RSC Advances



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. This Accepted Manuscript will be replaced by the edited, formatted and paginated article as soon as this is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the **Information for Authors**.

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard <u>Terms & Conditions</u> and the <u>Ethical guidelines</u> still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.



www.rsc.org/advances

Journal Name

Cite this: DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

Received 00th January 2012, Accepted 00th January 2012

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

ARTICLE

Xylariterpenoids A–D, four new sesquiterpenoids from the Xylariaceae fungus

Zu-Yan Wu,^{§,a} Yang Wu,^{§,a} Guo-Dong Chen,^{*,b} Dan Hu,^{*a*} Xiao-Xia Li,^{*a*} Xiang Sun,^{*c*} Liang-Dong Guo,^{*c*} Yan Li,^{*d*} Xin-Sheng Yao^{*,a} and Hao Gao,^{*,a}

RSC Advances

Four new sesquiterpenoids, sesquiterpenoids A–D (1–4), were isolated from the solid cultures of the Xylariaceae fungus (No. 63-19-7-3). Their structures were determined through NMR analyses, CD calculation, *in situ* dimolybdenum CD method, the modified Mosher's method, and X-ray data analysis. The cytotoxicities of all compounds against HL-60, SMMC-7721, A-549, MCF-7 and SW480 human cancer cell lines were assayed.

Introduction

www.rsc.org/

The Xylariaceae is one of the largest families of ascomycetes (over 60 genera and far more than 1000 species). Moreover, excess of 500 metabolites have been reported from Xylariaceae fungi.¹ Previous chemical investigations reveal that this family produces a variety of secondary metabolites including dihydroisocoumarins, punctaporonins, cytochalasins, butyrolactones and succinic acid derivatives.² During our ongoing search for bioactive secondary metabolites from endolichenic fungi,³ the chemical investigation of the Xylariaceae fungus (No. 63-19-7-3) was carried out, which led to the isolation of four new sesquiterpenoids (1-4). The planar structures of 1-4 were established primarily by NMR experiments. The absolute configurations of 1 and 2 were determined by CD and in situ dimolybdenum CD methods, while the absolute configurations of 3 and 4 were deduced via the modified Mosher's method and X-ray data analysis, respectively. Detail of the isolation, structural and absolute configurations elucidation, and cytotoxicity of all the compounds are reported herein.



Materials and methods

The fermented material of the Xylariaceae fungus (No. 63-19-7-3) was extracted with EtOAc, and the organic solvent was evaporated under vacuum to afford the dry crude extract (28.1g). Then the crude extract was dissolved in 90% (v/v) aqueous MeOH (500 mL) and partitioned against the same volume cyclohexane to afford cyclohexane fraction (C, 15.3 g) and aqueous MeOH fraction (W, 12.5 g). The aqueous MeOH fraction was successively subjected to column chromatography over ODS, Sephadex LH-20 and reversed-phase HPLC (RPHPLC) to obtain compounds 1-4. Then, the cytotoxicity assay of compounds 1-4 was performed. The detailed experimental procedures are available in the ESI.[†]

Results

Structural elucidation

Xylariterpenoid A (1) was obtained as a oil with a molecular formula of C15H24O3 (four degrees of unsaturation), which was determined by HRESIMS at m/z 275.1615 [M + Na]⁺ (calcd for $C_{15}H_{24}O_3Na$, 275.1623). The UV spectrum (252 nm) indicated the presence of an α , β -unsaturated carbonyl moiety. The IR spectrum showed bands corresponding to hydroxyl (3424 cm⁻¹) and α , β unsaturated carbonyl (1663 cm⁻¹) group. The ¹H NMR spectrum (Table 1) exhibited four methyls, three sp^3 methylenes, three sp^3 methines and one olefinic proton. The ¹³C NMR and DEPT spectra of 1 (Table 1) displayed 15 carbon signals consisting of four methyls, three methylenes, three sp³ methines, two sp³ quaternary carbons, two olefinic carbons, and one carbonyl carbon. The proton resonances were assigned to relevant carbon atoms through the HSQC experiment. Analysis of the ¹H, ¹H-COSY spectrum led to the identification of two isolated ¹H spin-systems corresponding to the C-2-C-1-C-6 and C-8-C-9-C-10 subunits (Fig. 2). In addition, the HMBC correlations from H₃-15 to C-2/C-3/C-4, from H-4 to C-

2/C-6, from Ha-1 to C-5, from H₃-14 to C-2/C-6/C-7/C-8, from H₃-12 to C-10/C-11/C-13, from H₃-13 to C-10/C-11/C-12, and from Ha-8 to C-2/C-6/C-7 deduced the planar structure of **1** with a bicyclo[3.1.1]heptane skeleton, which was shown in Fig. 2. Furthermore, the observed ${}^{4}J_{H-2-H-6}$ (5.8 Hz) was consistent with the bridgehead-bridgehead coupling constant of the bicyclo[3.1.1]heptanes,⁴ which confirmed the above deduction.

Fig. 2 Key HMBC and ¹H, ¹H-COSY of compounds 1 and 3.

The partial relative configuration of 1 was established by the NOESY. The NOESY correlations between Hb-1 and Ha-8/Hb-8 indicated the relative configurations of C-2, C-6 and C-7 in 1 were 2S*, 6S*, and 7S*, respectively. The absolute configurations of C-2, C-6 and C-7 were determined by comparison of the experimental and the simulated circular dichroism (CD) spectra. Since the conformations of the flexible side chain in 1 had an insignificant effect on the CD spectrum, the simplified structures (2R, 6R)-5 and (2S, 6S)-5 were used for CD calculations (Fig. 3). The preliminary conformational analyses for a pair of enantiomers ((2R, 6R)-5 and (2S, 6S)-5) were performed with Conflex version 7.0 via the MMFF94S force field. The corresponding minimum geometries were further fully optimized by DFT at the B3P86/6-31G(d) level as implemented in the Gaussian 09 program package. The obtained stable conformers were submitted to CD calculation by TDDFT [B3P86/6-311++G (2d, p)] method.⁵⁻⁸ The result showed that the experimental CD spectrum of 1 and the calculated CD spectrum of (2S, 6S)-5 have similar negative Cotton effects (CEs) in the region of 320-350 nm (Fig. 3), which suggested that the absolute configurations of C-2, C-6 and C-7 in 1 were 2S, 6S, and 7S, respectively. In addition, the absolute configuration of the C-10 of 1 was determined by the in situ dimolybdenum CD method, which was developed by Snatzke and Frelek.9,10 The negative Cotton effect (~ 310 nm), observed in the induced CD spectrum, permitted the assignment of 10R configuration according to the empirical rule proposed by Snatzke (Fig. 4). On the basis of the above deduction, the absolute configuration of 1 was assigned as 2S, 6S, 7S, 10R. Thus, the structure of 1 was established as (1S,5S,6S)-6-((R)-3,4dihydroxy-4-methylpentyl)-4,6-dimethylbicyclo[3.1.1]hept-3-en-2one, named as xylariterpenoid A.

Xylariterpenoid B (2) was isolated as a oil with the same molecular formula as 1. Except for the chemical shifts of protons around C-10 (Ha-8, Hb-8, Hb-9, H-10, and H₃-12, H₃-13, H₃-14), the ¹H and ¹³C NMR data (Table 1) of 2 were similar to those of 1, which disclosed that both the skeleton and the functional groups presented in 2 were same as those of 1, and suggested that 2 was a epimer of 1 different at C-10. The ¹H, ¹H-COSY and HMBC correlations (the details are available in the ESI†) observed fully

2 | J. Name., 2012, 00, 1-3

supported that **2** had the same planar structure as that of **1**. The NOESY correlation between Hb-1 and Ha-8 indicated that the relative configurations of C-2, C-6 and C-7 were also the same as **1**, which confirmed that **2** was a epimer of **1** different at C-10. In the CD spectrum, **2** showed the same Cotton effects as **1** (Fig. 5), indicating that the absolute configurations of C-2, C-6 and C-7 were S. However, the positive Cotton effect at around 310 nm, observed in the *in situ* dimolybdenum CD spectrum, permitted the assignment of 10S configuration for **2** (Fig. 4). On the basis of the above data, the absolute configuration of **2** was assigned as 2S, 6S, 7S, 10S. Thus, the structure of **2** was determined as (1S,5S,6S)-6-((S)-3,4-dihydroxy-4-methylpentyl)-4,6-dimethylbicyclo[3.1.1]hept-3-en-2-one, named as xylariterpenoid B.



Fig. 3 Experimental CD spectrum of 1 in MeOH and calculated CD spectrum of a pair of enantiomers of the corresponding simplified structures [(2R,6R)-5 and (2S,6S)-5].







Fig. 5. CD spectra of 1 and 2 in MeOH.

This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2012

Journal Name

RSC Advances

Xylariterpenoid C (3) was assigned as C15H22O3 (five degrees of unsaturation) on the basis of its HRESIMS at m/z 273.1465 [M+ Na]⁺ (calcd for $C_{15}H_{22}O_3Na$, 273.1467). The IR spectrum showed bands corresponding to hydroxyl (3439 cm⁻¹). The ¹H NMR spectrum (Table 1) exhibited two methyls, five sp³ methylenes, one oxygenated sp³ methine and three olefinic protons. The ¹³C NMR and DEPT spectra of 3 (Table 1) displayed 15 carbon signals consisting of two methyls, five sp³ methylenes, one oxygenated sp³ methine, two sp³ quaternary carbons, four olefinic carbons, and one carbonyl carbon. The proton resonances were assigned to relevant carbon atoms through the HSQC experiment. Interpretation of the ¹H, ¹H-COSY spectrum of **3** identified three isolated proton spin systems, which were C-1-C-2, C-4-C-5, and C-8-C-9-C-10 (Fig. 2). Combined with the analysis of ¹H, ¹H-COSY spectrum, the HMBC correlations from H₃-13 to C-6/C-10/C-11/C-12, from H₃-12 to C-6/C-10/C-11/C-13, from H₂-14 to C-6/C-8, from H-2 to C-4/C-6/C-15, from Hb-4 to C-3/C-6/C-15, from Hb-5 to C-1 and from Ha-5 to C-6/C-7 completed the planar structure of **3** (Fig.1).

The relative configuration of **3** was established by the NOESY data analysis. The orientation of H-10 was the same as those of H₂-5 and H₃-13, which was determined by the NOESY correlations between H-10 and H₃-13/Hb-5. Thus, the relative configuration of **3** was designated as 6R*, 10S*. The absolute configuration of **3** was determined by the modified Mosher method.¹¹ The $\Delta\delta$ values of the (*S*)- and (*R*)-MTPA esters (**3a** and **3b**) indicated the S configuration for C-10 (Fig. 6). On the basis of the above deduction, the absolute configuration 6R, 10S was proposed for **3**. Therefore, the structure of **3** was elucidated as (6R,8S)-8-hydroxy-7,7-dimethyl-11-methylenespiro[5.5]undec-2-ene-3-carboxylic acid, named as xylariterpenoid C.



Fig. 6. $\Delta\delta$ ($\delta_s - \delta_R$) values (in ppm) obtained for (S)- and (R)-MTPA esters (**3a** and **3b**).

Xylariterpenoid D (4) was isolated as a crystal. Its HRESIMS analysis gave a quasi-molecular ion peak at m/z 259.1667 [M + Na]⁺(calcd for C₁₅H₂₄O₂Na, 259.1674), 14 mass units less than **3**. The 1D NMR data of **4** revealed its structural features were similar to those of **3**, except that the resonance for C-15 [δ_C 171.7 (C-15)] was replaced by an oxygenated methylene group [$\delta_{C/H}$ 67.2 (C-15)/3.92 (br s, H₂-15)]. At the same time, the ¹H, ¹H-COSY and HMBC correlations (the details are available in the ESI†) observed fully supported the locations of functional groups. Thus, the planar structure of **4** was established as shown in Fig.1.

The relative configuration of ${\bf 4}$ was established on the basis of the NOESY data. The NOESY correlation between H-10 and Hb-5

indicated that **4** had the same relative configuration with **3**. In the meanwhile, the relative configuration of **4** was confirmed by singlecrystal X-ray crystallographic analysis (Fig. 7). Furthermore, the values of the Flack parameter (-0.1(3)) and the Hooft y parameter 0.04(16) allowed the assignment of the absolute configuration of **4** as 6R, 10S. Therefore, the structure of **4** was determined as (2S,6R)-9-(hydroxymethyl)-1,1-dimethyl-5-methylenespiro[5.5]undec-8-en-2-ol, named as xylariterpenoid D.



Fig. 7. X-ray crystal structure of 4.

Biological activities

All compounds were tested for the cytotoxicities against HL-60, A-549, MCF-7, SMMC-7721, and SW-480 human cancer cell lines using MTT method. However, compounds **1–4** exhibited no significant cytotoxicity, with $IC_{50} > 40 \ \mu M$.

Discussion and conclusion

Sesquiterpenes incorporating the bergamotane skeleton have been reported from fungi (such as *Ampulliferina* sp.,¹² *Ampulliferina*-like sp. No 27,^{13,14} *Aspergillus fumigatus*,^{15,16} *Massarina tunicate*,¹⁷*Penicillum expansum*,¹⁸ and *Podospora decipiens*¹⁹) and plants (such as *Tanacetum vulgare*,²⁰ and *Lepidolaena clavigera*^{21,22}). Compounds **1** and **2** are the first examples of the bergamotane-type sesquiterpenes with carbonyl at C-5 position. In addition, the previously reported chamigrane-type sesquiterpenes are halogenated analogues, which were isolated from red algae.²² Compounds **3** and **4** are new members of the nonhalogenated chamigrane-type sesquiterpenes. Although all new compounds exhibited no significant cytotoxicity, further studies still need to elucidate their promising bioactivity.

Acknowledgements

This work was financially supported by grants from the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (2012ZX09301002-003001006), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81422054, 81373306, 81202441), the Guangdong Natural Science Funds for Distinguished Young Scholar (S2013050014287), Guangdong Province Universities and Colleges Pearl River Scholar Funded Scheme (Hao Gao, 2014), and the high-performance computing platform of Jinan University.

No.	1		2		3		4	
	$\delta_{ m H}$	δ_{C}	$\delta_{ m H}$	$\delta_{ m C}$	$\delta_{ m H}$	δ_{C}	$\delta_{ m H}$	δ_{C}
1	2.07, d (9.1), a	40.8	2.08, d (9.5), a	40.8	2.17, m, a	30.2	2.05, m, a	28.9
	2.80, dt (9.1, 5.3), b		2.80, dt (9.5, 5.5), b		2.31, m, b		2.15, m, b	
2	2.45, br t (5.8)	48.6	2.47, br t (5.7)	48.4	7.09, m	141.5	5.63, br s	122.0
3		170.6		170.6		128.8		136.3
4	5.73, q (1.0)	121.5	5.74, q (1.4)	121.5	1.80, m, a	21.4	1.67, m, a	23.1
					2.31, m, b		1.96, m, b	
5		204.4		204.2	1.48, m, a	25.2	1.50, m, a	25.4
					1.95, m, b		1.87, m, b	
6	2.71, br t (5.8)	55.5	2.71, br t (5.7)	55.8		45.4		45.7
7		57.1		57.1		146.4		146.8
8	1.73, td (12.8, 4.0), a	35.6	1.90, td (12.4, 4.5), a	35.7	2.17, m, a	30.0	2.17, m, a	30.1
	2.31, td (12.8, 4.0), b		2.17, td (12.4, 4.5), b		2.31, m, b		2.33, m, b	
9	1.34, m, a	26.5	1.34, m, a	26.5	1.47, m, a	31.9	1.45, m, a	32.0
	1.48, m, b		1.50, m, b		1.86, m, b		1.82, m, b	
10	3.33, dd (10.3, 1.6)	78.8	3.36, dd (10.4, 1.8)	78.8	3.88, dd (11.9, 4.6)	73.3	3.87, dd (11.9, 4.7)	73.5
11		73.2		73.3		41.9		42.0
12	1.16, s	23.3	1.17, s	23.2	0.76, s	15.1	0.73, s	15.0
13	1.21, s	26.5	1.23, s	26.7	1.02, s	20.4	1.01, s	20.4
14	0.96, s	19.0	0.98, s	19.0	4.44, br s, a	112.0	4.55, br s, a	111.9
					4.92, br s, b		4.92, br s, b	
15	2.00, d (1.0)	23.6	2.01, d (1.4)	23.6		171.7	3.92, br s	67.2

Table1 ¹H (400 MHz) and ¹³C (100 MHz) NMR Spectroscopic Data for xylariterpenoid A-D (1-4) in CDCl₃ (δ in ppm, J in Hz).

Notes and references

^a Institute of Traditional Chinese Medicine and Natural Products, College of Pharmacy, Jinan University, Guangzhou 510632, PR China. E-mail: (H. Gao.) tghao@jnu.edu.cn; (X.-S. Yao) tyaoxs@jnu.edu.cn.

^b Department of Pharmaceutical Engineering, College of Natural Resources and Environment, South China Agricultural University, Guangzhou 510642, PR China. E-mail: (G.-D. Chen) chgdtong@163.com.

^c State Key Laboratory of Mycology, Institute of Microbiology, Chinese

Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, PR China.

^d State Key Laboratory of Phytochemistry and Plant Resources in West China, Kunming Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming 650204, PR China.

§These authors have contributed equally to this work.

‡ Crystal data of xylariterpenoid D (4): Data were collected using a Sapphire CCD with a graphite monochromated Cu K α radiation, $\lambda =$ 1.54184 Å at 173.00 (10) K. Crystal data: $C_{15}H_{24}O_2$, M = 236.34, orthorhombic, space group P212121; unit cell dimensions were determined to be *a* = 6.5259(3) Å, *b* = 13.1402(5)Å, *c* = 15.6863(7) Å, $\alpha = 90.00^{\circ}, \beta = 90.00^{\circ}, \gamma = 90.00^{\circ}, V = 1345.13(10)^{\circ}, Z = 4, Dx = 100^{\circ}$ 1.167 g/cm^3 , F (000) = 520, μ (Cu K_a) = 0.586 mm⁻¹. 10952 reflections were collected until $\theta_{max} = 62.93^{\circ}$, in which independent unique 1950 reflections were observed $[F^2 > 4\sigma (F^2)]$. The final refinement gave R = 0.0363, $R_W = 0.0909$, S = 1.079, Flack = -0.1(3), and Hooft y = 0.04(16). Crystal data of 4 was deposited in the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre (CCDC 1023174). †Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: the general experimental procedure, fungus material, extraction and isolation, spectroscopic data of 1-4, quantum chemical CD calculation of 5, single-crystal X-ray data of 4, the in situ dimolybdenum CD method, preparation of (S)- and (R)-MTPA esters of 3 (3a and 3b), cytotoxicity assay, and 1D and 2D NMR spectra of compounds 1-4. See DOI: 10.1039/b00000x/

- 1 M. Stadler and V. Hellwig, *Recent Res. Devel. Phytochem.*, 2005, 9, 41-93.
- 2 A. J. S. Whalley and R. L. Edwards, Can. J. Bot., 2007, 73, 802-810.
- (a) G. D. Chen, Y. J. Li, H. Gao, Y. Chen, X. X. Li, J. Li, L. D. Guo, 3 Y. Z. Cen and X. S. Yao, Planta Med., 2012, 78, 1683-1689; (b) J. W. He, G. D. Chen, H. Gao, F. Yang, X. X. Li, T. Peng, L. D. Guo and X. S. Yao, Fitoterapia, 2012, 83, 1087-1091; (c) F. Yang, G. D. Chen, H. Gao, X. X. Li, Y. Wu, L. D. Guo and X. S. Yao, J. Asian Nat. Prod. Res., 2012, 14, 1059-1063; (d) G. D. Chen, Y. Chen, H. Gao, L. Q. Shen, Y. Wu, X. X. Li, Y. Li, L. D. Guo, Y. Z. Cen and X. S. Yao, J. Nat. Prod., 2013, 76, 702-709; (e) Q. C. Zheng, G. D. Chen, M. Z. Kong, J. Y. Cui, X. X. Li, Z. Y. Wu, L. D. Guo, Y. Z. Cen, Y. Z. Zheng and H. Gao, Steroids, 2013, 78, 896-901; (f) F. Ye, G. D. Chen, J. W. He, X. X. Li, X. Sun, L. D. Guo, Y. Li and H. Gao, Tetrahedron Lett., 2013, 54, 4551-4554; (g) G. D. Chen, Y. R. Bao, Y. F. Huang, D. Hu, X. X. Li, L. D. Guo, J. Li, X. S. Yao and H. Gao, Fitoterapia, 2014, 92, 252-259; (h) Q. C. Zheng, M. Z. Kong, Q. Zhao, G. D. Chen, H. Y. Tian, X. X. Li, L. D. Guo, Y. Z. Zheng and H. Gao, Fitoterapia, 2014, 93, 126-131; (i) H. Xiong, G. K. Xiao, G. D. Chen, H. R. Chen, D. Hu, X. X. Li, S. W. Zhong, L. D. Guo, X. S. Yao and H. Gao, RSC Advances, 2014, 4, 24295-24299; (J) H. Zhao, G. Q. Wang, X. P. Tong, G. D. Chen, Y. F. Huang, J. Y. Cui, M. Z. Kong, L. D. Guo, Y. Z. Zheng, X. S. Yao and H. Gao. Fitoterapia, 2014, 98, 77-83.
- 4 R. B. Bates and V. P. Thalacker. J. Org. Chem., 1968, **33**, 1730-1732.
- H. J. Zhu, Modern Organic Stereochemistry Science Presses, Beijing, 2009.
- 6 J. Ren, J. X. Jiang, L. B. Li, T. G. Liao, R. R. Tian, X. L. Chen, S. P. Jiang, C. J. Pittman and H. J. Zhu, *Eur. J .Org. Chem.*, 2009, 23, 3987-3991.
- X. N. Li, Y. Zhang, X. H. Cai, T. Feng, Y. P. Liu, Y. Li, J.
 Ren, H. J. Zhu and X. D. Luo. Org. Lett., 2011, 13, 5896-5899.

Page 5 of 6

Journal Name

- S. D. Zhao, L. Shen, D. Q. Luo and H. J. Zhu, *Curr. Org. Chem.*, 2011, 15, 1843-1862.
- 9 L. D. Bari, G. Pescitelli, C. Pratelli, D. Pini and P. Salvadori, J. Org. Chem., 2011, 66, 4819-4825.
- 10 M. Gorecki, E. Jablonska, A. Kruszewska, A. Suszczynska, Z. Urbanczyk-Lipkowska, M. Gerards, J. W. Morzycki, W. J. Szczepek and J. Frelek, J. Org. Chem., 2007, 72, 2906-2916.
- I. Ohtani, T. Kusumi, Y. Kashman and H. Kakisawa, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1991, 113, 4092-4096.
- 12 Y. Kimura, H. Nakajima, T. Hamasaki, T. Matsumoto, Y. Matsuda, A. Tsuneda, *Agric. Biol. Chem.*, 1990, **54**, 813-814.
- 13 Y. Kimura, T. Matsumoto, H. Nakajima, T. Hamasaki, Y. Matsuda, Biosci. Biotechnol. Biochem., 1993, 57, 687-688.
- 14 S. Nozoe, H. Kobayashi, N. Morisaki, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 1976, 17, 4625-4626.
- 15 F. A. Macias, R. M. Varela, A. M. Simonet, H. G. Cutler, S. J. Cutler, R. A. Hill, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 2003, 44, 941-943.
- 16 H. Oh, J. B. Gloer, C. A. Shearer, J. Nat. Prod., 1999, 62, 487-501.
- 17 M. Massias, S. Rebuffat, L. Molho, A. Chiaroni, C. Riche, B. Bodo. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1990, **112**, 8112-8115.
- 18 Y. Che, J. B. Gloer, B. Koster, D. Malloch. J. Nat. Prod., 2002, 65, 916-919.
- 19 A. Chandra, L. N. Misra, R. S. Thakur, *Phytochemistry*, 1987, 26, 3077-3078.
- 20 N. B. Perry, E. J. Burgess, L. M. Foster, P. J. Gerard, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 2003, 44, 1651-1653.
- 21 N. B. Perry, E. J. Burgess, L. M. Foster, P. J. Gerard, M. Toyota, Y. Asakawa, J. Nat. Prod., 2008, 71, 258-261.
- 22 N. F. Sergei, K. S. Larisa, I. K. Anatoly, G. L. Ekaterina, A. S. Valentin, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 2000, 41, 1979-1982.

Graphic abstract

