CoV-2-infected primary airway epithelial cells

with or without drug treatment lysed in Trizol (Thermo Fisher Scientific) using the chloroform-

isopropanol-ethanol method. 500 ng of RNA was reversed transcribed into cDNA in 20 uL reaction

volume using RevertAid First Strand cDNA Synthesis kit (Thermo Fisher) in accordance to the

manufacturer's guidelines. RT-PCR was performed for each sample using TaqmanTM Universal Master

Mix II, with UNG (Thermo Fisher) on the ViiA7 Real time PCR system. Primers and probes (2019-nCoV

RUO kit) for detection of the SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid (N) gene were obtained from IDT.

Alamar Blue HS cell viability assay

Cell viability was assayed using Alamar Blue HS reagent (Thermofisher) according to

manufacturer's recommendations, with fluorescence (560ex/590em) measured at 72 hours post-

compound treatment after 4 hours of incubation with reagent using a Biotek HD1 Synergy instrument.

Fluorescence levels (indicative of resazurin reduction as a surrogate marker of cell viability) assayed in

DMSO-treated, uninfected cells were set as 100% cell viability. Dose response curves were fitted to the

mean value of experiments performed for each concentration in the 10-point, 3-fold dilution series

using a 4-parameter non-linear logistic regression curve with variable slope. All Alamar Blue assays were

conducted in 96-well black plates with clear bottoms. Concentrations of compound that inhibited 50% of

the fluorescence signal (CC50) were calculated from dose response data fitted to the mean value of

experiments performed for each concentration in the 10-point, 3-fold dilution series using a 4-

parameter non-linear logistic regression curve with variable slope using GraphPad Prism 9 (GraphPad

Software, La Jolla, CA, USA).

Cell lysate preparation

Cells or tissues were extracted with PB buffer (10 mM Tris pH 7.6, 10 mM NaCl, 0.1 mM EDTA,

and 0.35% Triton X-100), and centrifuged at 10,000 x g for 10 min. The supernatants were collected and

flash frozen.

Energy-dependent drug resin affinity chromatography (eDRAC)

Drug resin was prepared by coupling compound PAV-431 to an Affi-gel resin at a concentration

of 10 μM via the pyrazole nitrogen (Figure S6, synthetic chemistry described below), or position 4 of the

phenyl group. Control resin was prepared by blocking the Affi-gel matrix without drug. Resins were

equilibrated with column buffer (50 mM HEPES, pH 7.6, 100 mM KAc, 6 mM MgAc, 1 mM EDTA, 4 mM

TGA) prior to any DRAC experiments. 30 μL of cell extract supplemented with energy (1 mM ATP, GTP,

CTP and UTP with 4 mM creatine phosphate, and in some cases 5 μg/ml rabbit creatine kinase) was

applied to resin columns. The columns were clamped and incubated at 22°C for 1 hour for binding, and

flow through was collected. The columns were then washed with 100 bed volumes of column buffer. For

elution of bound complexes, 100 μL of column buffer containing free drug at a final concentration of 100

μM – 1 mM (approaching its maximum solubility in water) and supplemented with energy was added,

the column was clamped for 1 hour, and serial eluates were collected. Eluates were analyzed by SDS-

PAGE and WB. or later use.

Western blotting

SDS-PAGE gels were transferred in Towbin buffer to a polyvinylidene fluoride membrane.

Membranes were then blocked in 1% BSA, incubated for 1 hour at room temperature in a 1:1000

dilution of 100 μg/mL affinity-purified primary antibody, washed three times in PBS with 0.1% Tween-

20, incubated for 1 hour in a 1:5000 dilution of secondary anti-rabbit or anti-mouse antibody coupled to

alkaline phosphatase, washed further, and incubated in developer solution prepared from 100 μL of 7.5

mg/mL 5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl phosphate dissolved in 60% dimethyl formamide (DMF) in water and

100 µL of 15 mg/mL nitro blue tetrazolium dissolved in 70% DMF in water, adjusted to 50 mL with 0.1 M

Tris (pH 9.5)/0.1 mM magnesium chloride.

MS-MS analysis

Samples were processed by SDS-PAGE using a 10% Bis-Tris NuPAGE gel (Invitrogen) with the

MES buffer system. The mobility region was excised and processed by in-gel digestion with trypsin using

a ProGest robot (Digilab) with the protocol outlined below. Washed with 25 mM ammonium

bicarbonate followed by acetonitrile. Reduced with 10 mM dithiothreitol at 60°C followed by alkylation

with 50 mM iodoacetamide at room temperature. Digested with trypsin (Promega) at 37°C for 4 hours.

Quenched with formic acid, lyophilized, and reconstituted in 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid.

Half of each digested sample was analyzed by nano LC-MS/MS with a Waters M-Class HPLC

system interfaced to a ThermoFisher Fusion Lumos mass spectrometer. Peptides were loaded on a

trapping column and eluted over a 75 µm analytical column at 350 nL/min; both columns were packed

with Luna C18 resin (Phenomenex). The mass spectrometer was operated in data-dependent mode,

with the Orbitrap operating at 60,000 FWHM and 15,000 FWHM for MS and MS/MS respectively. APD

was enabled and the instrument was run with a 3 s cycle for MS and MS/MS.

Data were searched using a local copy of Mascot (Matrix Science) with the following

parameters: Enzyme: Trypsin/P; Database: SwissProt Human plus the custom sequences* (concatenated

forward and reverse plus common contaminants); Fixed modification: Carbamidomethyl (C)Variable

modifications: Oxidation (M), Acetyl (N-term), Pyro-Glu (N-term Q), Deamidation (N/Q)Mass values:

Monoisotopic; Peptide Mass Tolerance: 10 ppm; Fragment Mass Tolerance: 0.02 Da; Max Missed

Cleavages: 2. The data was analyzed by label free quantitation (LFQ) methods(40). LFQ intensity values

of each condition were measured in triplicate and compared against each other to generate log2 fold

change values for each protein and each combination of conditions. Proteins that were found

significantly enriched by a log2 fold change of > 1 and an adjusted p-value (accounting for multiple

hypothesis testing) of < 0.05 in the FLUV infected eDRAC eluates compared to the uninfected eluates

were searched for in a list of high confidence FLUV virus-host protein interactions and the VirusMentha

database of virus-protein interactions (46,47). Likewise, significantly enriched and depleted proteins

found in the BoCoV infected eDRAC eluate were searched for in a list of high confidence coronavirus

interactors and an aggregated list of coronavirus protein interactors shown experimentally (48,49).

Photocrosslinking and streptavidin precipitation

eDRAC columns were eluted with 100µM PAV-431 photocross-linker at 22oC. Eluates were

crosslinked by exposure to UV light for 3 minutes. Crosslinked products were subjected to treatments

that maintained protein-protein associations (native) or which reduced and denatured all proteins

(denatured). Native conditions were maintained by diluting an aliquot of the product 20x with 1%

Triton-X-100 column buffer. Denaturation was achieved by adjusting an aliquot to 1% SDS and 10mM

DTT and heating to 100oC/10 minutes prior to 20x dilution with 1% Triton-X-100 column buffer.

Streptavidin Sepharose beads were added to both native and denatured samples and mixed for 1 hr to

capture all biotinylated proteins, with and without co-associated proteins in the native and denatured

cases respectively, then washed 3x with 1% Triton-containing column buffer. Washed beads were

resuspended in 20µl of SDS loading buffer and analyzed by SDS-PAGE and WB.

In vivo **studies**

PEDV pig study

831 18 litters comprised of 91 individuals of newborn (2 – 4 days old) crossbred pigs weighing 3 kg were

832 randomized to control (vehicle) or treatment groups. Animals were infected with 1x105 PFU of PEDV

833 administered orally. Vehicle or drug was administered intramuscular at 4 mg/kg immediately after

834 challenge and again 24 hours post-infection. Compound efficacy was determined by survivability.

835 Endpoint of study was 6 days post-infection.

RSV cotton rat study

Female cotton rats, ~5 weeks of age, were obtained from Envigo (formerly Harlan), ear-tagged

for identification purposes, and allowed to acclimate for > 1 week prior to study start. Animals were

housed individually. Vehicle or drug was administered by an intraperitoneal route twice daily on study

days -1 through day 4. On day 0, animals were infected with 1x105 PFU of RSV A-2 virus originally

obtained from ATCC (VR-1540), administered in a 50 mL volume by an intranasal route approximately 2

hours after the morning treatment dose. Back titration of the viral stock and diluted inoculum was

performed to confirm the titer of the RSV stock used for infection. All inoculations were performed

while the animals were under the influence of inhalant anesthesia. All animals were euthanized on day 5

and the lungs were processed for determination of RSV titers by plaque assay.

Acknowledgements:

We thank Alfredo Calayag, Lisa Tucker, Caleb Declouette, Yvonne Dickschen, and Björn Wefers for

excellent technical assistance, David Hanzel and Homer Boushey for careful reading and improvement of

the manuscript, and Dmitry Temnikov for IT support. We are indebted to the late Guenter Blobel for

advice, inspiration, and encouragement.

Competing interests:

Vishwanath R. Lingappa is CEO of Prosetta Biosciences.

<u>References</u>

1. Aleem A, Akbar Samad AB, Slenker AK. Emerging Variants of SARS-CoV-2 And Novel Therapeutics
Against Coronavirus (COVID-19). In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing;
2022 [cited 2023 Jan 30]. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK570580/

2. Cele S, Jackson L, Khoury DS, Khan K, Moyo-Gwete T, Tegally H, et al. Omicron extensively but
incompletely escapes Pfizer BNT162b2 neutralization. Nature. 2022 Feb 24;602(7898):654–6.

3. European Food Safety Authority, European Centre for Disease Prevention, Control, European Union
Reference Laboratory for Avian Influenza, Adlhoch C, Fusaro A, Gonzales JL, Kuiken T, Marangon S, et
al. Avian influenza overview September – December 2021. EFSA J [Internet]. 2021 Dec [cited 2023 Jan
30];19(12). Available from: https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2903/j.efsa.2021.7108

4. Singh S, McNab C, Olson RM, Bristol N, Nolan C, Bergstrøm E, et al. How an outbreak became a
pandemic: a chronological analysis of crucial junctures and international obligations in the early
months of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Lancet. 2021 Dec;398(10316):2109–24.

5. Mackie PL. The classification of viruses infecting the respiratory tract. Paediatr Respir Rev. 2003
Jun;4(2):84–90.

6. Foster SA, Cerny J, Cheng YC. Herpes simplex virus-specified DNA polymerase is the target for the
antiviral action of 9-(2-phosphonylmethoxyethyl)adenine. J Biol Chem. 1991 Jan 5;266(1):238–44.

7. Marzi M, Vakil MK, Bahmanyar M, Zarenezhad E. Paxlovid: Mechanism of Action, Synthesis, and In
Silico Study. Wani TA, editor. BioMed Res Int. 2022 Jul 7;2022:1–16.

8. Moscona A. Neuraminidase Inhibitors for Influenza. N Engl J Med. 2005 Sep 29;353(13):1363–73.

9. Aoki FY, Macleod MD, Paggiaro P, Carewicz O, El Sawy A, Wat C, et al. Early administration of oral
oseltamivir increases the benefits of influenza treatment. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2003
Jan;51(1):123–9.

10.   Chen N, Zhang B, Deng L, Liang B, Ping J. Virus-host interaction networks as new antiviral drug
targets for IAV and SARS-CoV-2. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2022 Dec 31;11(1):1371–89.

11.   Kaufmann SHE, Dorhoi A, Hotchkiss RS, Bartenschlager R. Host-directed therapies for bacterial
and viral infections. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2018 Jan;17(1):35–56.

12.   Kumar N, Sharma S, Kumar R, Tripathi BN, Barua S, Ly H, et al. Host-Directed Antiviral Therapy.
Clin Microbiol Rev. 2020 Jun 17;33(3):e00168-19.

13.   Lingappa UF, Wu X, Macieik A, Yu SF, Atuegbu A, Corpuz M, et al. Host–rabies virus protein–
protein interactions as druggable antiviral targets. Proc Natl Acad Sci [Internet]. 2013 Mar 5 [cited
2022 May 13];110(10). Available from: https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1210198110

14.   Pawlotsky JM. What are the pros and cons of the use of host-targeted agents against hepatitis
C? Antiviral Res. 2014 May;105:22–5.

15.   Goodwin CM, Xu S, Munger J. Stealing the Keys to the Kitchen: Viral Manipulation of the Host
Cell Metabolic Network. Trends Microbiol. 2015 Dec;23(12):789–98.

16.   Koonin EV, Dolja VV, Krupovic M. Origins and evolution of viruses of eukaryotes: The ultimate
modularity. Virology. 2015 May;479–480:2–25.

17.   Krupovic M, Koonin EV. Multiple origins of viral capsid proteins from cellular ancestors. Proc Natl
Acad Sci [Internet]. 2017 Mar 21 [cited 2023 Jan 27];114(12). Available from:
https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1621061114

18.   Lingappa V, Hurt C, Garvey E. Capsid Assembly as a Point of Intervention for Novel Anti-viral
Therapeutics. Curr Pharm Biotechnol. 2013 Nov 31;14(5):513–23.

19.   Reed JC, Solas D, Kitaygorodskyy A, Freeman B, Ressler DTB, Phuong DJ, et al. Identification of an
Antiretroviral Small Molecule That Appears To Be a Host-Targeting Inhibitor of HIV-1 Assembly.
Simon V, editor. J Virol. 2021 Jan 13;95(3):e00883-20.

20.   Heckmann CM, Paradisi F. Looking Back: A Short History of the Discovery of Enzymes and How
They Became Powerful Chemical Tools. ChemCatChem. 2020 Dec 16;12(24):6082–102.

21.   Blobel G. Protein targeting (Nobel lecture). Chembiochem Eur J Chem Biol. 2000 Aug 18;1(2):86–
102.

22.   Lingappa JR, Hill RL, Wong ML, Hegde RS. A Multistep, ATP-dependent Pathway for Assembly of
Human Immunodeficiency Virus Capsids in a Cell-free System. J Cell Biol. 1997 Feb 10;136(3):567–81.

23.   Lingappa JR, Martin RL, Wong ML, Ganem D, Welch WJ, Lingappa VR. A eukaryotic cytosolic
chaperonin is associated with a high molecular weight intermediate in the assembly of hepatitis B
virus capsid, a multimeric particle. J Cell Biol. 1994 Apr;125(1):99–111.

24.   Lingappa VR, Lingappa JR. Recent insights into biological regulation from cell-free protein-
synthesizing systems. Mt Sinai J Med N Y. 2005 May;72(3):141–60.

25.   Nirenberg M. Historical review: Deciphering the genetic code – a personal account. Trends
Biochem Sci. 2004 Jan;29(1):46–54.

26.   Huang KY, Su MG, Kao HJ, Hsieh YC, Jhong JH, Cheng KH, et al. dbPTM 2016: 10-year anniversary
of a resource for post-translational modification of proteins. Nucleic Acids Res. 2016 Jan
4;44(D1):D435–46.

27.   Su MG, Weng JTY, Hsu JBK, Huang KY, Chi YH, Lee TY. Investigation and identification of
functional post-translational modification sites associated with drug binding and protein-protein
interactions. BMC Syst Biol. 2017 Dec;11(S7):132.

28.   Wold F. In Vivo Chemical Modification of Proteins (Post-Translational Modification). Annu Rev
Biochem. 1981 Jun;50(1):783–814.

29.   Alberts B. The Cell as a Collection of Protein Machines: Preparing the Next Generation of
Molecular Biologists. Cell. 1998 Feb;92(3):291–4.

30.   De Las Rivas J, Fontanillo C. Protein-protein interaction networks: unraveling the wiring of
molecular machines within the cell. Brief Funct Genomics. 2012 Nov 1;11(6):489–96.

31.   Wan C, Borgeson B, Phanse S, Tu F, Drew K, Clark G, et al. Panorama of ancient metazoan
macromolecular complexes. Nature. 2015 Sep 17;525(7569):339–44.

32.   Williams NK, Dichtl B. Co-translational control of protein complex formation: a fundamental
pathway of cellular organization? Biochem Soc Trans. 2018 Feb 19;46(1):197–206.

33.   Fischer M, Joppe M, Mulinacci B, Vollrath R, Konstantinidis K, Kötter P, et al. Analysis of the co-
translational assembly of the fungal fatty acid synthase (FAS). Sci Rep. 2020 Jan 21;10(1):895.

34.   Kamenova I, Mukherjee P, Conic S, Mueller F, El-Saafin F, Bardot P, et al. Co-translational
assembly of mammalian nuclear multisubunit complexes. Nat Commun. 2019 Dec;10(1):1740.

35.   Panasenko OO, Somasekharan SP, Villanyi Z, Zagatti M, Bezrukov F, Rashpa R, et al. Co-
translational assembly of proteasome subunits in NOT1-containing assemblysomes. Nat Struct Mol
Biol. 2019 Feb;26(2):110–20.

36.   Lautier O, Penzo A, Rouvière JO, Chevreux G, Collet L, Loïodice I, et al. Co-translational assembly
and localized translation of nucleoporins in nuclear pore complex biogenesis. Mol Cell. 2021 Jun
3;81(11):2417-2427.e5.

37.   Copley SD. Moonlighting is mainstream: paradigm adjustment required. BioEssays News Rev
Mol Cell Dev Biol. 2012 Jul;34(7):578–88.

38.   Farache D, Antine SP, Lee ASY. Moonlighting translation factors: multifunctionality drives diverse
gene regulation. Trends Cell Biol. 2022 Sep;32(9):762–72.

39.   Jeffery CJ. Multitalented actors inside and outside the cell: recent discoveries add to the number
of moonlighting proteins. Biochem Soc Trans. 2019 20;47(6):1941–8.

40.   Broce S, Hensley L, Sato T, Lehrer-Graiwer J, Essrich C, Edwards KJ, et al. Biochemical and
biophysical characterization of cell-free synthesized Rift Valley fever virus nucleoprotein capsids
enables in vitro screening to identify novel antivirals. Biol Direct. 2016 Dec;11(1):25.

41.   Petsch B, Hurt CR, Freeman B, Zirdum E, Ganesh A, Schörg A, et al. Discovery of Novel Small
Molecule Inhibitors of Multiple Influenza Strains in Cell Culture. Antiviral Res. 2010 Apr;86(1):A42.

42.   Nijhuis M, van Maarseveen NM, Boucher CAB. Antiviral Resistance and Impact on Viral
Replication Capacity: Evolution of Viruses Under Antiviral Pressure Occurs in Three Phases. In:
Kräusslich HG, Bartenschlager R, editors. Antiviral Strategies [Internet]. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer
Berlin Heidelberg; 2009 [cited 2023 Jan 30]. p. 299–320. (Handbook of Experimental Pharmacology;
vol. 189). Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-540-79086-0_11

43.   McKimm-Breschkin JL. Influenza neuraminidase inhibitors: antiviral action and mechanisms of
resistance: Resistance to influenza neuraminidase inhibitors. Influenza Other Respir Viruses. 2013
Jan;7:25–36.

44.   Jung K, Saif LJ. Porcine epidemic diarrhea virus infection: Etiology, epidemiology, pathogenesis
and immunoprophylaxis. Vet J. 2015 May;204(2):134–43.

45.   Selvarajah S, Lingappa AF, Michon M, Du L, Deiter F, Yu SF, et al. From COVID-19 to the Common
Cold: Novel Host-Targeted, Pan-Respiratory Antiviral Small Molecule Therapeutics [Internet].
Biochemistry; 2021 Jan [cited 2021 Dec 19]. Available from:
http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.01.17.426875

46.   Watanabe T, Kawakami E, Shoemaker JE, Lopes TJS, Matsuoka Y, Tomita Y, et al. Influenza virus-
host interactome screen as a platform for antiviral drug development. Cell Host Microbe. 2014 Dec
10;16(6):795–805.

47.   Calderone A, Licata L, Cesareni G. VirusMentha: a new resource for virus-host protein
interactions. Nucleic Acids Res. 2015 Jan 28;43(D1):D588–92.

48.   Gordon DE, Hiatt J, Bouhaddou M, Rezelj VV, Ulferts S, Braberg H, et al. Comparative host-
coronavirus protein interaction networks reveal pan-viral disease mechanisms. Science. 2020 Dec
4;370(6521):eabe9403.

49.   Perrin-Cocon L, Diaz O, Jacquemin C, Barthel V, Ogire E, Ramière C, et al. The current landscape
of coronavirus-host protein–protein interactions. J Transl Med. 2020 Dec;18(1):319.

50.   Zhao Z, Lu K, Mao B, Liu S, Trilling M, Huang A, et al. The interplay between emerging human
coronavirus infections and autophagy. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2021 Jan 1;10(1):196–205.

51.   Mao J, Lin E, He L, Yu J, Tan P, Zhou Y. Autophagy and Viral Infection. In: Cui J, editor. Autophagy
Regulation of Innate Immunity [Internet]. Singapore: Springer Singapore; 2019 [cited 2022 Jul 7]. p.
55–78. (Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology; vol. 1209). Available from:
http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-981-15-0606-2_5

52.   MacKinnon AL, Taunton J. Target Identification by Diazirine Photo-Cross-Linking and Click
Chemistry. Curr Protoc Chem Biol. 2009 Dec;1(1):55–73.

53.   Li Du, Fred Deiter, Mohamed S. Bouzidi, Jean-Noel Billaud, Graham Simmons, Prerna Dabral, et
al. TARGETING THE HOST-VIRUS INTERFACE TO BLOCK SARS-COV-2 ASSEMBLY IN AIRWAY CELLS. In.

54.   Du L, Deiter F, Bouzidi M, Billaud JN, Graham S, Prerna D, et al. A Novel Viral Assembly Inhibitor
Blocks SARS-CoV-2 Replication in Airway Epithelial Cells [Internet]. In Review; 2023 May [cited 2023
Jun 26]. Available from: https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-2887435/v1

55.   Eder J, Sedrani R, Wiesmann C. The discovery of first-in-class drugs: origins and evolution. Nat
Rev Drug Discov. 2014 Aug;13(8):577–87.

56.   Sadri A. Is Target-Based Drug Discovery Efficient? Discovery and "Off-Target" Mechanisms of All
Drugs. J Med Chem. 2023 Sep 6;acs.jmedchem.2c01737.

57.   Lee JA, Berg EL. Neoclassic Drug Discovery: The Case for Lead Generation Using Phenotypic and
Functional Approaches. SLAS Discov. 2013 Dec;18(10):1143–55.

58.   Heinricher MM. Pain Modulation and the Transition from Acute to Chronic Pain. In: Ma C, Huang
Y, editors. Translational Research in Pain and Itch [Internet]. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2016
[cited 2023 Feb 3]. p. 105–15. (Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology; vol. 904). Available
from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-017-7537-3_8

59.   Hurley JM, Loros JJ, Dunlap JC. Circadian Oscillators: Around the Transcription–Translation
Feedback Loop and on to Output. Trends Biochem Sci. 2016 Oct;41(10):834–46.

60.   Ivan M, Kaelin WG. The EGLN-HIF O 2 -Sensing System: Multiple Inputs and Feedbacks. Mol Cell.
2017 Jun;66(6):772–9.

61.   Karsdal MA, Nielsen SH, Leeming DJ, Langholm LL, Nielsen MJ, Manon-Jensen T, et al. The good
and the bad collagens of fibrosis – Their role in signaling and organ function. Adv Drug Deliv Rev.
2017 Nov;121:43–56.

62.   Rizzino A, Wuebben EL. Sox2/Oct4: A delicately balanced partnership in pluripotent stem cells
and embryogenesis. Biochim Biophys Acta BBA - Gene Regul Mech. 2016 Jun;1859(6):780–91.

63.   Versteeg HH, Heemskerk JWM, Levi M, Reitsma PH. New Fundamentals in Hemostasis. Physiol
Rev. 2013 Jan;93(1):327–58.

64.   Kamenova I, Mukherjee P, Conic S, Mueller F, El-Saafin F, Bardot P, et al. Co-translational
assembly of mammalian nuclear multisubunit complexes. Nat Commun. 2019 Apr 15;10(1):1740.

65.   Fu H, Subramanian RR, Masters SC. 14-3-3 Proteins: Structure, Function, and Regulation. Annu
Rev Pharmacol Toxicol. 2000 Apr;40(1):617–47.

66.   Jia H, Liang Z, Zhang X, Wang J, Xu W, Qian H. 14-3-3 proteins: an important regulator of
autophagy in diseases. Am J Transl Res. 2017;9(11):4738–46.

67.   Obsilova V, Obsil T. The 14-3-3 Proteins as Important Allosteric Regulators of Protein Kinases. Int
J Mol Sci. 2020 Nov 21;21(22):8824.

68.   Pennington K, Chan T, Torres M, Andersen J. The dynamic and stress-adaptive signaling hub of
1020   14-3-3: emerging mechanisms of regulation and context-dependent protein–protein interactions.
1021   Oncogene. 2018 Oct;37(42):5587–604.

1022   69.   Stevers LM, Sijbesma E, Botta M, MacKintosh C, Obsil T, Landrieu I, et al. Modulators of 14-3-3
1023   Protein–Protein Interactions. J Med Chem. 2018 May 10;61(9):3755–78.

1024   70.   Aghazadeh Y, Papadopoulos V. The role of the 14-3-3 protein family in health, disease, and drug
1025   development. Drug Discov Today. 2016 Feb;21(2):278–87.

1026   71.   Corradi V, Mancini M, Santucci MA, Carlomagno T, Sanfelice D, Mori M, et al. Computational
1027   techniques are valuable tools for the discovery of protein–protein interaction inhibitors: The 14-3-3σ
1028   case. Bioorg Med Chem Lett. 2011 Nov;21(22):6867–71.

1029   72.   Hartman AM, Hirsch AKH. Molecular insight into specific 14-3-3 modulators: Inhibitors and
1030   stabilisers of protein–protein interactions of 14-3-3. Eur J Med Chem. 2017 Aug;136:573–84.

1031   73.   Mori M, Vignaroli G, Cau Y, Dinić J, Hill R, Rossi M, et al. Discovery of 14-3-3 Protein-Protein
1032   Interaction Inhibitors that Sensitize Multidrug-Resistant Cancer Cells to Doxorubicin and the Akt
1033   Inhibitor GSK690693. ChemMedChem. 2014 May;9(5):973–83.

1034   74.   Ottmann C. Small-molecule modulators of 14-3-3 protein–protein interactions. Bioorg Med
1035   Chem. 2013 Jul;21(14):4058–62.

1036   75.   Zhao J, Du Y, Horton JR, Upadhyay AK, Lou B, Bai Y, et al. Discovery and structural
1037   characterization of a small molecule 14-3-3 protein-protein interaction inhibitor. Proc Natl Acad Sci.
1038   2011 Sep 27;108(39):16212–6.

1039   76.   Liu J, Cao S, Ding G, Wang B, Li Y, Zhao Y, et al. The role of 14-3-3 proteins in cell signalling
1040   pathways and virus infection. J Cell Mol Med. 2021 May;25(9):4173–82.

1041   77.   Michi AN, Proud D. A toolbox for studying respiratory viral infections using air-liquid interface
1042   cultures of human airway epithelial cells. Am J Physiol Lung Cell Mol Physiol. 2021 Jul 1;321(1):L263–
1043   80.

1044