## **Cembranoids from the Soft Corals** *Sinularia granosa* **and**  *Sinularia querciformis*

Yi Lu,<sup>*a*</sup> Jui-Hsin Su,<sup>b</sup> Chiung-Yao HuANG,<sup>*a*</sup> Yung-Chun LIU,<sup>b</sup> Yao-Haur Kuo,<sup>*c*</sup> Zhi-Hong WEN,<sup>a</sup> Chi-Hsin HSU, *<sup>a</sup>* and Jyh-Horng SHEU\*,*a*,*<sup>d</sup>*

*<sup>a</sup> Department of Marine Biotechnology and Resources, National Sun Yat-sen University; <sup>d</sup> Asia-Pacific Ocean Research Center, National Sun Yat-sen University; Kaohsiung 804, Taiwan: <sup>b</sup> Department of Biological Science and Technology, Meiho Institute of Technology; 23 Pingguang Road, Neipu Hsiang, Pingtung 912, Taiwan: and cNational Research Institute of Chinese Medicine; Taipei 112, Taiwan.*

Received October 19, 2009; accepted January 7, 2010; published online January 28, 2010

**Two new cembranoids, namely granosolides C (1) and D (2), along with one known cembranoid 4, were isolated from the soft coral** *Sinularia granosa***. Chemical investigation of** *Sinularia querciformis* **also afforded one new cembranoid, querciformolide E (3), along with four known cembranoids 4—7. The structures of these compounds were elucidated on the basis of their spectroscopic data. Both 4 and 5 were shown to significantly inhibit the accumulation of the pro-inflammatory inducible nitric oxide synthase protein in lipopolysaccharide-stimulated RAW264.7 macrophage cells.**

**Key words** cembranoid; soft coral; anti-inflammatory activity; *Sinularia granosa*

During the course of our search for bioactive metabolites from marine invertebrates inhabiting Taiwanese waters, several cembrene-type diterpenoids<sup>1—3)</sup> and norcembranoid- $\frac{1}{2}$  based metabolites<sup>4—6)</sup> have been isolated from soft corals of the genus *Sinularia*. We recently reported six new cembranoids querciformolides A—D and granosolides A and B, along with two known metabolites from the soft coral *Sinularia querciformis* and *S. granosa*. 7) In continuation of our search for bioactive metabolites from the above two soft corals, we have further isolated eight metabolites including three new cembranoids, granosolides C and D (**1**, **2**) and querciformolide E (**3**), along with four known metabolites, flexibilisolide A  $(4)$ , <sup>8</sup> flexilarin  $(5)$ , <sup>9</sup> sinulariolide  $(6)$ <sup>10</sup> and sinulaflexiolide E  $(7)$ .<sup>11)</sup> The structures of compounds 1—3 have been established by extensive spectroscopic analysis, including 2D NMR  $(^{1}H - ^{1}H$  correlation spectroscopy (COSY), heteronuclear multiple quantum coherence (HMQC), heteronuclear multiple bond connectivity (HMBC), and nuclear Overhauser effect spectroscopy (NOESY)) experiments. The cytotoxicity of compounds **1**—**7** against human medulloblastoma (Daoy), human breast carcinoma (MCF-7), human cervical epitheloid (HeLa), and human laryngeal (HEp 2) carcinoma cells was studied, and the ability of **1**—**7** to inhibit upregulation of the pro-inflammatory iNOS (inducible nitric oxide synthase) and COX-2 (cyclooxygenase-2) proteins in LPS (lipopolysaccharide)-stimulated RAW264.7 macrophage cells was also evaluated.

Granosolide C (1) exhibited a  $[M+Na]^+$  peak at  $m/z$ 447.2357 (Calcd for  $C_{23}H_{36}O_7$ Na 447.2359) and established the molecular formula  $C_{23}H_{36}O_6$  in the HR-electrospray ionization (ESI)-MS. Thus, **1** has six degrees of unsaturation. The IR spectrum showed the presence of hydroxy (3460  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) and carbonyl (1716 cm<sup>-1</sup>) groups. Furthermore, the similar <sup>1</sup>H- and <sup>13</sup>C-NMR spectroscopic data (Tables 1, 2) of **1** and **4** revealed that both compounds have the similar 14 membered rings. However, an additional methoxy group ( $\delta_c$ ) 52.4, CH<sub>3</sub>;  $\delta_H$  3.76, s) was observed in 1. In addition, the methoxy group positioned at C-16 was confirmed by the HMBC correlation between the methoxy protons ( $\delta_{\rm H}$  3.76)

and the carbonyl carbon ( $\delta_c$  165.9, qC, C-16). In order to confirm the structure, including the stereochemistry of **1**, a base-catalyzed hydrolysis of **4** was performed and the reaction was found to afford **1**. 8) Thus, the relative structure of **1** was established.

Granosolide D (**2**) showed a pseudomolecular ion peak  $[M+Na]^+$  at  $m/z$  431.2406 in the HR-ESI-MS, corresponding to the molecular formula  $C_{23}H_{36}O_6$  and six degrees of unsaturation. The complete assignment of the  ${}^{1}$ H- and  ${}^{13}$ C-NMR spectroscopic data (Tables 1, 2) for compound **2** was achieved by a combination of distortionless enhancement by polarization transfer (DEPT), COSY, HMBC, and HMQC data (Fig. 1). Analysis of the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR spectrum suggested that one of the four methyl groups is due to an acetoxy group resonating at  $\delta_{\rm H}$  2.13 (s). The planar structure of 2 was proposed by the assistance of extensive 2D NMR study (Fig. 1). In order to confirm the structure, including the stereochemistry of **2**, a base-catalyzed hydrolysis of **6** was performed and the reaction was found to afford a known compound flexibilisin B  $(8)$ .<sup>8)</sup> We further observed that acetylation of 8



Table 1. <sup>1</sup> H-NMR Data for Compounds **1**—**3**

	1 <sup>a</sup>	$2^{b}$	3 <sup>b</sup>
1	$2.84 \text{ m}$	2.69 <sub>m</sub>	$2.90 \text{ m}$
2	$2.01$ m; $1.42$ m	$1.84 \text{ m}$ ; $1.56 \text{ m}$	$2.04m$ ; 1.37 m
3	$2.84 \text{ m}$	$2.93$ dd $(8.0, 5.0)$	$2.95$ dd $(10.0, 4.0)$
5	2.61 dd $(14.4, 6.8)^{c}$	$2.02 \text{ m}$	2.48 d $(7.0)$
	2.18 dd (14.4, 8.0)		
6	$5.62$ ddd $(16.0, 8.0, 6.8)$	$1.43 \; \mathrm{m}$	5.50 dt (15.5, 7.0)
7	5.42 d (16.0)	$5.14$ dd $(7.0, 7.0)$	5.46 d (15.5)
9	$1.52 \text{ m}$	$2.15 \text{ m}$ ; 1.78 m	$1.70 \text{ m}$ ; $1.31 \text{ m}$
10	$1.83$ m; $1.64$ m	1.81 <sub>m</sub>	$1.54$ m; $1.48$ m
11	4.95 d $(10.0)$	5.05 d(8.0)	4.86 d $(10.0)$
13	$1.46$ m; $1.43$ m	$1.53 \; \mathrm{m}$	$1.50$ m; $1.34$ m
14	$1.52 \text{ m}$	$1.70 \text{ m}$ ; $1.53 \text{ m}$	$1.81 \text{ m}$ ; $1.50 \text{ m}$
17	$6.28$ s; 5.53 s	$6.29$ s; $5.60$ s	$6.30$ s; 5.54 s
18	1.40 s	$1.31$ s	1.35 s
19	$1.26$ s	1.65 s	$1.28$ s
20	1.14 s	1.14s	$1.15$ s
OMe	3.76 s	3.76 s	3.76 s
OAc	$2.11$ s	$2.13$ s	$2.11$ s

*a*) Spectra recorded at 400 MHz in CDCl<sub>3</sub>. *b*) Spectra recorded at 500 MHz in CDCl<sub>3</sub>. *c*) *J* values (Hz) in parentheses.

Table 2. 13C-NMR Data for Compounds **1**—**3**

	1 <sup>a</sup>	$2^{b}$	3 <sup>b</sup>
$\mathbf{1}$	37.1 $(CH)^{c}$	38.2 (CH)	35.4 (CH)
$\overline{2}$	$31.6$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	$34.2$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	29.3 $(CH_2)$
3	59.8 (CH)	$60.9$ (CH)	58.8 (CH)
$\overline{4}$	61.4(C)	59.7 $(C)$	61.2(C)
5	42.1 $(CH2)$	$37.7$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	$39.7 \, (CH_2)$
6	123.6 (CH)	$23.2$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	$123.3$ (CH)
7	138.3 (CH)	123.8 (CH)	140.1 (CH)
8	73.5(C)	135.4(C)	$73.3 \,(C)$
9	$38.3$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	$33.6$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	$38.0$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )
10	$24.7$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	$26.4$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	$24.4 \, (CH2)$
11	79.3 (CH)	76.3 (CH)	79.8 (CH)
12	74.2 (C)	74.3 $(C)$	74.3 (C)
13	36.1 $(CH_2)$	37.2 $(CH_2)$	34.4 (CH <sub>2</sub> )
14	$26.1$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	$26.2$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	$23.2 \, (CH_2)$
15	141.4 (C)	143.1 (C)	142.1 $(C)$
16	165.9 (C)	167.4(C)	167.4(C)
17	$123.7 \, (CH2)$	124.5 $(CH_2)$	124.6 $(CH2)$
18	$18.7 \, (CH_3)$	$17.0 \, (CH3)$	18.3 $(CH_3)$
19	$28.9$ (CH <sub>3</sub> )	$17.8$ (CH <sub>3</sub> )	$30.2 \, (CH3)$
20	$24.2$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	$25.1$ (CH <sub>2</sub> )	23.3 $(CH_3)$
OMe	52.4 $(CH_3)$	52.0 $(CH_3)$	52.0 $(CH_3)$
OAc	$22.0 \, (CH_3)$	$21.0$ (CH <sub>3</sub> )	$21.1$ (CH <sub>3</sub> )
	170.6(C)	170.7 (C)	172.1(C)

*a*) Spectra recorded at 100 MHz in CDCl<sub>3</sub>. *b*) Spectra recorded at 125 MHz in CDCl3. *c*) Deduced from DEPT.

gave a product which was found to be identical with **2** by comparison of the physical and spectroscopic data. Thus, the relative structure of **2** was determined.

Querciformolide E (**3**) was isolated as a white powder and showed a  $[M+Na]^+$  ion peak in the HR-ESI-MS corresponding to the molecular formula  $C_{23}H_{36}O_7$ , the same as that of 1. Furthermore, it was found that the NMR data of **3** were very similar to those of **1** (Tables 1, 2). By analysis of 2D NMR ( 1 H–<sup>1</sup> H COSY, HMQC, and HMBC) correlations, compound **3** was shown to possess the same molecular framework as that of **1**. The *J* values for both H-6 and H-7 (15.5 Hz) further confirmed the *E*-configuration of the 6,7-double bond. The relative configurations of the six chiral centers at C-1, C-3, C-4, C-8, C-11, and C-12 in **3** were elucidated by detailed



Fig. 1. Key<sup>1</sup>H-<sup>1</sup>H COSY and HMBC Correlations for 2



Fig. 2. Selective NOESY Correlations of **3**

analysis of NOE correlations, as shown in Fig. 2. It was found that H-1 ( $\delta_{\rm H}$  2.90, m) showed an NOE interaction with  $H_3$ -18 ( $\delta$ <sub>H</sub> 1.35, s), and H-6 ( $\delta$ <sub>H</sub> 5.50, dd, J=15.5, 7.0 Hz) showed NOE interactions with all of H-9 $\alpha$  ( $\delta_H$  1.31, m), H<sub>3</sub>-18, and H<sub>3</sub>-19 ( $\delta$  1.28, s), and H-9 $\alpha$  also showed NOE interactions with H<sub>3</sub>-19 and H-11 ( $\delta$ <sub>H</sub> 4.86, d, J=10.0 Hz), while H-7 ( $\delta$ <sub>H</sub> 5.46, d, J=15.5 Hz) was NOE correlated with H-3  $(\delta_H$  2.95, dd, *J*=10.0, 4.0 Hz). Therefore, H-1, H<sub>3</sub>-18, H<sub>3</sub>-19, and H-11 are situated on the  $\alpha$ -face, and in contrast H-3 and the acetoxy group at C-11 should be positioned on the  $\beta$ face. Furthermore, the NOE interactions found between  $H_2$ -20 and both H-13a and H-13b, but not between  $H_3$ -20 and H-11, assigned the  $\alpha$ -orientation of the hydroxy group of C-12. From the above observations and further analysis of other NOE interactions (Fig. 2), the 1*R*\*, 3*S*\*, 4*S*\* and 8*S*\* relative configurations of **3** were established.

In order to explore the biological activities of the isolated compounds, the cytotoxicity and anti-inflammatory activities of these compounds were evaluated. The cytotoxicity of compounds **1**—**7** was tested against the proliferation of a limited panel of cancer cell lines, including Daoy, MCF-7, HeLa and HEp2 cells. The results showed that all of the compounds were not cytotoxic toward the above cancer cells  $(IC_{50}^{\circ}$ 's >20  $\mu$ g/ml). The inhibiting up-regulation of proinflammatory iNOS and COX-2 proteins of LPS-stimulated RAW264.7 macrophage cells was further evaluated using immunoblot analysis. At a concentration of  $10 \mu$ M, both 4 and 5 were found to significantly reduce the levels of iNOS protein to  $19.4 \pm 4.5\%$  and  $13.8 \pm 2.1\%$ , respectively, relative to the control cells stimulated with LPS only. At the same concentration, metabolites **1**—**7** did not inhibit the COX-2 expression by LPS treatment (Fig. 3).

## **Experimental**

Melting points were determined using a Fisher-Johns melting point apparatus and were uncorrected. Optical rotations were measured on a JASCO DIP-1000 digital polarimeter. UV spectra were recorded on a JASCO V650



Fig. 3. Effect of Compounds **1**—**7** on iNOS and COX-2 Proteins Expression of RAW264.7 Macrophage Cells by Immunoblot Analysis

Under the same experimental condition CAPE (caffeic acid phenylethyl ester,  $10 \mu$ M) reduced the levels of the iNOS and COX-2 to  $2.5\pm3.7\%$  and  $67.2\pm13.4\%$ , respectively. \* Significantly different from LPS alone stimulated group  $(p<0.05)$ . *a*) Stimulated with LPS. *b*) Stimulated with LPS in the presence of  $1 - 7$  (10  $\mu$ M).

spectrophotometer. IR spectra were recorded on a JASCO FT/IR-4100 infrared spectrophotometer. ESI-MS were obtained with a Bruker APEX II mass spectrometer. The NMR spectra were recorded on a Varian Unity INOVA 500 FT-NMR at 500 MHz for <sup>1</sup>H and 125 MHz for <sup>13</sup>C or on a Varian 400 MR FT-NMR at 400 MHz for  ${}^{1}$ H and 100 MHz for  ${}^{13}C$ , respectively, in CDCl<sub>3</sub> using TMS as an internal standard. Silica gel 60 (Merck, 230-400 mesh) was used for column chromatography. Precoated silica gel plates (Merck, Kieselgel 60  $F_{254}$ , 0.2 mm) were used for analytical TLC. High-performance liquid chromatography was performed on a Hitachi L-7100 HPLC apparatus with a Merck Hibar Si-60 column (250×21 mm, 7  $\mu$ m).

**Animal Material** *Sinularia querciformis* (specimen no. 20040112-7) and *S. granosa* (specimen no. 20040112-2) were collected by hand by scuba diving off the coast of Pingtung, located on the southernmost tip of Taiwan in January, 2004, at a depth of 5—10 m, and stored in a freezer until extraction. Two voucher samples were deposited at the Department of Marine Biotechnology and Resources, National Sun Yat-sen University.

**Extraction and Separation** The sliced tissues of the soft coral *Sinularia granosa* (0.8 kg, wet wt) were exhaustively extracted with EtOH ( $11\times$ 5). The combined EtOH extract was filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue was partitioned between EtOAc and H2O. The EtOAc extract (8.7 g) was chromatographed over silica gel by column chromatography and eluted with EtOAc in *n*-hexane (0—100%, stepwise) then with MeOH in EtOAc (5—50%, stepwise) to yield 26 fractions. Fraction 17, eluted with *n*-hexane–EtOAc (1:1), was further separated by normal phase HPLC using *n*-hexane–acetone (6:1) to yield 2 (1.8 mg). Fraction 19, eluted with *n*-hexane–EtOAc (1:2), was further purified by Si gel column chromatography using *n*-hexane–acetone  $(6:1)$  to afford  $1(3.0 \text{ mg})$  and  $4(8.9 \text{ mg})$ .

Sliced tissues of the soft coral *Sinularia querciformis* (0.9 kg, wet wt) were exhaustively extracted with EtOH ( $11\times6$ ). The combined EtOH extract was filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue was partitioned between EtOAc and H<sub>2</sub>O, and the EtOAc extract  $(9.4 g)$  subjected to column chromatography on silica gel and eluted with EtOAc in *n*-hexane (0—100%, stepwise) to yield 15 fractions. Fraction 9, eluted with *n*hexane–EtOAc (1 : 1), was further purified over silica gel using *n*hexane–acetone (4 : 1) to afford 3 subfractions. Subfraction 2 was also separated by normal phase HPLC using *n*-hexane–acetone (7 : 1) to afford **6** (32.3 mg) and **7** (22.2 mg). Fraction 10, eluted with *n*-hexane–EtOAc (1 : 2), was purified on a silica gel column using *n*-hexane–acetone (2 : 1) followed by normal phase HPLC, using *n*-hexane–acetone (4 : 1) to afford **4** (11.4 mg) and **5** (5.1 mg). Fraction 11, eluted with *n*-hexane–EtOAc (1 : 3), was rechromatographed on a silica gel column using *n*-hexane–acetone (1 : 1) followed by purification by normal phase HPLC, using *n*-hexane–acetone (2 : 1) to afford **3** (1.8 mg).

Granosolide C (1): Colorless oil;  $[\alpha]_D^{25}$  – 11.8 ( $c$ =0.53, CHCl<sub>3</sub>); IR (neat)  $v_{\text{max}}$  3460, 2968, 2929, 2859, 1716, 1626, 1440, 1375 and 1235 cm<sup>-1</sup>; UV (MeOH)  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$  216 (log  $\varepsilon$ =3.8); <sup>1</sup>H-NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 400 MHz) and <sup>13</sup>C-NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 100 MHz), see Tables 1 and 2; ESI-MS  $m/z$ : 447 [M+Na]<sup>+</sup>; HR-ESI-MS  $m/z$ : 447.2357 [M+Na]<sup>+</sup> (Calcd for C<sub>23</sub>H<sub>32</sub>O<sub>6</sub>Na, 447.2359).

Granosolide D (2): Colorless oil;  $[\alpha]_D^{25} - 101.7$  (*c*=0.18, CHCl<sub>3</sub>); IR (neat)  $V_{\text{max}}$  3440, 2966, 1721, 1376 and 1242 cm<sup>-1</sup>; UV (MeOH)  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$  213 (log  $\varepsilon$ =3.8); <sup>1</sup>H-NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 500 MHz) and <sup>13</sup>C-NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 125 MHz), see Tables 1 and 2; ESI-MS  $m/z$ : 431 [M+Na]<sup>+</sup>; HR-ESI-MS  $m/z$ : 431.2406  $[M+Na]^+$  (Calcd for  $C_{23}H_{36}O_6Na$ , 431.2409).

Querciformolide E (3): White powder; mp 70—72 °C;  $[\alpha]_D^{25}$  -17.1 (*c*= 0.14, CHCl<sub>3</sub>); IR (neat)  $V_{\text{max}}$  3448, 2926, 1738, 1710, 1456, 1375, and 1242 cm<sup>-1</sup>; UV (MeOH)  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$  211 (log  $\varepsilon$ =3.9); <sup>1</sup>H-NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 500 MHz) and <sup>13</sup>C-NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 125 MHz), see Tables 1 and 2; ESI-MS *m*/*z*: 447 [M+Na]<sup>+</sup>;  $\text{Na}$ ]<sup>+</sup>; HR-ESI-MS *m*/*z*: 447.2361 [M+Na]<sup>+</sup> (Calcd for C<sub>23</sub>H<sub>36</sub>O<sub>7</sub>Na, 447.2359).

**Hydrolysis of 4** A solution of **4** (8.0 mg) was dissolved in 10% methanolic NaOH solution (1.0 ml), and the mixture was stirred at  $0^{\circ}$ C for 12 h. The mixture was then neutralized with diluted HCl (0.1 N) and evaporated, and the residue was extracted with CHCl<sub>3</sub> (2.0 ml $\times$ 3). The CHCl<sub>3</sub>-soluble layers were combined, dried over anhydrous  $NaSO<sub>4</sub>$  and evaporated. The residue was subjected to column chromatography over silica gel using EtOAc–*n*hexane (1 : 3) to yield **1** (1.5 mg, 17.3%).

**Hydrolysis of 6** By using the same procedure as for the preparation of **8**, the reaction of **6** (5.0 mg) with 10% methanolic NaOH solution (1 ml) afforded a crude product which was subjected to column chromatography over silica gel using EtOAc–*n*-hexane (1 : 1) to yield **8** (1.8 mg, 32.8%).

**Acetylation of 8** A solution of **8** (1.8 mg) in pyridine (0.1 ml) was mixed with  $Ac<sub>2</sub>O$  (0.1 ml), and the mixture was stirred at room temperature for 12 h. After evaporation of excess reagent, the residue was subjected to column chromatography over Si gel using *n*-hexane–acetone (6 : 1) to yield the diacetyl derivative **2** (1.5 mg, 75.0%).

**Cytotoxicity Testing** Cell lines were purchased from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC). Cytotoxicity assays of compounds **1**—**7** were performed using the MTT [3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide] colorimetric method.12,13)

*In Vitro* **Anti-inflammatory Assay** Macrophage (RAW264.7) cell line was purchased from ATCC. *In vitro* anti-inflammatory activities of compounds **1**—**4** and **6**—**8** were measured by examining the inhibition of LPS (lipopolysaccharide)-stimulated upregulation of iNOS (inducible nitric oxide synthetase) and COX-2 (cyclooxygenase-2) proteins in macrophage cells using Western blot analysis.<sup>7,14,15</sup>)

**Acknowledgment** Financial support was provided by Ministry of Education (96C031702) and National Science Council of Taiwan (NSC 95- 2113-M-110-011-MY3) awarded to J.-H. Sheu.

## **References**

- 1) Su J.-H., Ahmed A. F., Sung P.-J., Chao C.-H., Kuo Y.-H., Sheu J.-H., *J. Nat. Prod.*, **69**, 1134—1139 (2006).
- 2) Ahmed A. F., Wen Z.-H., Su J.-H., Hsieh Y.-T., Wu Y.-C., Hu W.-P., Sheu J.-H., *J. Nat. Prod.*, **71**, 179—185 (2008).
- 3) Ahmed A. F., Tai S.-H., Wen Z.-H., Su J.-H., Wu Y.-C., Hu W.-P., Sheu J.-H., *J. Nat. Prod.*, **71**, 946—951 (2008).
- 4) Tseng Y.-J., Ahmed A. F., Dai C.-F., Chiang M. Y., Sheu J.-H., *Org. Lett.*, **7**, 3813—3816 (2005).
- 5) Ahmed A. F., Shiue R.-T., Wang G.-H., Dai C.-F., Kuo Y.-H., Sheu J.- H., *Tetrahedron*, **59**, 7337—7344 (2003).
- 6) Ahmed A. F., Su J.-H., Kuo Y.-H., Sheu J.-H., *J. Nat. Prod.*, **67**, 2079—2082 (2004).
- 7) Lu Y., Huang C.-Y., Lin Y.-F., Wen Z.-H., Su J.-H., Kuo Y.-H., Chiang M. Y., Sheu J.-H., *J. Nat. Prod.*, **71**, 1754—1759 (2008).
- 8) Su J.-H., Lin Y.-F., Lu Y., Yeh H.-C., Wang W.-H., Fan T.-T., Sheu J.- H., *Chem. Pharm. Bull.*, **57**, 1189—1192 (2009).
- 9) Lin Y.-S., Chen C.-H., Liaw C.-C., Chen Y.-C., Kuo Y.-H., Shen Y.-C., *Tetrahedron*, **65**, 9157—9764 (2009).
- 10) Kashman Y., Bodner M., Loya Y., Benayahu Y., *Israel J. Chem.*, **16**,  $-3(1977)$
- 11) Wen T., Ding Y., Deng Z., Ofwegen L., Proksch P., Lin W., *J. Nat. Prod.*, **71**, 1133—1140 (2008).
- 12) Alley M. C., Scudiero D. A., Monks A., Hursey M. L., Czerwinski M. J., Fine D. L., Abbott B. J., Mayo J. G., Shoemaker R. H., Boyd M. R., *Cancer Res.*, **48**, 589—601 (1988).
- Scudiero D. A., Shoemaker R. H., Paull K. D., Monks A., Tierney S., Nofziger T. H., Currens M. J., Seniff D., Boyd M. R., *Cancer Res.*, **48**, 4827—4833 (1988).
- 14) Jean Y.-H., Chen W.-F., Sung C.-S., Duh C.-Y., Huang S.-Y., Lin C.-S., Tai M.-H., Tzeng S.-F., Wen Z.-H., *Br. J. Pharmacol.*, **158**, 713—725 (2009).
- 15) Jean Y.-H., Chen W.-F., Duh C.-Y., Huang S.-Y., Hsu C.-H., Lin C.-S., Sung C.-S., Chen I.-M., Wen Z.-H., *Eur. J. Pharmacol.*, **578**, 323— 331 (2008).