### Screening and evaluation of antioxidant activity of phosphoroselenoates and derivates



<u>Airton Sinott<sup>1\*</sup>, Ana Paula Pesarico<sup>1</sup>, Lucas Iarocz<sup>2</sup>, Márcio S. Silva<sup>2</sup>, Lucielli Savegnago<sup>1\*</sup></u>

<sup>1</sup> Program in Biotechnology, Technology Developing Center – CDTEC, Federal University of Pelotas – UFPel, Brazil

<sup>2</sup> Program in Chemistry, Pharmaceutical and Food Sciences – CCQFA, Federal University of Pelotas – UFPel, Brazil



\*antsinott@gmail.com \* luciellisavegnago@yahoo.com.br

### INTRODUCTION

Compounds containing phosphorus are known as powerful herbicides and anti-fungicide(1,2). However, more studies are necessary to expand other applications of these compounds with different groups, such as selenium.

Thus, this study aims to evaluate the antioxidant activity of five phosphoroselenoates that could lead to new potential drugs capable of restoring the redox system equilibrium of an organism.

Compound concentration					
	10µM	50µM	100µM	500µM	
Phosphoroselenoates effect on TBARS assay in cerebral tissue of mice.					
3a	84.69 ± 8.41	80.59 ± 11.5	85.89 ± 7.34	79.77 ± 4.97	
3c	$79.35 \pm 4.97$	83.79 ± 5.83	$90.36 \pm 3.05$	57.02 ± 13.05 **	
3d	59.51 ± 14.15 *	_	_	_	
3f	73.00 ± 0.69 *	_	-	_	
3g	87.64 ± 2.42	$78.64 \pm 2.68$	78.11 ± 0.72	57.96 ± 8.95 ***	
Phosphoroselenoates effect on ROS assay in the cerebral cortex of mice.					
3a	71.50 ± 13.00 *	_	_	_	
3c	98.30 ± 7.15	76.10 ± 7.90 *	61.40 ± 2.76 **	_	
3d	61.70 ± 15.00 *	_	_	_	
3f	$70.30 \pm 18.90$	$84.90 \pm 13.40$	70.10 ± 17.50	62.7±12.3	
3g	$94.00 \pm 11.10$	$94.10 \pm 3.92$	67.20 ± 15.80 *	_	
	Phosphor	oselenoates effec	ct on the FRAP assa	y	
3a	$0.11 \pm 0.02$	$0.12 \pm 0.01$	$0.12 \pm 0.02$	$0.16 \pm 0.01$	
3c	$0.11 \pm 0.02$	$0.15 \pm 0.01$	$0.15 \pm 0.01$	0.3 ± 0.01 ***	
3d	$0.16 \pm 0.01$	$0.23 \pm 0.04$	$0.40 \pm 0.03$	1.02 ± 0.18 ***	
3f	$0.14 \pm 0.01$	0.17 ± 0.016	$0.17 \pm 0.04$	0.29 ± 0.04 *	
3g	0.16 ± 0.01	$0.16 \pm 0.01$	$0.19 \pm 0.03$	0.26 ± 0.02 **	
Phosphoroselenoates effect on DPPH radical scavenging assay.					
3a	$5.53 \pm 3.67$	$7.83 \pm 4.09$	$4.68 \pm 2.39$	21.93 ± 0.88 *	
3c	$6.14 \pm 6.14$	$18.38 \pm 7.49$	$12.21 \pm 6.20$	$7.38 \pm 4.18$	
3d	$2.19 \pm 2.19$	$3.94 \pm 3.94$	$3.72 \pm 3.72$	5.04 ±5.04	
3f	$12.20 \pm 6.48$	$6.83 \pm 2.93$	$9.87 \pm 9.87$	$3.62 \pm 3.62$	
3g	$3.72 \pm 3.72$	$6.95 \pm 3.81$	$11.92 \pm 4.69$	19.06 ± 3.60 *	
Phosphoroselenoates effect on ABTS <sup>+</sup> radical scavenging assay.					
3a	$5.02 \pm 3.19$	10.35 ± 1.09 *	_	_	
3c	1.92 ±1.92	$8.76 \pm 0.79$	$3.84 \pm 3.14$	$2.34 \pm 2.34$	
3d	$3.85 \pm 3.85$	$3.06 \pm 3.06$	$1.86 \pm 0.93$	$12.40 \pm 6.53$	

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The phosphoroselenoates were synthesized by Laboratório de Sintese Orgânica Limpa (LASOL) of UFPel.



**Figure 1.** Chemical structure of O,O-Dimethyl Se-phenyl phosphoroselenoate (**3a**), O,O-Dibutyl Se-phenyl phosphoroselenoate (**3c**), O,O-Dibenzyl Se-phenyl phosphoroselenoate (**3d**), O,O-Dimethyl Se-(p-tolyl) phosphoroselenoate (**3f**), Se-(4-Methoxyphenyl) O,O-dimethyl phosphoroselenoate (**3g**).

The compounds were diluted using dimethyl sulfoxide as a solvent in a concentration curve:



10 50 100 500 μΜ μΜ μΜ μΜ

### Assays to evaluate the antioxidant activity:

Free radical scavenging activity of
2-azinobis-3-ethylbenzothiazoline-6-sulfonic acid (ABTS) and
2,2-diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl radical (DPPH) (3,4).

-----> Ferric ion reducing antioxidant power (FRAP) (5).

Inhibition of reactive oxygen species (ROS) formation and thiobarbituric acid reactive species (TBARS) on cerebral tissue of mice (CEEA-13008-2020), induced by azide and sodium nitroprusside, respectively (6,7).



**Statistical analysis :** One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's test, using the software GraphPad prism 7.

3g6.76 ± 2.598.60 ± 2.43	6.91 ± 3.29	19.80 ± 2.57 **

no effect effect unable to evaluate

Figure 2. Antioxidant activity of the compounds in different assays.

**TBARS:** Data are expressed as mean  $\pm$  SEM (n = 3) of % of lipid peroxidation in cerebral tissue, vehicle 33.5  $\pm$  5.65, induced 100; **ROS:** Data are expressed as mean  $\pm$  SDM (n = 3) of units of fluorescence, vehicle 82.10  $\pm$  0.05, induced 139  $\pm$  26.8; **FRAP:** Data are expressed as mean  $\pm$  SDM (n = 3) of units of fluorescence, vehicle 0.11  $\pm$  0.02. **DPPH and ABTS:** Data expressed mean  $\pm$  SDM (n=3) percentage of scavenging activity, veichle 0.00  $\pm$  0.00. The asterisks represent significant difference (\* p<0.05 \*\*p<0.01 \*\*\*p<0.001) when compared with vehicle/induced group. Oneway ANOVA followed by Tukey's test.

# CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study suggests the antioxidant effects of the compounds in *in vitro assays*. On this group of molecules, the **3g** appears to have the most promising effect, which will be used on *in* 



The results indicate that the phosphoroselenoates have different levels of antioxidant activity in the assays.

All compounds, except **3a**, were effective in protecting against lipid peroxidation on TBARS and present antioxidant power on reducing ferric ion. **3a**, **3c**, **3d**, and **3g** also prevented the ROS levels when compared by the induced group. The phosphoroselenoates had their scavenging activity in synthetic radicals on ABTS and DPPH assays tested. From them, **3a** and **3g** were effective on both assays, and **3f** was only able to scavenge free radicals on ABTS.

#### vivo assays in the future studies.



Westheimer, F. H. Science 1987, 235, 1173-1178.
Zhan, H. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol, 2018, 102, 5033-5043
Ohkawa, H. Analytical biochemistry 1979, 95, 351-358
Loetchutinat, S. Radiation Physics and Chemistry 2005, 72, 323-331
Choi, C. W. Plant Science 2002, 163, 1161-1168.
Brand-Williams, W. Food Science and Technology. 1995, 28, 25-30
*Re, R. Free Radical Biology and Medicine* 1999, 26 1231-1237

