

A Configuration Dependence of the Longitudinal Relaxation Times of Carbohydrate Derivatives

By L. D. HALL* and CAROLINE PRESTON

(Department of Chemistry, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver 8, British Columbia, Canada)

Summary A Fourier Transform method has been used to measure the longitudinal relaxation times of the anomeric protons of eight anomeric pairs of pyranose derivatives; in every instance the axial proton has a shorter relaxation time than its equatorial counterpart.

With the advent^{1,2} of highly selective techniques for the determination of nuclear relaxation times, it is now possible to investigate the diagnostic potential of this class of n.m.r. parameters. We now report a configuration dependence of the longitudinal relaxation times (T_1 -values) of the anomeric protons of pyranose carbohydrates. The data listed in the Table were obtained *via* a F.T. method, using solutions that had been degassed by repeated freeze-pump-thaw cycles. With the exception of the two D-mannose derivatives (3) and (5), the assignments of the anomeric protons were trivial.

From the data listed for D-glucose (1), D-galactose (2), and 2-acetamido-2-deoxy-D-glucose (4) it is evident that an axially oriented proton has a shorter T_1 -relaxation time than its equatorially disposed counterpart. It is tempting to ascribe this differential to the different degrees of dipole-dipole relaxation that H_{1a} and H_{1e} have with H_{3a} and H_{5a} by virtue of their different spatial separations. That the T_1 differential exists with substituents other than hydroxy at C_1 , is clearly demonstrated by the data given for α and β methyl D-glucopyranoside (6) and α and β methyl D-xylopyranoside (7); the latter data show that the dependence also applies for pentopyranoses. It is also obvious from the data for the pair of 1,2,3,4,6-penta-O-acetyl-D-glucopyranoses (8), that esterification of the other hydroxy substituents leaves the T_1 -differential essentially unchanged, although the absolute values of T_1 are reduced by *ca.* 40%.

If this differential is general, and there seems to be no reason why it should not be, then it provides the basis of a new method for assigning configuration, which might be applicable when other n.m.r. methods are ambiguous. For example, distinction between the two anomeric proton resonances of D-mannose (3) and 2-acetamido-2-deoxy-D-mannopyranose (5) cannot be made on the basis of their coupling with H_2 . Yet a sizable differential exists in their

TABLE. Longitudinal relaxation times^a (T_1 -values, in sec) for the anomeric protons of pyranose carbohydrates^b

Compound		H_1 (Axial)	H_1 (Equatorial)
D-Glucose (1) ^{c,d}	α		6.4
	β	3.4	
D-Galactose (2) ^{c,e}	α		7.0
	β	3.9	
D-Mannose (3) ^c	α		6.3
	β	1.8	
2-Acetamido-2-deoxy-D-glucopyranose (4) ^{c,d} ..	α		4.7
	β	2.3	
2-Acetamido-2-deoxy-D-mannopyranose (5) ^c	α		4.9
	β	1.1	
Methyl D-glucopyranoside (6) ^{c,f}	α		2.4
	β	1.6	
Methyl D-xylopyranoside (7) ^{c,g}	α		3.8
	β	2.2	
1,2,3,4,6-penta-O-acetyl-D-glucopyranose (8) ^h ..	α		3.7
	β	2.0	

^a Measured with a Varian XL-100 instrument fitted with a Varian 620L computer programmed for a 16K F.T., at a probe temperature of *ca.* 42° unless otherwise stated. ^b *Ca.* 10% w/v. ^c In 99.96% deuterium oxide. ^d Sample temperature, 46°. ^e Sample temperature, 49°. ^f T_1 for OMe: $\alpha = 2.5$, $\beta = 3.1$ s. ^g T_1 for OMe: $\alpha = 2.6$, $\beta = 2.7$ s. ^h In deuteriobenzene.

T_1 values that, in light of the other data discussed above, leads one to assign the lower field doublet to the α -anomer in both instances. An additional dependence, partially exemplified by derivatives (1, 3) and (4, 5) involves vicinally related protons; their interaction is larger when they have a *gauche* orientation.

It also seems probable that substituents other than the protons directly attached to the ring carbon atoms will show a configurational dependence of their T_1 -values, although the differential is likely to be smaller in magnitude. This is so for the methoxy resonances of (6) and (7).

(Received, 24th October 1972; Com. 1809.)

¹ R. Freeman and S. Wittekoek, *J. Mag. Res.*, 1969, **1**, 238.

² R. R. Ernst and W. A. Anderson, *Rev. Sci. Instr.*, 1966, **37**, 93; R. L. Vold, J. S. Waugh, M. P. Klein, and D. E. Phelps, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1968, **48**, 33831; R. Freeman and H. D. W. Hill, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1970, **53**, 4103.