Stereoselectivity *of* **Prochiral Thioalkyl Groups in the Enzymatic Oxidation of Thioacetals by Fungi**

Barbara J. Auret,^a Derek R. Boyd,*a E. Sally Cassidy,^a Fiona Turley,a Alex F. Drake,^b and **Stephen F. Mason*b**

^a Department of Chemistry, The Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast, BT9 5AG, N. Ireland, U.K. **^b***Department of Chemistry, King's College, London, WC2R 2LS, U.K.*

Enzymatic oxidation of 2-substituted 1,3-dithians in cultures of a *Helminthosporium* species shows a stereopreference for equatorial oxidation and for (1S)-monosulphoxide products.

Each sulphur atom of 1,3-dithian **(1a)** and its 2-alkyl- **(1b,c)** and **2,2'-dialkyl-derivatives (ld,e)** bears both a pro-R and a pro-S lone pair of electrons, and the lone pair with **a** given prochirality has an equatorial orientation at one sulphur atom but an axial orientation at the other. Previous studies $1-3$ have shown that the mono-oxygenase enzymes produced by fungi distinguish between a $pro-R$ and a $pro-S$ lone pair of electrons of a sulphur atom in the oxidation of **(la)** and its analogues without a prochiral 2-carbon atom. **A** concomitant axialequatorial enzymatic discrimination is reported here at pro-R and pro-S thioalkyl groups in an extension of the studies to 2-prochiral- 1,3-dithians **(lb,c,d).**

The thioacetals **(lb-d)** were added individually as substrates to cultures of a Helminthosporium species (NRRL **4671)** and the trans-monosulphoxide **(2)** and cis-monosulphoxide **(3)** products were separated and purified by column chromatography on silica gel, followed by preparative h.p.l.c.⁴ (yields $35-65\%$ overall from the substrate). In each case, the trans-monosulphoxide **(2b,c,d)** is found to be the major product $(82-100\%)$ (Table 1), showing the steric preference of the fungal mono-oxygenase enzyme(s) for the equatorial lone pairs of the corresponding 1,3-dithian **(lb,c,d).** The achiral oxidant NaIO, similarly differentiates between the diastereotopic lone pairs of the sulphur atoms in **(lb,c,d),** affording the corresponding trans-monosulphoxide $(2b, c, d)$ as the major product $(90-100\%)$.

In order to evaluate the stereopreference of the enzymatic oxidation for the pro-R or pro-S thioalkyl groups, the $(+)$ - $(1 R, 2 R)$ -trans-monosulphoxide **(2b)** (enantiomer) $([\alpha]_D$ + 62°) and the $(+)$ - $(1R,2S)$ -cis-isomer (3b) (enantiomer)

 $([\alpha]_D + 201^{\circ})$ were synthesised by the 2-methylation of $(+)$ -(1R)-1,3-dithian 1-oxide⁵ (2a) \equiv (3a) (enantiomer) $([\alpha]_{\text{D}} + 227^{\circ}, \text{EtOH})$. A comparison of the $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}$ rotations and the c.d. spectra of the synthetic $(+)$ - $(1R)$ -monosulphoxides with the corresponding values for the products of the enzymatic oxidation of **(lb)** in the cultures of the Helminthosporium species shows that the major metabolites are the $(-)$ - $(1S,2S)$ -

Table 1. Relative yield and *[a]~* (EtOH) of the monosulphoxide metabolites **(2b,c,d)** and **(3b,c)** and the enantiomeric excess (e.e.) and configuration of the preferred enantiomer assigned from comparisons of the c.d. spectra.

^a Estimated by duplicate n.m.r. analyses of the product mixture (250 MHz, CDCl₃). ^b Obtained from product samples after isolation by
preparative h.p.l.c. ^c Obtained by n.m.r. analysis (ref. 6) and duplicated by [isomers in cyclohexane solution; comparison values obtained from synthesised enantiomers are, for the $(-)$ - $(1S)$ -isomers, $\Delta \epsilon_{233}$ –
 $\Delta \epsilon_{292}$ + 13.5 **(2a)** = **(3a)**, and $\Delta \epsilon_{232}$ – 25.6, $\Delta \epsilon_{215}$ + 21.8 **(2e)**

enantiomer **(2b)** and the $(-)$ - $(1S, 2R)$ -enantiomer **(3b)**, produced in an enantiomeric excess of 27% and 36% , respectively (Table **1).** The same values for the enantiomeric excess of **(2b)** and **(3b)** were estimated by the n.m.r. method of Pirkle and coworkers,⁶ using solutions in $(-)$ -phenyl- or 1- $(+)$ -9anthryl-2,2,2-trifluoroethanol, diluted with CDCl₃, to distinguish the ${}^{1}H$ n.m.r. signals of the 2-alkyl groups in each enantiomer. The optical yields of the major metabolites **(2c)** and **(3c)** from **(lc)** were estimated by the n.m.r. method, and the respective $(1S,2S)$ and $(1S,2R)$ configurations were assigned by comparisons of the c.d. spectra (Table 1).

Only the trans-monosulphoxide *(2d)* in racemic form was isolated from the enzymatic oxidation of the thioacetal **(Id),** the most sterically crowded of the 1,3-dithians examined. In contrast, the less crowded thioacetal **(lc),** in which the bulk of the 2-t-butyl group is not buttressed by another aikyl group at the 2-carbon atom, as in **(Id),** gives the largest enantiomeric excess *(72%)* of the series investigated in the minor *cis*monosulphoxide product **(3c)** from the enzymatic oxidation $(Table 1)$. The lack of chiral discrimination in the enzymatic oxidation of **(Id)** does not arise from 2,2'-dialkyl substitution, since the thioacetal **(le)** in cultures of the *Helminfhosporium* species was oxidised to $(2e) \equiv (3e)$, with a 35% enantiomeric excess of the $(-)$ -(1*S*)-isomer, comparable to the optical yields of the $(-)$ - $(1S)$ -enantiomers of $(2b)$ and $(3b)$ from the corresponding oxidation of the thioacetal **(lb)** (Table **1).**

The partial recovery of racemic monosulphoxides after their incubation with growing cultures of the Helminthosporium species eliminates the possibility of optical activity resulting from selective removal of one enantiomer during metabolism.

Overall, the product analyses suggest that the enzymatic oxidation of the thioacetals **(lb,c)** has a stereopreference **of** ca. 27-35 % for equatorial oxidation of the *pro-S* thioalkyl group or *ca.* $36-72\%$ for axial oxidation of the *pro-R* thioalkyl group. These results (and methods of stereochemical assignment) are of particular relevance in view of earlier work on other thioacetal sulphoxides which have also been produced under enzymatic control. $3,7$

We thank Dr R. Hamilton for synthetic assistance and the DEN1 for a postgraduate award (to **E.S.C.).**

Received, *10th December 1982; Corn. 1425*

References

- 1 B. J. Auret, D. R. Boyd, H. B. Henbest, C. G. Watson, K. Balenovic, **V.** Polak, **V.** Johanides, and **S.** Divjak, *Phytochemistry,* 1974, **13,** 65.
- 2 M. N. Akhtar, D. R. Boyd, J. D. Neill, and D. **M.** Jerina, *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans.* 1, 1980, 1693.
- 3 B. J. Auret, D. R. Boyd, F. Breen, and R. M. E. Greene, *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Truns.* **I,** 1981, 930.
- 4 F. A. Carey, 0. D. Dailey, Jr., 0. Hernandez, and J. R. Tucker, *J. Org. Chem.* 1976, **41,** 3975.
- 5 R. F. Bryan, F. A. Carey, 0. D. Dailey, Jr., R. J. Maher, and R. **W.** Miller, *J. Org. Chem.,* 1978, **43,** 90.
- 6 W. H. Pirkle, **S.** D. Beare, and R. L. Muntz, *Tetrahedron Lett.,* 1974, 2295.
- 7 R. Gmelin, H.-H. Luxa, K. Roth, and G. Hofle, *Phytochemistry,* 1976, **15,** 1717; M. Poje, 0. Nota, and K. Balenovic, *Tetrahedron,* 1980, *36,* 1897; **H.** C. J. Ottenheijm, R. M. J. Liskamp, R. Helquist, J. W. Lauher, and M. **S.** Shekhani, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.,* 1981, **103,** 1720.