Novel 1,5-diaryl pyrazole-3-carboxamides as selective COX-2/sEH inhibitors with analgesic, anti-inflammatory, and lower cardiotoxicity effects
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1
Abstract

COX-2 selective drugs have been withdrawn from the market due to cardiovascular side effects, just a few years after their discovery. As a result, a new series of 1,5-diaryl pyrazole carboxamides 19-31 was synthesized as selective COX-2/sEH inhibitors with analgesic, anti-inflammatory, and lower cardiotoxic properties. The target compounds were synthesized and tested in vitro against COX-1, COX-2, and sEH enzymes. Compounds 20, 22 and 29 exhibited the most substantial COX-2 inhibitory activity (IC50 values: 0.82-1.12 µM) and had SIs of 13, 18, and 16, respectively, (c.f. celecoxib; SI = 8). Moreover, compounds 20, 22, and 29 were the most potent dual COX-2/sEH inhibitors, with IC50 values of 0.95, 0.80, and 0.85 nM against sEH, respectively, and were more potent than the standard AUDA (IC50 = 1.2 nM). Furthermore, in vivo studies revealed that these compounds were the most active as analgesic/anti-inflammatory derivatives with a good cardioprotective profile against cardiac biomarkers and inflammatory cytokines. Finally, the most active dual inhibitors were docked inside COX-2/sEH active sites to explain their binding modes.
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1- Introduction

The market for new peripheral analgesics and anti-inflammatory agents is still a challenge, as they are used not only to manage inflammation and pain, but also to help with the symptomatic treatment of a variety of disorders, such as cancer, gout, cardiovascular disease, and so on. As a result, pharmaceutical research will increasingly focus on compounds that can treat both acute and chronic pain [1-3]. The clinical application of non-selective NSAID is restricted especially for patients with a history of peptic ulcer, as they are accompanied by primary and secondary unwanted side effects. They act by depriving the cyclooxygenase enzyme isoforms COX-1 and COX-2, which prevent the production of cytoprotective prostaglandins (PGs). As a result, the development of selective COX-2 inhibitors was regarded as a promising approach for avoiding the adverse effects of NSAIDs on the gastrointestinal system [4,5]. However, due to a decrease in the production of the protective prostacyclin (PGI2), there is an increased incidence of cardiovascular side effects [6,7]. Soluble epoxide hydrolase (sEH) is a pervasive enzyme found throughout the body, with the highest concentrations found in the liver, renal, lungs, and vascular tissues [8]. This enzyme is specific for aliphatic epoxides of fatty acids, such as epoxyeicosatrienoic acids (EETs), which are a metabolic derivative of Arachidonic Acid (AA) [9, 10]. EETs have been shown to have analgesic and anti-inflammatory properties as well as cardiovascular protective effects [11]. Furthermore, EETs demonstrated pro-angiogenic properties, which are linked to a cardioprotective effect in chronic phases [12]. The enzyme sEH mediates the addition of water to EETs, resulting in dihydroxyeicosatrienoic acids (DHETs) with reduced biological activity [13]. As a result, inhibiting the enzyme sEH causes an increase in EET concentration, which has anti-inflammatory, pain-relieving, and cardiovascular risk-lowering properties [14].
Pyrazole framework plays an essential role in biologically active compounds and therefore represents an interesting template for medicinal chemistry. Many pyrazole derivatives are known to exhibit a wide range of biological properties such as anti-inflammatory [15-18], analgesic [19], and anticancer [20, 21]. The pyrazole ring is present as the core in a variety of leading drugs such as selective COX-2 inhibitor (Celecoxib) [22, 23], non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (Lonazolac) [24], phosphodiesterase inhibitor (Sildenafil) [25], and antiobesity drug (Rimonabant) [26, 27].

Encouraged by these findings, and as part of our ongoing research program [12, 28-30] to find new and improved anti-inflammatory agents, we present here the synthesis and pharmacological evaluation of novel 1,5-diaryl pyrazole-3-carboxamide derivatives (19-31, Fig. 2) as safer and potent analgesic and anti-inflammatory agents. The newly synthesized derivatives were tested \textit{in vitro} for their inhibitory effects on COX-1, COX-2, and sEH. Compounds with strong inhibitory activity were chosen for testing for analgesic, anti-inflammatory, ulcerogenicity, inhibition of inflammatory cytokines, and cardiovascular effects \textit{in vivo}. Finally, a molecular docking study was presented in order to provide a plausible explanation for the differences in bioactivity between our newly synthesized derivatives against both COX-2 and sEH enzymes.

1.1. Rational Design
Recently, the design of a single modulator agent pointing different targets using multi-target directed ligand (MTDL) technique constitutes one of the most prominent techniques in recent medicinal chemistry research. Firstly, identification of each target pharmacophore is the critical step in the MTDL technique, followed by hybridization of the pharmacophoric moieties which is carried out to provide one molecule able to simultaneously hit the different targets. Herein, our dual COX-2/sEH inhibitor design depends on the determination of COX-2/sEH pharmacophores through selective COX-2 [31], selective sEH and recently reported dual COX-2/sEH inhibitors [12]. Consequently, COX-2 pharmacophoric moiety is represented as diaryl-heterocycle, which accomplishes the required Y-shaped structure. Additionally, its adhesion to the five-membered pyrazole nucleus which is known for its precarious role in COX-2 activity. On the other hand, sEH pharmacophoric moiety was detected through the inspection study of known selective sEH inhibitors’ interaction inside 3D protein structure and the reported dual COX-2/sEH inhibitors. Noticeably, these studies exposed that amide moiety is an essential chemical unit in enzyme interaction. Moreover, its adhesion to aromatic residue through a short linker is a noticeable point needed to be examined. So, we hybridize both COX-2/sEH pharmacophoric moieties together along with study the effect of linker elongation between amide and aromatic residue on both COX-2/sEH activities as shown in Fig. 2.
Fig. 2. Rational design of compounds 19-31

2. Results and discussion
2.1. Chemistry

In this study, pyrazole-3-carboxamides were prepared using substituted pyrazole-3-carboxylic acids by coupling to a series of amines. All the compounds were satisfactorily characterized by nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy and high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS).

As previously stated, phenethylamine derivatives 5-8 and 10 were synthesized using the general process specified in Scheme 1 [32].

![Scheme 1: Synthesis of phenethylamine derivatives 5-8 and 10.](image)

**Reagents and conditions:** (a) 1,5-dibromopentane, bromoethyl ether, 1,4-dibromobutane or 1,4-dibromopentane DIPEA, toluene, reflux, 20 h. (b) LiAlH₄, Et₂O, 0 °C to room temperature (rt), overnight. (c) 37% aqueous formaldehyde, NaBH₃CN, acetic acid, CH₃CN, rt, 3h. (d) LiAlH₄, Et₂O, 0 °C to rt, overnight.

The preparation of 1-benzyl-3-aminopiperidine was also accomplished using a three-step procedure [33]. ¹H NMR and ¹³C NMR spectroscopic analyses, as well as high-resolution mass spectrometry, were used to confirm the structures of compounds 11-13.
**Scheme 2:** Synthesis of 1-benzyl-3-aminopiperidine 13

**Reagents and conditions:** a) Benzyl bromide, Na₂CO₃, DCM /H₂O (2:1), reflux, 3 h. (b) NH₂NH₂, ethanol, reflux, 3 h. (c) NaNO₂, TFA, H₂O, 0 °C for 2 h then 80 °C for 2 h.

The synthesis of pyrazole-3-carboxamide derivatives 19-31 is depicted in **Scheme 3**. The pyrazole-3-carboxylic acid esters 15 and 16 were prepared by treating p-chloropropiophenone with diethyl oxalate in the presence of lithium bis(trimethylsilyl)amide (LHMDS) as a base, yielding lithium salt 14 which was then coupled in ethanol with 2,4-dichlorophenyl hydrazine HCl or 4-chlorophenylhydrazine HCl, followed by intramolecular cyclization in acetic acid under refluxing conditions to yield the pyrazole esters 15 and 16. The ¹H NMR spectrum of 15 as an example of these esters showed singlet equivalent to three protons at δ 2.31 ppm which assigned to methyl group and ethoxy group with a quartet at 4.42 ppm and a triplet at 1.39 ppm as well as aromatic protons. The structure of 15 was also confirmed by HRESI-MS which gave a molecular ion m/z 409.0277 [M+H]⁺ which is consistent with the molecular formula C₁₉H₁₆Cl₃N₂O₂. Under standard conditions, basic hydrolysis was used to convert these esters to the corresponding carboxylic acids 17 and 18. Analysis of the ¹H NMR spectrum of 17 as an example of ester hydrolysis revealed the disappearance of ethoxy protons in its ester starting material. Furthermore, the ethoxy carbon signals were also disappeared in the ¹³C NMR spectrum of the product, indicating successful deprotection of the carboxylic acid group. The coupling reaction between pyrazole-3-carboxylic acids 17 and 18 and appropriates amines was performed by using (benzotriazol-1-yloxy)tris
(dimethylamino)phosphonium hexafluorophosphate (BOP) as the coupling reagent in the presence of DIPEA to give the targeted pyrazole-3-carboxamides 19-31 in very good yields. All the structures of pyrazole-3-carboxamides were confirmed by NMR spectroscopic and high-resolution mass spectrometry. Compound 28 as an example of this series was identified by the appearance of extra peaks which were not presented in the carboxylic acid starting material 18 in both the $^1$H NMR and $^{13}$C NMR spectra as well as via HRESI mass spectrometry. The $^1$H NMR spectrum of 28 revealed the appearance of two sets of doublets at 7.12 and 6.88 ppm with coupling constant of $J = 8.6$ Hz each assigned to the phenyl protons which is indicative of aromatic para-disubstitution, two signals of two protons integration each at 3.63 (q) and 2.83 (t) ppm attributed to NHCH$_2$CH$_2$ group, and piperidinyl protons. The structure of 28 was also confirmed by HRESI-MS which gave a molecular ion m/z 567.1479 [M+H]$^+$ consistent with the molecular formula C$_{30}$H$_{30}$Cl$_3$N$_4$O of the desired product.
**Scheme 3:** Synthesis of pyrazole-3-carboxamides 19-31

**Reagents and conditions:** (a) LHMDS -78 °C to rt, 16 h. (b) 2,4-dichlorophenyl hydrazine HCl or 4-dichlorophenylhydrazine HCl, EtOH, rt, 20 h, then AcOH, reflux, 24 h. (c) KOH, MeOH, 60 °C, 4 h. (d) Appropriate amine, BOP, DIPEA, DCM, overnight, rt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound No.</th>
<th>$R^1$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Compound No.</th>
<th>$R^1$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>(\text{CH}_3) (\text{C}_3)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>(\text{CH}_3) (\text{C}_3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>(\text{N}) (\text{C}_5)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>(\text{N}) (\text{C}_5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>(\text{N}) (\text{C}_6)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>(\text{N}) (\text{C}_6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>(\text{N}) (\text{C}_6) (\text{O})</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>(\text{N}) (\text{C}_6) (\text{O})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>(\text{N}) (\text{C}_6) (\text{N}) (\text{C}_6) (\text{N}) (\text{C}_6)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>(\text{N}) (\text{C}_6) (\text{N}) (\text{C}_6) (\text{N}) (\text{C}_6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>(\text{N}) (\text{C}_6) (\text{N}) (\text{C}_6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>(\text{N}) (\text{C}_3) (\text{CH}_3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2. Pharmacological Evaluations

2.2.1. In vitro assays

2.2.1.1. COX-1 and COX-2 inhibition assays

All the newly synthesized 1,5-diaryl pyrazole-3-carboxamides 19-31 were screened for in vitro COX-1/COX-2 inhibition assays, using the COX-1/COX-2 (human) Inhibitor Screening Assay Kit [34]. The half-maximal inhibitor concentrations IC\(_{50}\) values were computed as the means of three determinations acquired, and the selectivity index (SI) values were calculated as IC\(_{50}\) (COX-1)/IC\(_{50}\) (COX-2). Table 1. The IC\(_{50}\) values of the screened compounds were obtained and compared to the reference drug celecoxib.

The in vitro assay revealed that many of the synthesized compounds exhibited significant efficacy and selectivity against the COX-2 isoform. Compounds 20-22, 24, and 29 are extremely strong COX-2 inhibitors with IC\(_{50}\) values in the sub-micromolar range. Furthermore, they demonstrated clear preferential COX-2 over COX-1 inhibition with SIs of 13, 9, 18, 6, and 16, respectively. Compounds 20, 21, 22, and 29 were particularly interesting because they exhibited the most substantial COX-2 inhibitory activity (IC\(_{50}\) values: 0.82-1.12 \(\mu\)M). They had SIs of 13, 9, 18, and 16, respectively, which were 1.15-2.25-fold greater than celecoxib (SI = 8, Table 1). The structural activity relationship analysis of the new 1,5-diaryl pyrazole-3-carboxamides 19-31 revealed that the substitution pattern on the phenyl group of the phenethyl moiety was a crucial element for the COX-2 inhibition and selectivity. The 4-morpholin-4-yl phenethyl derivatives 22 (R\(^1\) = H) and 29 (R\(^1\) = Cl) were the most potent among the synthesized derivatives, with IC\(_{50}\) values of 0.74 and 0.82 \(\mu\)M against the COX-2 isoform and SI of 19 and 16, respectively, and were more potent than the reference celecoxib (IC\(_{50}\) = 0.88, SI = 8). The unsubstituted derivative 24 was roughly twice less potent than 22 and 29, with an IC\(_{50}\) of 1.57 \(\mu\)M against the COX-2 isoform and a SI of 6, whereas the 4-
dimethylamino derivatives 19 (R¹ = H) and 25 (R¹ = Cl) had IC₅₀ values of 2.47 and 1.68, respectively, and SI of 3 and 5, respectively. The presence of 2-methylpyrrolidine or piperidine groups on the phenethyl moiety of 1,5-bis(4-chlorophenyl)-pyrazole-3-carboxamides 20 and 21 significantly increased COX-2 selectivity over the reference drug celecoxib.

The COX-2 selectivity was reduced by at least 4-folds when the 4-morpholin-4-yl moiety in compound 29 was replaced by 4-pyrrolidin-1-yl or 4-piperidin-1-yl in compounds 26 and 28, respectively. Furthermore, among the studied compounds, the 4-phenylpiperazine carbonyl derivatives 23 and 31, as well as the benzylpiperidine-3-yl carbonyl derivative 30, had the highest IC₅₀ values (lowest inhibitory effect), implying that the N-phenethyl carboxamide architecture is important for COX-2 inhibition and selectivity.

2.2.1.2. Soluble epoxide hydrolase (sEH) assay

The inhibitory activity of the synthesized derivatives 19-31 against sEH enzyme using a cell-based assay kit [35] was evaluated in vitro and presented as IC₅₀ values in Table 1. In comparison to the reference AUDA (IC₅₀ = 1.2 nM), most of the compounds examined demonstrated good inhibitory activity against sEH, with IC₅₀ values ranging from 0.80 to 4.70 nM. The in vitro sEH assay results complemented the COX-2 inhibitory activity assay, which revealed that compounds 20-22, 24, and 29 with the highest COX-2 inhibition and selectivity were the most potent sEH inhibitors with IC₅₀ values ranging from 0.80 to 1.2 nM. Compounds 20, 22, and 29 were the most potent dual COX-2/sEH inhibitors, with IC₅₀ values of 0.95, 0.80, and 0.85 nM against sEH, respectively, and were more potent than the standard AUDA (IC₅₀ = 1.2 nM). According to the results, the presence of N-phenethyl carboxamide architecture is required for sEH inhibition. As a result, compounds 23 and 31 containing 4-phenylpiperazine carbonyl in the 3-position of diaryl pyrazole, as well as the benzylpiperidine-3-yl carbonyl derivative 30, had the lowest inhibitory effects.
Table 1: COX-1/COX-2 and sEH inhibitory activities of 19-31, Celecoxib, and AUDA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound No.</th>
<th>COX-1 (IC₅₀, µM)</th>
<th>COX-2 (IC₅₀, µM)</th>
<th>SIᵃ</th>
<th>sEHᵇ (IC₅₀, nM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.57±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>0.95±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>1.10±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>0.80±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.20±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.20±0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.35±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.50±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.60±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.80±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>0.85±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.10±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>4.70±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celecoxib</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>260±14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃ Selectivity index was calculated by dividing COX-1 IC₅₀ by COX-2 IC₅₀.
ᵇ the values are the mean ± SEM (n = 3).

2.2.2. In vivo assays

2.2.2.1. Analgesic activity

Based on the results of previous in vitro tests, five compounds (20-22, 24, and 29) were selected to be examined for in vivo analgesic activity using the acetic acid-induced writhing method [36]. The reduction in acetic acid-induced writhing episodes was used to determine the efficacy and potency of the tested compounds. Table 2 summarizes the obtained results.

When compared to the reference drug, celecoxib, which had 13.43% inhibition in the number of writhing, the results revealed that all of the compounds tested had good analgesic activity, with percent inhibition in the number of writhing ranging from 34% to 71%. Compounds 20,
22, and 29, the most potent dual COX-2/sEH inhibitors in vitro, also triggered the highest analgesic activity with % inhibition of 62.68, 71.64, 67.16, respectively, and potencies of 4.66, 5.33, and 5, respectively.

**Table 2: Analgesic activity of compounds 19-31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound Code</th>
<th>No. of writhes(a) (mean ± SE)</th>
<th>% Inhibition</th>
<th>Potency (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.50±0.60</td>
<td>62.68</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.50±0.50</td>
<td>41.79</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.50±0.40</td>
<td>71.64</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.00±0.60</td>
<td>34.32</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.00±0.40</td>
<td>67.16</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celecoxib</td>
<td>29.00±0.60</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>33.50±0.80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Values are given as mean ± SE.

\(b\) Potency are calculated according to equation of relative potency \% = % of inhibition of tested compound / % of inhibition of reference x 100

**2.2.2.2. Anti-inflammatory assay**

Five compounds (20-22, 24, and 29) were selected to be examined for in vivo anti-inflammatory activity using Winter et al. carrageen-induced paw edema bioassay method [37]. The compounds' efficacy was measured as the decrease in edema paw volume and calculated as edema inhibition percentage (EI %) after 1, 3, and 5 h of carrageenan injection versus the standard drug celecoxib. Results demonstrated that the five tested compounds showed potent anti-inflammatory activities with EI% in the range of 38% to 71%. After 5 h of compound administration, the anti-inflammatory activities of compounds 20, 22, and 29 outperformed celecoxib. They showed a rapid onset of action and a long-lasting effect until the fifth hour after the compounds were given. Compound 22 was equipotent to celecoxib
after the first hour of administration, but it had more potent anti-inflammatory activity than celecoxib after the third and fifth hours, (Table 3). Based on our findings, the 1,5-diaryl pyrazole scaffold with N-phenethyl carboxamide architecture is a promising lead for developing highly efficient COX-2/sEH inhibitors as potent anti-inflammatory agents.

Table 3: The percentages of edema inhibition of compounds 20-22, 24, and 29

| Compound No. | Baseline Paw diameter (mm) ± SE | % of Edema inhibition |
|--------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|
|              |                               | 1h | 3h | 5h |
| Control      | 2.76±0.09                     | -- | -- | -- |
| 20           | 2.30±0.06                     | 24 | 49 | 62 |
| 21           | 2.83±0.09                     | 19 | 37 | 43 |
| 22           | 2.01±0.09                     | 32 | 59 | 71 |
| 24           | 2.98±0.09                     | 17 | 32 | 38 |
| 29           | 2.08±0.07                     | 29 | 52 | 65 |
| Celecoxib    | 2.09±0.07                     | 40 | 54 | 22 |

The anti-inflammatory activity (the percentage of edema inhibition) was calculated according to the following equation:

\[
\% \text{ Edema} = \frac{[(V_{R} - V_{L}) \text{ control} - (V_{R} - V_{L}) \text{ treated}]}{(V_{R} - V_{L}) \text{ control}} \times 100
\]

Where, \( V_{R} \): Average right paw thickness, \( V_{L} \): Average left paw thickness.

2.3. Gastric ulcerogenic activity

The two most common side effects of chronic administration of NSAIDs are gastrointestinal erosion and ulcers. As a result, we were curious about the ulcerogenic potential of the most potent compounds, 20, 22, and 29, when administered orally. The ulcerogenic effects of these compounds were assessed by macroscopic observation of rat's intestinal mucosa following the oral use of 10 mg/kg of 20, 22, and 29 as well as indomethacin and celecoxib [38, 39].
Compounds 22 and 29 showed no ulceration from the isolated rat stomach, whereas compound 20 showed moderate hyperemia without gross ulceration (Table 4). Compounds 20, 22, and 29 were discovered to have a potent and dual COX-2/sEH inhibitory profile, as well as potent anti-inflammatory activity with no gastric toxicity.

Table 4. Ulcerogenic effects of compounds 20, 22 and 29.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No. of gastric ulcers</th>
<th>Severity lesions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.4±0.01</td>
<td>0.6±0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celecoxib</td>
<td>2.5±0.10</td>
<td>5.8±0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indomethacin</td>
<td>8.5±0.40</td>
<td>12.5±0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. Effect on inflammatory cytokines

2.4.1. Prostaglandin E2 (PGE2)

PGE2 inhibition has been identified as one of the most effective methods of inflammation therapy since high levels of the inflammatory mediator PGE2 occurs in inflammatory disorders [40, 41]. In addition, recent reports on the significance of reducing PGE2 in anti-inflammatory effects [42]. A study was conducted on the 20, 22, and 29 capacities to inhibit PGE2 in the PGE2 serum rat levels in blood samples collected following 5h of subcutaneous carrageenan injections. Table 5 estimates and shows the percentage of PGE2 inhibition. The results obtained showed that compounds 20, 22, and 29 had a significant reduction in serum PGE2 (% inhibition = 73-78), which was greater than the reference celecoxib (72%).
2.4.2. Determination of rat serum TNF-α and IL-6

Typical pro-inflammatory cytokines (TNF-α and IL-6) have been found to identify the occurrence of inflammation and their role in chronic diseases [43]. The overall anti-inflammatory impact is dependent in part on lowering the levels of these inflammatory indicators in the plasma [44]. The serum concentrations of TNF-α and IL-6 in blood samples collected from rats treated with chemicals 20, 22, and 29 were evaluated in the current investigation (Table 5). Compounds 20, 22, and 29 significantly reduced rat serum concentrations of both TNF-α (% inhibition = 72-75) and IL-6 (% inhibition = 78-80) which were more active than celecoxib of 64 and 71, respectively. Compound 22 was the most active compound, with a TNF-α inhibition rate of 77 compared to celecoxib (% TNF-α inhibition = 64) and decreasing serum IL-6 concentration at a rate of 80% compared to celecoxib of 71%.
**Table 5:** PEG₂, TNF-α and IL-6 rat serum concentrations for compounds 20, 22, 29 and Celecoxib.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound No.</th>
<th>Inflammatory markers [serum concentration (pg/ml), %inhibition]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEG₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>81.52±2.40&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>65.78±2.15&lt;sup&gt;abc&lt;/sup&gt; 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>78.13±2.40&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celecoxib</td>
<td>84.63±2.50&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (pre)</td>
<td>70.98±1.15 ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (post)</td>
<td>302.15±10.89&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are expressed as (mean ± SE). Statistics were done by One-way ANOVA and confirmed by Turkey's test. PGE; Prostaglandin E, IL-6; Interleukin 6, TNF-α; Tumor necrosis factor α.

<sup>a</sup> P<0.05: Statistically significant from control (pre) group
<sup>b</sup> P<0.05: Statistically significant from control (post) group (Carrageenan)
<sup>c</sup> P<0.05: Statistically significant from standard group (Celecoxib)

### 2.5. Cardiovascular evaluation

The celecoxib-induced cardiotoxicity in rats [45, 46] was used to assess the potential cardiovascular risks of the most active compounds 22 and 29. The heart's response to the tested compounds was expressed as the change in the serum levels of lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), troponine-I (Tn-I), tumor necrosis factor-α (TNF-α), and creatine kinase-MB (CK-MB) at a dose of 100 mg/kg of tested compounds as well as celecoxib. **Table 6** displays the obtained results.

Celecoxib treatment resulted in a significant increase in the diagnostic biomarkers of cardiomyopathy (Tn-I, LDH, and CK-MB) when compared to normal control [47-49]. Compounds 22 and 29, on the other hand, caused no significant changes in the levels of two of these biomarkers (LDH and CK-MB) when compared to the control, indicating their lower
cardiotoxic side effects. Furthermore, compounds 22 and 29 significantly reduced the serum concentration of TNF-α, a key player in the inflammatory response and cardiac depression [50], with % inhibition of 77% and 75%, respectively, when compared to celecoxib ( % inhibition = 64% ), as shown in Table 5. Based on these findings, the proposed scaffold could be a promising starting point for the development of selective COX-2/sEH inhibitors as potent analgesic/anti-inflammatory agents with lower cardiotoxicity.

Table 6: Measurements of serum Tn-I, LDH and CK-MB in 22, 29 and celecoxib.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Troponine-I (pg/ml)</th>
<th>LDH (IU/L)</th>
<th>CK-MB (IU/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal control</td>
<td>75±05</td>
<td>1536±100</td>
<td>16±2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celecoxib</td>
<td>340±12*</td>
<td>2100±100*</td>
<td>96±04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>105±08*</td>
<td>1375±30*</td>
<td>15±2.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>130±04*</td>
<td>1500±25*</td>
<td>20±04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analyzed by one-way ANOVA test (n = 6).

* Significantly different from normal control group at p < 0.05.

* Significantly different from celecoxib group at p < 0.05.
2.6. Molecular docking study

To provide a plausible explanation for the divergence in the bioactivity that existed among our newly synthesized derivatives against both COX-2 and sEH enzymes, a molecular docking study was conducted employing the freely available Autodock Vina program, version 1.1.2 [51, 52]. The 3D crystal structures of sEH (PDB code: 1VJ5) and COX-2 (PDB code: 5KIR) retrieved from Protein Data Bank (https://www.rcsb.org) were utilized for this purpose. This study would unveil some structural insights into their binding patterns and key interactions with COX-2 and sEH enzymes. Accordingly, the most active compounds 22 and 29 in addition to some other inactive or least active ones 30 and 31, for comparison, were selected to be docked inside the active sites of both targets. Interestingly enough, the most/least active compounds were the same on both enzymes. Initially, a validation process of the docking methodology into COX-2 was performed through redocking the co-crystallized ligand, Rofecoxib into the binding site using the assigned protocol settings. The redocked results of this study revealed the superposition of the redocked rofecoxib over the co-crystallized ligands with RMDS of 1.32 Å using UCSF Chimera software version 1.15 [53] suggesting that the proposed protocol is acceptable and valid for the analysis of binding modalities of the tested compounds. Also, it was found that the redocked pose involved in similar interactions to that of co-crystallized ligand including H-bonding with Arg-513 residue and some other hydrophobic interactions, Fig. 3 (A-C).
Fig. 3. A) Overlay of the redocked rofecoxib (shown as sticks, colored in green) and the co-crystallized ligand (shown as sticks, colored in violet) with RMSD of 1.34 Å; B) 3D Binding mode and interactions of redocked rofecoxib into COX-2 active site (PDB code: 5KIR); C) 2D binding mode of the redocked rofecoxib into COX-2 active site showing different types of interactions. H-bonds were represented as dashed green lines. All hydrogens were removed for the purposes of clarity.

The top two pyrazole-3-carboxamide derivatives with the most COX-2 inhibitory activity, 22 and 29, as well as the two derivatives with the least inhibitory activity, 30 and 31, were initially docked into the active pocket of COX-2. The results revealed that compounds 22 and 29 adopted a common binding mode similar to rofecoxib, with the diaryl pyrazole scaffold buried deep into the active site and the extended arm composed of 4-morpholin-4-yl phenethyl carboxamide located near the active site's entrance and exposed outward. In compounds 22 and 29, one of the two nitrogen atoms of the pyrazole ring and the NH of the carboxamide moiety formed two important H-bonding interactions with the key-residue in the active site Tyr-355 amino acid. Moreover, in both 22 and 29, the oxygen atom of the extended 4-morpholine moiety was involved in an additional H-bonding with the Tyr-115 residue.
Detailed analysis revealed that the pyrazole ring and the phenyl group of the phenethyl moiety in compound 22 was involved in two π-cation interactions with the residue Arg-120. In addition, one of the two phenyl groups attached to pyrazole formed π-sigma interaction with Val-523 residue. Finally, compounds 22 and 29 were involved in several hydrophilic interactions with Val-116, Val-349, Leu-352, Tyr-385, Trp-387, Phe-518 and Ala-527 amino acid residues. Due to the presence of an additional chlorine atom in 29, the compound was forced to twist through the carboxamide linker to avoid some clashes, resulting in the loss of some π interactions and a slight decrease in activity when compared to 22 (IC50 = 0.82 and 0.74 M, respectively). The 2D and 3D binding interactions of 22 and 29 within the active site of the COX-2 enzyme were shown in Fig. 4(A-D).
Fig. 4. Comparison of docking and 2/3D binding modes of compound 22 (Stick/Ball and stick with carbons colored in orange) and compound 29 (Stick/Ball and stick with carbons colored in cyan) within the catalytic active site of COX-2 enzyme (PDB code: 5KIR); A) 3D binding mode of compound 22 into active site of COX-2 enzyme; B) 2D Docking mode of 22 showing different types of interactions inside the active site of COX-2 enzyme; C) 3D binding mode of compound 29 into active site of COX-2 enzyme; D) 2D Docking mode of 29 showing different types of interactions inside the active site of COX-2 enzyme. H-bonds were represented as dashed green lines. All hydrogens were removed for the purposes of clarity. H-bond surfaces around ligands were created.
Meanwhile, compound 30 with the benzyl piperidine moiety was docked, and the results showed that fits nicely inside the active pocket without forming any H-bonds with the key residues, as shown in Fig. 5(A-B). Furthermore, the difference in the length of the extension tethered to diaryl pyrazole between 30 and compounds 22 and 29 resulted in the loss of one important H-bonding with the Tyr-115 residue, which was easily approached by the morpholine ring. The superior bioactivity of 22 over 30 (IC$_{50}$ = 2.33 M) could be attributed to the extra length and H-bonding, which were visible in Fig. 5C through the overlay of both 22 and 30. The docking results of the least active compound 31 (IC$_{50}$ = 3.23 M) revealed a completely inverse binding pattern and alignment without the formation of any critical H-bonding interactions. It was only involved in a few hydrophobic and π-π stacking interactions, as shown in Fig. 5D. Compound 31 protruded outside the pocket due to its inverse orientation, depriving it of important interactions.
Fig. 5. Comparison of docking and 2/3D binding modes of compound 30 (Stick/Ball and stick with carbons colored in yellow) and compound 31 (Ball and stick with carbons colored in red) within the catalytic active site of COX-2 enzyme (PDB code: 5KIR); A) 3D binding mode of compound 30 into active site of COX-2 enzyme; B) 2D Docking mode of 30 showing different types of interactions inside the active site of COX-2 enzyme; C) Overlay of compound 22 and 30 into active site of COX-2 enzyme showing the difference in length and interactions; D) 3D binding mode of compound 31 into active site of COX-2 enzyme. H-bonds were represented as dashed green lines. All hydrogens were removed for the purposes of clarity. H-bond surfaces around ligands were created.
In addition to the investigation of binding modalities of the compounds and study of their interactions, the docking scores recorded by Autodock Vina (Binding affinity, $\Delta G$ (kcal/mol)) for this simulation were consistent with the in vitro results and our explanation for the binding patterns. The binding affinities recorded by the docking software for the compounds 22, 29, 30 and 31 were -11.6, -10.6, -9.2 and -8.4 kcal/mol, respectively. Finally, the overlay of the top docking poses 22 and 29 with the co-crystallized ligand into COX-2 binding pocket showed good shape complementarity while compound 31 adopted an inverse positioning and alignment, Fig. 6(A-C).

**Fig. 6.** A) Overlay of the top docked poses 22 (orange), 29 (cyan) and rofecoxib (green) as a co-crystalized ligand into the COX-2 binding pocket (PDB code: 5KIR); B) Superposition of 22, 29, 30, 31 and rofecoxib into the active site of COX-2 protein represented as secondary structure displayed in a flat ribbon style; C) Overlay of the docked poses 22 (orange), 31 (red) and rofecoxib (green) into the COX-2 binding pocket to compare their different binding patterns.
On the other hand, the docking results of the two most active derivatives 22 and 29 into the active site of sEH showed that the top docked poses adopted a common binding pattern and modality where the diaryl pyrazole scaffold was located near the entrance of the active pocket and exposed outward while the 4-morpholin-4-yl phenethyl carboxamide extension was leaned in the catalytic pocket of sEH composed of the three main amino acids; Asp333, Tyr381, Tyr465 which are responsible for the activity of the enzyme, Fig. 7(A-D) [54, 55]. It was worth noting that this extended moiety in both 22 and 29 shared the same orientation and positioning of the co-crystalized ligand CIU in the catalytic pocket, Fig. 7(D). Also, the amide moiety in compound 22 was engaged in two important H-bonding interactions with Gln-382 residue while phenyl morpholine moiety was involved in some π-π stacking with Tyr-381, His-523, and Tyr-524 amino acid residues, Fig. 7(A-B). Moreover, the diaryl pyrazole bearing p-chloro substitutes in the two compounds 22 and 29 aligned towards Met-337, Try-341, Ala-363, Trp-472, and Ala-475 residues forming hydrophobic interactions. It was found also that the pyrazole ring was involved in π-sulfur interactions with Met-468, Met-308 and Met-337, respectively. Finally, the diaryl core formed π-π stacking with Pro-369 and Trp-341 amino acids. It was conceptualized that the slight difference in inhibitory activities between 22 and 29 (IC$_{50}$ = 0.78 and 0.84 nM, respectively) could be attributed to the absence of some H-bonding interactions and clashes that might be existed as a result of the extra chlorine atom in 29.
Fig. 7. Comparison of docking and 2/3D binding modes of compound 22 (Stick and stick/ball with carbons colored in orange) and compound 29 (Ball and stick with carbons colored in cyan) within the catalytic active site of sEH enzyme (PDB code: 1VJ5); A) 3D binding mode of compound 22 into active site of sEH enzyme; B) 2D Docking mode of 22 showing different types of interactions inside the active site of sEH enzyme; C) 3D binding mode of compound 29 into active site of sEH enzyme; D) Overlay of compound 22, 29 and co-crystallized ligand, CIU (colored in green) into active site of sEH enzyme showing their alignment and interactions. H-bonds were represented as dashed green lines. All hydrogens were removed for the purposes of clarity. H-bond surfaces around ligands were created.

On the contrary, compounds 30 and 31 showed the least activity against the sEH enzyme with IC$_{50}$ values of 4.1 and 4.7 nM, respectively. The examination of the docking results indicated that these two ligands shared a completely different alignment and orientation compared with the previously docked active derivatives 22 and 29, Fig. 8(A-D). It was found that the benzyl piperidine carboxamide and phenyl piperazin moieties in 30 and 31, respectively protrude
outside the active pocket of sEH enzyme while, the diaryl pyrazole core buried deep into the
extended part of the active site surrounded by Met-337, Try-341, Ilu-361, Pro-369, Gln-382,
Met-368 and Trp-472 engaging only in some hydrophobic interactions without forming any
H-bonds. Thus, the catalytic room (Asp333, Tyr381, and Tyr465) of the active site has
become out of reach for these two ligands due to their different binding patterns and opposed
dispositions. This great variation could be observed upon superposition of 30 and 31 with the
crystallized ligand, CIU owing to the inferior activities compared to CIU, Fig. 8(D). The
docking scores recorded by Autodock Vina in terms of binding affinities, $\Delta G$ (kcal/mol) for
this study were in line with the in vitro activities and our findings where compounds 22, 29,
30 and 31 revealed docking scores of -10.4, -10.3, -8.7 and -8.5 kcal/mol, respectively. Taken
together, the docking simulation, along with the in vitro assay results, support the promising
hybridization approach between the amide sEH pharmacophoric group and the diaryl
pyrazole COX-2 core to develop potent leads for further optimization as anti-inflammatory
agents with fewer cardiovascular risks.
Fig. 8. Comparison of docking and 2/3D binding modes of compound 30 (Stick and stick/ball with carbons colored in yellow) and compound 31 (Ball and stick with carbons colored in red) within the catalytic active site of sEH enzyme (PDB code: 1VJ5); A) 3D binding mode of compound 30 into active site of sEH enzyme; B) 2D Docking mode of 30 showing different types of interactions inside the active site of sEH enzyme; C) 3D binding mode of compound 31 into active site of sEH enzyme; D) Overlay of compound 30, 31 and co-crystallized ligand, CIU (colored in green) into active site of sEH enzyme showing their different alignments and interactions. H-bonds were represented as dashed green lines. All hydrogens were removed for the purposes of clarity. H-bond surfaces around ligands were created.
3. CONCLUSIONS

Novel series of 1,5-diaryl pyrazole-3-carboxamides 19-31 were synthesized and evaluated against COX-1, COX-2, and sEH enzymes as dual COX-2/sEH inhibitors. The most active dual inhibitors 20, 22, 29 showed, in vivo, potent analgesic, and anti-inflammatory biological outcomes, all of which are higher than celecoxib with lower ulcerogenicity. In terms of the cardiovascular system, the results confirmed that 22 and 29 are less cardiotoxic than the reference celecoxib. This was demonstrated by lower levels of diagnostic biomarkers of myocardial damage, such as LDH, Tn-I, TNF-, and CK-MB, as well as the inflammatory markers PGE2 and IL6.
4. Experimental

4.1. Chemistry

**General Details:** See Appendix A

Compounds 5-8 and 10 [32], 14-18 [33] were prepared as reported earlier.

**General procedure for synthesis of indole-2-carboxamide derivatives 19-31**

A mixture of the appropriate indole-2-carboxylic acids 17 and 18 (0.60 mmol, 1 eq.), BOP (1.5 eq.), and DIPEA (2 eq.) in DCM (30 mL) was stirred for 10 min at rt before adding the appropriate amine (1.2 eq.). The resulting reaction mixture was stirred overnight at rt. After vacuum removal of the solvent, the residue was extracted with EtOAc, washed with 5% HCl, saturated NaHCO₃ solution, brine, dried over MgSO₄, and evaporated under reduced pressure to yield a crude product that was purified by flash chromatography on silica gel to yield the final carboxamides 19-31.

**4.1.1. 1,5-bis(4-Chlorophenyl)-N-(4-(dimethylamino)phenethyl)-4-methyl-1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (19)**

Yield % 80, mp 68-70 °C. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, δ ppm CDCl₃): δ 7.35 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.26 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.20 – 7.04 (m, 7H, Ar-H, amide NH), 6.71 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 3.64 (q, J = 7.7 Hz, 2H, NHCH₃CH₂), 2.91 (s, 6H, N(CH₃)₂), 2.91 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂CH₂), 2.35 (s, 3H, CH₃). ¹³C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 162.70, 149.40, 144.59, 140.90, 137.91, 134.89, 133.41, 131.26, 129.45, 129.09, 127.91, 126.96, 125.90, 118.96, 113.03, 40.79, 40.69, 35.06, 9.37. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H⁺] C_{27}H_{27}Cl_{2}N_{4}O: 493.1556, found: 493.1557.
4.1.2. 1,5-bis(4-Chlorophenyl)-4-methyl-N-(4-(2-methylpyrrolidin-1-yl)phenethyl)-1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (20)

Yield % 81, mp 78-80 °C. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, δ ppm CDCl\(_3\)): δ 7.35 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.72 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.19 – 7.05 (m, 7H, Ar-H, amide NH), 6.56 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 3.86 - 3.82 (m, 1H, pyrrolidin-H), 3.63 (q, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H, NHCH\(_2\)CH\(_2\)), 3.44 - 3.47 (m, 1H, pyrrolidin-H), 3.14 (q, J = 8.4 Hz, 1H, pyrrolidin-H), 2.83 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 2H, NHCH\(_2\)CH\(_2\)), 2.35 (s, 3H, CH\(_3\)), 2.16 – 1.91 (m, 3H, pyrrolidin-H), 1.72 - 1.65 (m, 1H, pyrrolidin-H), 1.17 (d, J = 6.2 Hz, 3H, CHCH\(_3\)). \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) δ 162.70, 144.61, 140.89, 137.92, 134.88, 133.40, 131.25, 129.58, 129.45, 129.40, 129.12, 127.92, 126.35, 125.89, 118.95, 111.97, 53.44, 40.78, 35.10, 33.08, 30.91, 23.29, 19.38, 9.35. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]+ C\(_{30}\)H\(_{31}\)Cl\(_2\)N\(_4\)O: 533.1869, found: 533.1871.

4.1.3. 1,5-bis(4-Chlorophenyl)-4-methyl-N-(4-(piperidin-1-yl)phenethyl)-1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (21)

Yield % 82, mp 65-67 °C. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, δ ppm CDCl\(_3\)): δ 7.35 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.27 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.17 – 7.04 (m, 7H, Ar-H, amide NH), 6.89 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 3.64 (q, J = 7.6 Hz, 2H, NHCH\(_2\)CH\(_2\)), 3.15 – 3.07 (m, 4H, piperidin-H), 2.84 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 2H, NHCH\(_2\)CH\(_2\)), 2.34 (s, 3H, CH\(_3\)), 1.76 – 1.65 (m, 4H, piperidin-H), 1.61 – 1.50 (m, 2H, piperidin-H). \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) δ 162.70, 150.90, 144.55, 140.92, 137.89, 134.90, 133.44, 131.25, 129.60, 129.37, 129.11, 129.08, 127.89, 125.91, 116.82, 50.90, 40.51, 35.13, 25.89, 24.28, 9.35. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]+ C\(_{30}\)H\(_{31}\)Cl\(_2\)N\(_4\)O: 533.1869, found: 533.1870.
4.1.4. 1,5-bis(4-Chlorophenyl)-4-methyl-N-(4-morpholinophenethyl)-1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (22)

Yield % 78, mp 80-82 °C. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, \(\delta\) ppm CDCl\(_3\)):
\(\delta\) 7.35 (d, \(J = 8.4\) Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.28 (d, \(J = 8.7\) Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.21 – 7.04 (m, 7H, Ar-H, amide NH), 6.87 (d, \(J = 8.6\) Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 3.89 – 3.82 (m, 4H, morph-H), 3.65 (q, \(J = 7.7\) Hz, 2H, NHCH\(_2\)CH\(_2\)), 3.16 – 3.09 (m, 4H, morph-H), 2.86 (t, \(J = 7.3\) Hz, 2H, NHCH\(_2\)CH\(_2\)), 2.35 (s, 3H).

\(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 162.70, 149.87, 144.52, 140.96, 137.89, 134.92, 133.50, 131.23, 130.52, 129.54, 129.12, 129.09, 127.85, 125.92, 118.96, 115.97, 66.93, 49.56, 40.51, 35.18, 9.35.

HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]\(^+\) C\(_{29}\)H\(_{29}\)Cl\(_2\)N\(_4\)O: 535.1662, found: 535.1662.

4.1.5. 1,5-bis(4-Chlorophenyl)-1H-pyrazol-3-yl)(4-phenylpiperazin-1-yl) methanone (23)

Yield % 76, mp 80-82 °C. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, \(\delta\) ppm CDCl\(_3\)):
\(\delta\) 7.37 (d, \(J = 8.4\) Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.33 – 7.23 (m, 4H, Ar-H), 7.19 – 7.08 (m, 4H, Ar-H), 6.95 (d, \(J = 8.0\) Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 6.90 (t, \(J = 7.4\) Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 4.02 (dt, \(J = 18.4, 5.2\) Hz, 4H, piperazin-H), 3.27 (dt, \(J = 21.6, 5.3\) Hz, 4H, piperazin-H), 2.19 (s, 3H, \(\text{CH}_3\)). \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 163.32, 151.05, 146.03, 140.03, 137.96, 134.91, 133.30, 131.13, 129.23, 129.14, 129.12, 127.99, 125.84, 120.46, 118.25, 116.66, 50.22, 49.54, 47.17, 42.12, 9.08. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]\(^+\) C\(_{27}\)H\(_{25}\)Cl\(_2\)N\(_4\): 491.1400, found: 491.1400.

4.1.6. 5-(4-Chlorophenyl)-1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-4-methyl-N-phenethyl-1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (24)

Yield % 80, mp 128-130 °C. \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, \(\delta\) ppm CDCl\(_3\)):
\(\delta\) 7.43 (d, \(J = 2.2\) Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 7.34 – 7.19 (m, 9H, Ar-H), 7.10 – 7.02 (m, 3H, Ar-H, amide NH), 3.67 (q, \(J = 7.1\), 2H, NHCH\(_2\)CH\(_2\)), 2.93 (t, \(J = 7.6\) Hz, 2H, NHCH\(_2\)CH\(_2\)), 2.39 (s, 3H, \(\text{CH}_3\)). \(^{13}\)C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)) \(\delta\) 162.66, 144.95, 142.96, 139.03, 135.91, 135.88, 134.88, 132.95, 130.80,
130.44, 130.32, 128.88, 128.80, 128.55, 127.83, 127.22, 126.39, 117.69, 40.42, 36.11, 9.42.

HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]^+ C_{25}H_{21}Cl_3N_3O: 484.0745, found: 484.0745.

4.1.7. 5-(4-Chlorophenyl)-1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-N-(4-(dimethylamino)phenethyl)-4-methyl-1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (25)

Yield % 82, mp 72-74 °C. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, δ ppm CDCl₃): δ 7.42 (d, J = 2.1 Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 7.33 – 7.22 (m, 4H, Ar-H), 7.13 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.09 – 7.02 (m, 3H, Ar-H, amide NH), 6.70 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 3.62 (q, J = 7.7 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂CH₂), 2.91 (s, 6H, N(CH₃)₂), 2.83 (t, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂CH₂), 2.39 (s, 3H, CH₃). ¹³C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 162.63, 149.37, 145.07, 142.89, 135.95, 135.83, 134.83, 132.94, 130.81, 130.50, 130.28, 129.40, 128.86, 127.81, 127.29, 126.97, 117.65, 113.03, 40.81, 40.74, 35.05, 9.44. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]^+ C_{27}H_{26}Cl_3N_4O: 527.1167, found: 527.1171.

4.1.8. 5-(4-Chlorophenyl)-1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-4-methyl-N-(4-(pyrrolidin-1-yl)phenethyl)-1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (26)

Yield % 81, mp 87-89 °C. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, δ ppm CDCl₃): δ 7.42 (d, J = 2.1 Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 7.34 – 7.23 (m, 4H, Ar-H), 7.14 – 7.03 (m, 5H, Ar-H, amide NH), 6.52 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 3.62 (q, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂CH₂), 3.29 – 3.21 (m, 4H, pyrrolidin-H), 2.82 (t, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂CH₂), 2.40 (s, 3H, CH₃), 2.02 – 1.94 (m, 4H, pyrrolidin-H). ¹³C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 162.64, 146.68, 145.11, 142.89, 135.98, 135.81, 134.82, 132.94, 130.83, 130.54, 130.26, 129.47, 128.86, 127.82, 127.32, 125.51, 117.63, 111.85, 47.70, 40.89, 35.13, 25.45, 9.46. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]^+ C_{29}H_{28}Cl₃N₄O: 553.1323, found: 553.1323.
4.1.9. 5-(4-Chlorophenyl)-1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-4-methyl-N-(4-(2-methylpyrrolidin-1-yl)phenethyl)-1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (27)

Yield % 78, mp 85-87 °C. 1H NMR (400 MHz, δ ppm CDCl₃): δ 7.42 (d, J = 2.1 Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 7.33 – 7.22 (m, 4H, Ar-H), 7.13 – 7.02 (m, 5H, Ar-H, amide NH), 6.53 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 3.88 – 3.79 (m, 1H, pyrrolidin-H), 3.62 (q, J = 7.2 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂CH₂), 3.40 (t, J = 8.6 Hz, 1H, pyrrolidin-H), 3.18 – 3.07 (m, 1H, pyrrolidin-H), 2.81 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂CH₂), 2.39 (s, 3H, CH₃), 1.73 – 1.64 (m, 1H, pyrrolidin-H), 1.16 (d, J = 6.2 Hz, 3H, CHCH₃). 13C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 162.64, 145.91, 145.10, 142.88, 135.96, 135.81, 134.82, 132.94, 130.80, 130.50, 130.27, 129.52, 128.85, 127.79, 127.30, 125.28, 117.64, 111.91, 53.68, 48.30, 40.85, 35.13, 23.31, 19.44, 9.43. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]+ C₃₀H₃₀Cl₃N₄O: 567.1480, found: 567.1484.

4.1.10. 5-(4-Chlorophenyl)-1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-4-methyl-N-(4-(piperidin-1-yl)phenethyl)-1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (28)

Yield % 78, mp 80-82 °C. 1H NMR (400 MHz, δ ppm CDCl₃): δ 7.42 (d, J = 2.2 Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 7.31 – 7.23 (m, 4H, Ar-H), 7.12 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.08 – 7.00 (m, 3H, Ar-H, amide NH), 6.88 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 3.63 (q, J = 7.6 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂CH₂), 3.14 – 3.07 (m, 4H, piperidin-H), 2.83 (t, J = 7.6 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂CH₂), 2.38 (s, 3H, CH₃), 1.73 - 1.66 (m, 4H, piperidin-H), 1.61 – 1.51 (m, 2H, piperidin-H). 13C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 162.62, 150.85, 145.03, 142.90, 135.95, 135.83, 134.84, 132.95, 130.80, 130.50, 130.28, 129.58, 129.33, 128.86, 127.81, 127.27, 117.65, 116.79, 50.88, 40.56, 35.13, 25.89, 24.28, 9.42. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]+ C₃₀H₃₀Cl₃N₄O: 567.1480, found: 567.1479.
4.1.11. 5-(4-Chlorophenyl)-1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-4-methyl-N-(4-morpholinophenethyl)
1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (29)

Yield % 79, mp 90-92 °C. 1H NMR (400 MHz, δ ppm CDCl3): δ 7.42 (d, J = 2.2 Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 7.32 – 7.21 (m, 4H, Ar-H), 7.15 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 7.09 – 7.01 (m, 3H, Ar-H, amide NH), 6.85 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 3.87 – 3.80 (m, 4H, morph-H), 3.62 (q, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂CH₃), 3.14 – 3.07 (m, 4H, morph-H), 2.84 (t, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H, NHCH₂C₂H₅), 2.38 (s, 3H).

13C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl3) δ 162.63, 149.84, 144.99, 142.93, 135.92, 135.86, 134.86, 132.94, 130.80, 130.50, 130.48, 130.29, 129.51, 128.87, 127.83, 127.23, 117.66, 115.96, 66.92, 49.55, 40.56, 35.14, 9.43. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]+ C₂₉H₂₸Cl₃N₄O₂: 569.1272, found: 569.1279.

4.1.12. N-(1-Benzylpiperidin-3-yl)-5-(4-chlorophenyl)-1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-4-methyl-
1H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide (30)

Yield % 76, mp 80-82 °C. 1H NMR (400 MHz, δ ppm CDCl3): δ 7.45 (d, J = 1.9 Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 7.35 – 7.18 (m, 9H, Ar-H), 7.07 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 4.29 – 4.20 (m, 1H, piperidin-H), 3.52 (q, J = 12.4 Hz, 2H, PhCH₂), 2.65 - 2.60 (m, 6H, piperidin-H), 2.51 – 2.29 (m, 6H, piperidin-H, CH₃), 1.83 – 1.53 (m, 4H, piperidin-H). 13C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl3) δ 161.82, 145.22, 142.83, 138.46, 136.11, 135.79, 134.79, 132.94, 130.80, 130.57, 130.29, 128.85, 128.15, 127.80, 127.39, 126.94, 117.61, 62.88, 58.22, 53.59, 45.01, 29.62, 22.54, 9.45. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]+ C₂₉H₂₸Cl₃N₄O: 553.1323, found: 553.1323.

4.1.13. (5-(4-Chlorophenyl)-1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-4-methyl-1H-pyrazol-3-yl)(4-
phenylpiperazin-1-yl)methanone (31)

Yield 75%, mp 83-85 °C. 1H NMR (400 MHz, Chloroform-d) δ 7.44 (d, J = 2.2 Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 7.34 – 7.22 (m, 5H, Ar-H), 7.18 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 7.08 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 6.93 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 2H, Ar-H), 6.88 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 1H, Ar-H), 4.00 (dt, J = 19.6, 5.2 Hz,
4H, piperazin-H), 3.25 (dt, J = 22.1, 5.1 Hz, 4H, piperazin-H), 2.23 (s, 3H, CH3). 13C NMR (101 MHz, cdcl3) δ 163.23, 151.05, 142.01, 135.94, 135.73, 134.84, 132.99, 130.69, 130.58, 130.30, 129.20, 128.94, 127.88, 127.33, 120.37, 117.09, 116.64, 50.15, 49.53, 47.21, 42.13, 9.14. HRESI-MS m/z calcd for [M+H]+ C27H24Cl3N4O: 525.1010, found: 525.1016.
4.2. Pharmacological Evaluations

4.2.1. In vitro assays

4.2.1.1. COX-1 and COX-2 inhibition assays

All the newly synthesized 1,5-diaryl pyrazole-3-carboxamides 19-31 were screened for in vitro COX-1/COX-2 inhibition assays, using the COX-1/COX-2 (human) Inhibitor Screening Assay Kit [34]. See Appendix A.

4.2.1.2. Soluble epoxide hydrolase (sEH) assay

The inhibitory activity of the synthesized derivatives 19-31 against sEH enzyme using a cell-based assay kit [35] was evaluated in vitro and presented as IC₅₀ values. See Appendix A.

4.2.2. In vivo assays

4.2.2.1. Analgesic activity

Five compounds (20-22, 24, and 29) were selected to be examined for in vivo analgesic activity using the acetic acid-induced writhing method [36]. The reduction in acetic acid-induced writhing episodes was used to determine the efficacy and potency of the tested compounds. See Appendix A.

4.2.2.2. Anti-inflammatory assay

Five compounds (20-22, 24, and 29) were selected to be examined for in vivo anti-inflammatory activity using Winter et al. carrageen-induced paw edema bioassay method [37]. The compounds' efficacy was measured as the decrease in edema paw volume and calculated as edema inhibition percentage (EI %) after 1, 3, and 5 h of carrageenan injection versus the standard drug celecoxib. See Appendix A
4.3. Gastric ulcerogenic activity

The ulcerogenic effects of compounds 20, 22, and 29 were assessed by macroscopic observation of rat's intestinal mucosa following the oral use of 10 mg/kg of 20, 22, and 29 as well as indomethacin and celecoxib [38, 39]. See Appendix A.

4.4. Effect on inflammatory cytokines

Assessment of inflammatory cytokines PGE$_2$, IL-6 and TNF-$\alpha$ were determined using specific ELISA kits according to the manufacturer's instructions. All the parameters are measured using OD 450 nm [40-44]. See Appendix A.

4.5. Cardiovascular evaluation

Troponin-I (cTn-I) levels in serum were determined using ELISA kits and the reported method [56]. Levels of LDH and CK-MB were determined spectrophotometry [57, 58]. See Appendix A.
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