Norbornane Mimics of Distorted β -D-Glucopyranosides – Inhibitors of β -D-Glucopyranosidases?

by Stephan Buser and Andrea Vasella*

Laboratorium für Organische Chemie, ETH-Zürich, Wolfgang Pauli-Strasse 10, CH-8093 Zürich

The racemic gluco-configured norbornanes 4 and 16 were prepared and tested as inhibitors of β -glucosidases. The known alcohol 5 was deprotected to provide the triol 6. Silylation (\rightarrow 7), monobenzoylation (\rightarrow 8/9), and oxidation provided the regioisomeric ketones 10 and 11. Reduction of 10 gave the desired endo-alcohol 13, albeit in low yield, while reduction of the isomeric ketone 11 provided mostly the altro-configured endo-alcohol 12. The alcohol 13 was desilylated to 14. Debenzoylation to 15 followed by hydrogenolytic deprotection gave the amino triol 4 that was reductively aminated to the benzylamine 16. The amino triols 4 and 16 proved weak inhibitors of the β -glucosidase from Caldocellum sac*charolyticum* (4: $IC_{50} = 5.6$ mm; 16: $IC_{50} = 3.3$ mm) and from sweet almonds (16: $IC_{50} = 5.5$ mm). A comparison of 4 with the *manno*-configured norbornane 3 shows that 3 is a better inhibitor of snail β -mannosidase than 4 is of β -glucosidases, in keeping with earlier results suggesting that these β -glycosidases enforce a different conformational itinerary.

Introduction. – β -Glycosidases impose a conformational change on their substrates to comply with the stereoelectronic control of glycoside cleavage $[1-4]$. Several conformations allow the required coplanar arrangement of a non-bonding, doubly occupied orbital of the ring O-atom and the σ^* orbital of the scissile bond [5], and it was considered likely that all of them are enforced by different glycosidases [6]. Stable mimics of the individual acceptable conformers may act as selective inhibitors and contribute in assessing the conformational itinerary enforced by a specific glycosidase. It was claimed that inhibitors mimicking such distorted conformers should be inherently more selective than mimics of an intermediate oxocarbenium cation and be more sensitive to small geometric changes [7] [8]. In keeping with these considerations, the manno-configured isoquinuclidine 1 [9] mimicking a $^{1,4}B/^{1}S_3$ conformation inhibits snail β -mannosidase rather strongly $(K_i=1 \mu M)$ at pH 4.5), while the *gluco*-configured diastereoisomer 2 is almost inactive against β -glucosidases, and the (racemic) manno-configured norbornane 3 is only a modest β -mannosidase inhibitor ($K_i \approx 50 \,\mu$ M; extrapolated to the Dmanno-enantiomer). The difference between the strength of the inhibition by 1 and 3 can be traced back to geometric differences. A superposition¹) of the isoquinuclidine 1 with C(1) to C(5) and O-C(5) of a β -D-GlcNAc substrate²) in the ^{1,4}B-conformation (root-mean-square deviation (r.m.s.) 0.09 \AA) reveals that the atomic distance between

© 2006 Verlag Helvetica Chimica Acta AG, Zürich

¹) Calculation and superposition were carried out using Macromodel V. 6 [10]. The structures were minimized with the PRCG algorithm using the MM3* force field.

The structure was taken from the X-ray crystal structure of the chitinase B from Serratia marcescens complexed with this substrate [11].

the N-atom of 1 (which is to interact with the catalytic acid residue of the glycosidase) and the glycosidic O-atom of the substrate amounts to 0.6 Å , while the corresponding distance for the norbornane 3 and the substrate in a ^{1,4}B-conformation (r.m.s. 0.19 \AA) is 1.3 Å. Minimization of the distance between the N-atom of 3 and the glycosidic O-atom of the substrate by varying the conformation of the substrate from $^{1,4}B$ towards $^{4}H_{3}$ shows that at the point of the least distance $(d=0.14 \text{ Å})$, the substrate possesses a $^{4}H_{3}$ conformation with a dihedral angle C(5)O–C(1)–C(2)–C(3) of 0.8°. This suggests that the isoquinuclidine 1 and the norbornane 3 could mimic a different conformation of the reactive substrate, although they both comprise a biased cyclohexane boat mimicking the tetrahydropyran ring of the reactive conformer of the glycoside. Could the different location and orientation of the N-atom of 3 qualify the *gluco*-configured norbornane 4 as inhibitor of β -glucosidases, in contradistinction to the isoquinuclidine 2? To answer this question, we decided to prepare the *gluco*-norbornane 4 and its N -benzylated analogue 16.

Synthesis. – Deprotection of the known acetal 5 [8] in EtSH/EtOH provided the triol 6 (88%; Scheme) that was silylated with 'BuPh₂SiCl [12] to yield 83% of the diol 7. Treatment of 7 with benzoyl chloride (BzCl) afforded the regioisomeric monobenzoates $8/9$ 82:18 (91%) that could not be separated on account of a facile Bz-group migration. The mixture $8/9$ was, therefore, oxidised by *Dess–Martin's* periodinane [13]. The resulting ketones were readily separated by chromatography to afford 10 (71%) and 11 (13%). Reduction of 10 with bulky reducing agents afforded only a mixture $8/9$, while reduction with NaBH₄ in MeOH provided the desired *endo*-alcohol 13 (29%) together with 8/9 82 : 18 (65%). This somewhat disappointing result can be explained by the steric hindrance of an exo-approach by the [(benzyloxy)carbonyl]amino group, perhaps forming a non-productive complex with the reducing agent, as proposed by Martinez et al. [14]. The role played by the bridgehead substituent is corroborated by the reduction of the ketone 11 which provided mostly (49%) the *endo*alcohol 12 resulting form the expected exo-attack of the reducing agent, besides 29% of 8/9 82 : 18. The still rather high amount of the undesired mixture 8/9 suggests that the vicinal benzoyloxy group also contributes to shielding of the exo-side. Desilylation of 13 with NH₄F [15] provided the diol 14 (89%), which was debenzoylated with MeONa to afford the triol 15 (98%). Hydrogenolysis of 15 provided the amino triol 4 (93%). Reductamination of 4 with PhCHO and NaBH4 yielded 75% of the benzylamine 16.

The ketone 10 shows a strong NOE (12.3%) between $H-C(3)$ and $H-C(5)$ (Fig.). The unambiguous assignment of the ¹H-NMR signals is based on a DQFCOSY and a

a) EtSH, H_2SO_4 , EtOH; 88%. b) 'BuPh₂SiCl, 1H-imidazole, DMF; 83%. c) BzCl, 4-(dimethylamino)pyridine (DMAP), toluene; $8/9$ 82:18 (91%). d) Dess-Martin's periodinane, CH₂Cl₂; 10 (71%) and 11 (13%). e) NaBH4, MeOH; 12 (49%) and 8/9 82 : 18 (29%). f) NaBH4, MeOH; 13 (29%) and 8/9 82 : 18 (65%). g) NH4F, MeOH; 89%. h) MeONa, MeOH; 98%. i) Pd/C, H2, EtOH; 93%. j) PhCHO, MgSO4, MeOH; then NaBH4, MeOH; 75% from 15.

HSQC spectrum. Due to signal overlap, the interpretation of the NOEs in 11 was not reliable. The *endo*-alcohol 13 shows a NOE of 8.8% between $H-C(3)$ and $H-C(5)$, whereas the interpretation of the NOEs of 12 was again hampered by signal overlap. However, a vicinal coupling of ca. 3.3 Hz between $H-C(3)$ and $H-C(4)$ evidences the *exo*-orientation of H-C(3) of 12 (*cf.* [16]).

Figure. NOEs Observed between $H-C(3)$ and $H-C(5)$ of 10 and 13, and J(3,4) of 12

Inhibition Studies. – The results of the inhibition of *Caldocellum saccharolyticum* β glucosidase and sweet almonds β -glucosidases by the racemic norbornanes 4 and 16 are summarized in the Table. Neither 4 nor 16 are inhibitors, as shown by the lowest IC_{50} value of 3.3 mm (inhibition of the C. saccharolyticum β -glucosidase by 16) at pH 6.8 where a significant fraction of the inhibitor is unprotonated³). A comparison of the inhibition constants with those obtained for snail β -mannosidase has to account for the different pH of the assays. The pK_{HA} value suggests that, at pH 4.5, only one in 10000 molecules of 3 ($pK_{HA} = 8.6$ [8]) is not protonated. Snail β -mannosidase is inhibited by 3 5.5 times more strongly at pH 5.5 than at pH 4.5 [17]. Thus, an inhibitor geometrically corresponding to 3, but with a hypothetical pK_{HA} of 4.5 should inhibit *ca*. 55000 times more strongly than 3, and display an inhibition constant of $50-100$ nm. Analogous considerations for 4 (hypothetical analogue possessing a pK_{HA} of 6.8) suggest an inhibition constant of $ca. 5 \mu M⁴$.

Table. Inhibition of β -Glucosidases by the Norbornanes 4 and 16 at pH 6.8 and the Indicated Temperature

Compound	β -Glucosidase from <i>Caldocellum saccharolyticum</i> β -Glucosidase from sweet almonds at 55 $^{\circ}$	at 37 $^{\circ}$
16 (pK_{HA} 7.9) $IC_{50} = 3.3$ mm	4 (pK_{HA} 8.4) $IC_{50} = 5.6$ mm	no inhibition $IC_{50} = 5.5$ mm

These considerations suggest that the geometry of the *manno*-configured norbornane 3 is closer to that of the reactive β -D-mannopyranoside conformer than the geometry of the *gluco*-configured norbornane 4 is to the reactive β -D-glucopyranoside conformer. This conclusion is consistent with earlier results of inhibition studies of the manno- and gluco-analogue isoquinuclidines 1 and 2 and supports the hypothesis of a different reactive conformation for these glycosidases (cf. [5] [18] [19]).

We thank the Swiss National Foundation and F. Hoffmann La Roche, Basel, for generous support, M. Schneider and P. Kälin for the p $K_{H\Lambda}$ determination, and Dr. B. Bernet for doublechecking the manuscript.

Experimental Part

General. See [8]. The β -glucosidases and 4-nitrophenyl β -D-glucopyranoside were purchased from Sigma, and used without any further purification.

Benzyl N-[(1RS,2RS,3SR,4SR,5SR)-2,3-Dihydroxy-5-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[2.2.1]hept-1-yl]carbamate (6). A soln. of 5 (1.4 g, 4.03 mmol), conc. H_2SO_4 (0.05 ml, 0.94 mmol) and EtSH (12.5 g, 202 mmol) in EtOH (30 ml) was heated to reflux, stirred for 5 d, treated with EtSH (10 g, 160 mmol), stirred for 1 d, treated with EtSH (8.4 ml, 135 mmol), stirred for 1 d, cooled to 23°, treated with NaHCO₃ (80 mg, 0.95 mmol), and evaporated. FC (AcOEt/MeOH 20:1 \rightarrow 10:1) gave 6 (1.09 g, 88%). Colourless powder. R_f (AcOEt/MeOH 10:1) 0.48. M.p. 129°. IR (KBr): 3600-2500s (br.), 1723s, 1587m, 1499s, 1466s. ¹H-NMR (400 MHz, CD₃OD): 1.34 (br. dd, J=12.0, 3.5, H_{exo}-C(6)); 1.56 (br. d, J=10.0, H-C(7)); 1.61 – 1.68 (m, H-C(5)); 1.68 – 1.76 (m, H_{endo}-C(6), H'-C(7)); 2.02 (br. s, H-C(4)); 1.72 (br. d, $J=7.2$, CH₂-C(5)); 3.78 (br. s, H-C(2), H-C(3)); 5.04 (s, PhCH₂); 7.26-7.53 (m, 5 arom. H). ¹³C-NMR (100 MHz, CD₃OD; assignments based on a HSQC spectrum): 32.68 (t, C(6)); 34.52 (t, C(7)); 40.80 (d, C(5)); 44.07 (d, C(4)); 63.68 (t, CH₂-C(5)); 66.08 (t, PhCH₂); 67.19 (s, C(1)); 74.10, 75.09

³) We have already reported a marked dependence of the inhibition on the pH in the assay [8], corroborating the hypothesis that the inhibitor binds to the glycosidase in the unprotonated form.

 $K_i = IC_{50}/2.$

(2d, C(2), C(3)); 128.82 (d); 128.96 (4d); 138.43 (s); 158.09 (s, C=O). ESI-MS: 308.1 (35, [M+H]⁺), 330.1 $(100, [M+Na]^+)$. Anal. calc. for C₁₆H₂₁NO₅ (307.35): C 62.53, H 6.89, N 4.56; found: C 62.28, H 6.77, N 4.41.

Benzyl N-[(1RS,2RS,3SR,4SR,5SR)-5-{[(tert-Butyl)diphenylsilyloxy]methyl}-2,3-dihydroxybicy $clo[2.2.1]hept-1-yl] carbamate (7). A soln. of 6 (1.06 g, 3.45 mmol), 1H-imidazole (350 mg, 5.1 mmol)$ and 'BuPh₂SiCl (1.04 g, 3.78 mmol) in DMF (30 ml) was stirred at 23 $^{\circ}$ for 3 d, treated with 'BuPh₂SiCl (53 mg, 0.19 mmol), stirred for 1 d, treated with 'BuPh₂SiCl (53 mg, 0.19 mmol), stirred for 3 d, cooled to 0°, treated with H₂O (30 ml), and extracted with Et₂O (2 \times 30 ml, 2 \times 15 ml). The combined org. layers were dried (MgSO₄) and evaporated. FC (cyclohexane/AcOEt $2:1 \rightarrow 1:1$) gave 7 (1.57 g, 83%). Colourless powder. R_f (cyclohexane/AcOEt 1:1) 0.47. M.p. 120°. IR (CHCl₃): 3505w, 3423w, 2933m, 1959w, 1898w, 1722s, 1607w, 1587w, 1508s. ¹H-NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃; assignments based on a DQFCOSY and a HSQC spectrum): 1.04 (s, t-Bu); 1.43 (dd, J = 12.5, 5.8, H_{exo}-C(6)); 1.49 – 1.53 (m, H_{endo}-C(6)); 1.52 (br. d, $J=10.3$, H $-C(7)$); 1.68–1.74 (m, H $-C(5)$); 1.86 (br. d, $J\approx$ 9.6, H $-C(7)$); 2.20 (br. s, H $C(4)$); 3.04 (br. s, OH); 3.42-3.52 (m, CH₂-C(5)); 3.68 (br. s, OH); 3.77, 3.82 (2 br. s, H-C(2), H- $C(3)$); 5.06 (s, PhCH₂); 5.28 (s, NH); 7.31 – 7.64 (m, 15 arom. H). ¹³C-NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃; assigments based on a HSQC spectrum): 19.24 (s, Me₃C); 26.89 (q, Me₃C); 30.37 (t, C(7)); 33.32 (t, C(6)); 39.02 (d, $C(5)$; 42.97 (d, $C(4)$); 63.19 (s, $C(1)$); 66.24 (t, CH₂ $-C(5)$); 66.76 (t, PhCH₂); 73.90, 74.15 (2d, C(2), C(3)); 127.69 (4d); 128.04 (2d); 128.19 (d); 128.56 (2d); 129.67 (2d); 133.64 (2s); 135.57 (4d); 136.27 (s); 156.44 (s, C=O). ESI-MS: 546.0 (6.4, $[M+H]^+$), 567.9 (100, $[M+Na]^+$). Anal. calc. for C32H39NO5Si (545.75): C 70.43, H 7.20, N 2.57; found: C 70.38, H 7.18, N 2.58.

(1RS,2RS,3SR,4SR,5SR)-1-{[(Benzyloxy)carbonyl]amino}-5-{[(tert-butyl)diphenylsilyloxy]methyl}- 2-hydroxybicyclo[2.2.1]hept-3-yl Benzoate (8) and (1RS,2RS,3SR,4SR,5SR)-1-{[(Benzyloxy)carbonyl] amino}-5-{[(tert-butyl)diphenylsilyloxy]methyl}-3-hydroxybicyclo[2.2.1]hept-2-yl Benzoate (9). A soln. of 7 (500 mg, 0.92 mmol) and Et₃N (234 mg, 2.3 mmol) in toluene (8.4 ml) was treated with BzCl (135 mg, 0.96 mmol), stirred at 20 $^{\circ}$ for 3 d, treated with DMAP (20 mg, 0.16 mmol), stirred for 2 d, and evaporated. FC (hexane/AcOEt 3:1) yielded $8/9$ 82:18 (540 mg, 91%). Colourless foam. R_f (cyclohexane/ AcOEt 2 : 1) 0.55. IR (CHCl3): 3432w, 3015s, 1964w, 1899w, 1817w, 1718s, 1602w, 1585w, 1507m, 1552w, 1428w, 1278s. ¹H-NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 8/9 82:18): data of 8: 1.07 (s, t-Bu); 1.52 (br. t, $J \approx 12$, H_{exo}- $C(6)$); 1.62–1.78 (m, H_{endo}-C(6)); 1.80–1.98 (m, H-C(5), 2 H-C(7)); 2.43 (br. s, H-C(4)); 2.53 (br. d, $J=6.2$, exchange with CD₃OD, OH); 3.56 (d, $J=5.9$, CH₂-C(5)); 4.02 (br. dd, $J=6.2$, addn. of $CD_3OD \rightarrow br. d, J=5.0, H-C(2))$; 4.96 (br. d, $J=5.3, H-C(3)$); 5.06 (s, PhCH₂); 5.39 (br. s, exchange with CD₃OD, NH); 7.32–8.34 (m, 20 arom. H); data of 9: 2.29 (br. s, H-C(4)); 4.17 (br. t, $J=4.9$, addn. of $CD_3OD \to m$, H $-C(3)$; 5.00–5.09 (m, PhCH₂, H $-C(2)$); 5.23 (br. s, exchange with CD₃OD, NH). ¹³C-NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): data of 8/9 82 : 18: 19.39 (s, Me₃C); 27.03 (q, Me₃C); 32.51 (t, C(6), $C(7)$); 66.55 (t, PhCH₂); 77.75 (d, C(3)); 127.64 (5d); 127.94 (2d); 128.01 (d); 128.37 (2d); 128.43 (2d); 129.62 (4d); 129.68 (d); 135.49 (3d); 129.70, 133.16, 133.54, 136.38 (4s); 155.74 (s, N-C=O); 166.43 $(s, O-C=O)$; data of 8: 39.35, 40.48 (2d, C(4), C(5)); 62.99 $(s, C(1))$; 66.10 $(t, CH_2-C(5))$; 75.06 (d, C(2)); data of 9: 39.60 (d, C(4) or C(5)); 62.27 (s, C(1)); 75.39 (d, C(3)). HR-ESI-MS: 672.2751 $([M+Na]^+, C_{39}H_{43}NNaO_6Si^+$; calc. 672.2757). Anal. calc. for $C_{39}H_{43}NO_6Si$ (649.86): C 72.08, H 6.67, N 2.16; found: C 72.08, H 6.73, N 2.41.

Oxidation of 8/9. A soln. of 8/9 82:18 (150 mg, 0.231 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (7.5 ml) was cooled to 0°, treated with 15% Dess–Martin periodinane in CH_2Cl_2 (0.6 ml) during 50 min, stirred for 120 min, and treated with 10% aq. Na₂S₂O₃ soln. (10 ml) and NaHCO₃ (250 mg). The org. layers were separated, and the aq. layer was extracted with CH_2Cl_2 (4 × 10 ml). The combined org. layers were dried (Na_2SO_4) and evaporated. FC (hexane/AcOEt 5:1) afforded 10 (106 mg, 71%) and 11 (21 mg, 13%).

(1RS,3SR,4SR,5SR)-1-{[(Benzyloxy)carbonyl]amino}-5-{[(tert-butyl)diphenylsilyloxy]methyl}-2 oxobicyclo[2.2.1]hept-3-yl Benzoate (10). R_f (cyclohexane/AcOEt 3:1) 0.61. IR (CHCl₃): 3409w, 3012m, 1769m, 1724s, 1602w, 1512m, 1452w, 1428w, 1264s, 1112s. ¹H-NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃; assignments based on a DQFCOSY spectrum): 1.06 (s, t-Bu); 1.54–1.58 (m, irrad. at 2.16 \rightarrow NOE of 6.8%, H_{exo}-C(6)); 2.03 – 2.09 (m, H_{endo} – C(6), H – C(7)); 2.12 – 2.20 (m, irrad. at 5.16 \rightarrow NOE of 8.5%, irrad. at 2.73 \rightarrow NOE of 5.8%, H-C(5)); 2.62 (br. d, J=10.9, H'-C(7)); 2.73 (br. s, irrad. at 5.16 \rightarrow NOE of 3.2%, irrad. at 2.16 \rightarrow NOE of 2.0%, H-C(4)); 3.69–3.71 (*m*, irrad. at 2.73 \rightarrow NOE of 1.7%, irrad. at 2.16 \rightarrow NOE of 3.9%, CH₂-C(5)); 5.08 (s, PhCH₂); 5.16 (br. s, irrad. at 2.73 \rightarrow NOE of 4.0%, irrad. at $2.16 \rightarrow NOE$ of 12.3%, H-C(3)); 5.49 (br. s, NH); 7.30–8.20 (20 arom. H). ¹³C-NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃): 19.23 (s, Me₃C); 26.88 (q, Me₃C); 34.36, 39.30 (2t, C(6), C(7)); 39.36, 41.17 (2d, C(4), C(5)); 65.60 (t, CH₂- $C(5)$; 66.70 (s, $C(1)$; 67.00 (t, PhCH₂); 75.32 (d, $C(3)$); 127.80 (4d); 128.06 (2d); 128.23 (d); 128.46 (2d); 128.57 (2d); 129.79 (d); 129.82 (d); 129.92 (2d); 133.47 (d); 135.57 (4d); 129.24 (s); 133.40 (2s); 136.17 (s); 154.61 (s, N-C=O); 165.36 (s, O-C=O); 207.91 (s, C=O). ESI-MS: 669.9 (100, $[M+Na]^+$). Anal. calc. for C39H41NO6Si (647.84): C 72.31, H 6.38, N 2.16; found: C 72.26, H 6.35, N 2.18.

(1RS,2RS,4SR,5SR)-1-{[(Benzyloxy)carbonyl]amino}-5-{[(tert-butyl)diphenylsilyloxy]methyl}-3 oxobicyclo[2.2.1]hept-2-yl Benzoate (11). R_f (cyclohexane/AcOEt 3:1) 0.59. IR (CHCl₃): 3440w, 3012w, 1767m, 1728s, 1602w, 1510m, 1452w, 1418w, 1266s, 1110s. ¹H-NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃; assignments based on a DQFCOSY spectrum): 1.06 (s, t-Bu); 1.55 – 1.59 (m, H_{exo} – C(6)); 1.80 – 1.89 (m, H – C(7)); 2.08 – 2.18 $(m, H-C(5)), H'-C(7))$; 2.31 – 2.43 $(m, H_{endo}-C(6))$; 2.81 (br. s, H-C(4)); 3.56 – 3.76 $(m, CH_2-C(5))$; 4.92 (d, J =11.9), 5.03 (d, J=12.1) (PhCH₂); 5.19–5.26 (br. s, NH); 5.25 (d, J=2.9, H-C(2)); 7.34 – 8.06 (m, 20 arom. H). ¹³C-NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃): 19.22 (s, Me₃C); 26.86 (q, Me₃C); 37.46 (t, $C(6)$, $C(7)$); 49.73 (d, $C(4)$, $C(5)$); 58.50 (s, $C(1)$); 65.39 (t, $CH₂-C(5)$); 66.59 (t, PhCH₂); 75.15 (d, $C(2)$); 127.81 (4d); 127.82 (4d); 128.48 (4d); 129.86 (d); 130.05 (d); 133.20 (d); 135.57 (5d); 128.93 (s); 133.60 (2s); 135.64 (s); 155.00 (s, N-C=O); 165.77 (s, O-C=O); 207.57 (s, C=O). ESI-MS: 670.0 $(100, [M+Na]^+)$. Anal. calc. for C₃₉H₄₁NO₆Si (647.84): C 72.31, H 6.38, N 2.16; found: C 72.18, H 6.56, N 2.05.

(1RS,2SR,3SR,4SR,5SR)-1-{[(Benzyloxy)carbonyl]amino}-6-{[(tert-butyl)diphenylsilyloxy]methyl}- 2-hydroxybicyclo[2.2.1]hept-3-yl Benzoate (13). A soln. of 10 (165 mg, 0.255 mmol) in MeOH (15 ml) was treated with NaBH₄ (20 mg, 0.53 mmol), stirred vigorously for 15 min at 23°, treated with 20% NaH₂PO₄ soln. (5 ml) and CHCl₃ (5 ml), stirred for 2 h, and treated with CHCl₃ (5 ml) and H₂O (5 ml). The layers were separated, and the aq. layer was extracted with CHCl₃ (3×5 ml). The combined org. layers were dried (MgSO₄) and evaporated. FC (hexane/AcOEt 5:1) gave 13 (48 mg, 29%) and a 82:18 mixture of $8/9$ (108 mg, 65%). Colourless foam. R_f (cyclohexane/AcOEt 2:1) 0.60. IR (CHCl₃): 3435w, 3011w, 1964w, 1899w, 1824w, 1714s, 1602w, 1512s, 1452w, 1428w, 1276s, 1112s. ¹H-NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃; assignments based on DQFCOSY and HSQC spectra): $1.03-1.06$ (m, $H_{exo}-C(6)$); 1.06 (s, t-Bu); 1.77 (br. d, J = 10.3, H–C(7)); 1.98 (br. d, J = 10.2, irrad. at 4.20 \rightarrow NOE of 4.0%, H'–C(7)); 2.10 (br. t, $J=6.4$, irrad. at $4.60 \rightarrow \text{NOE}$ of 8.8%, H-C(5)); 2.40 (br. s, irrad. at $4.60 \rightarrow \text{NOE}$ of 4.3% , H-C(4)); 2.45 (br. t, $J=10.1$, H_{endo}-C(6)); 3.58 (d, $J=6.3$, irrad. at 2.10 \rightarrow NOE of 2.6%, CH₂-C(5)); 4.20 (br. s, H-C(2)); 4.31 (br. s, exchange with CD₃OD, OH); 4.60 (br. s, irrad. at 2.10 \rightarrow NOE of 11.3%, H-C(3)); 5.03, 5.09 (2d, J=12.2, PhCH₂); 5.21 (br. s, exchange with CD₃OD, NH); 7.33-8.04 (m, 20) arom. H). ¹³C-NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃; assignments based on a HSQC spectrum): 19.27 (s, $Me₃C$); 26.91 (q, Me₃C); 28.95 (t, C(6)); 36.55 (t, C(7)); 39.89 (d, C(5)); 41.72 (d, C(4)); 64.42 (s, C(1)); 66.12 $(t, CH₂ - C(5))$; 66.98 (t, PhCH₂); 81.84 (d, C(2)); 85.13 (d, C(3)); 127.72 (4d); 128.14 (d); 128.29 (d); 128.37 (3d); 128.60 (d); 129.66 (3d); 129.69 (d); 129.71 (d); 133.07 (d); 135.61 (4d); 130.18 (s); 133.63 (2s); 136.05 (s); 156.68 (s, N-C=O); 166.38 (s, O-C=O). HR-ESI-MS: 672.2745 $([M+Na]^+$ $C_{39}H_{43}NNaO_6Si^+$; calc. 672.2757). Anal. calc. for $C_{39}H_{43}NO_6Si$ (649.86): C 72.08, H 6.67, N 2.16; found: C 72.22, H 6.83, N 2.29.

(1RS,2RS,3RS,4SR,5SR)-1-{[(Benzyloxy)carbonyl]amino}-5-{[(tert-butyl)diphenylsilyloxy]methyl}- 3-hydroxybicyclo[2.2.1]hept-2-yl Benzoate (12). A soln. of 11 (69 mg, 0.11 mmol) in MeOH (5.5 ml) was treated with NaBH₄ (8 mg, 0.21 mmol), stirred for 15 min at 23° , treated with 20% aq. NaH₂PO₄ soln. (5 ml) and CHCl₃ (5 ml), and stirred for 20 min. The layers were separated, and the aq. layer extracted with CHCl₃ (3×5 ml). The combined org. layers were dried (MgSO₄) and evaporated. FC (hexane/AcOEt 5:1) gave 12 (34 mg, 49%) and a 82:18 mixture of 8/9 (29 mg, 29%). Colourless foam. R_f (cyclohexane/AcOEt 2 : 1) 0.61. IR (CHCl3): 3446w, 3011m, 1967w, 1899w, 1815w, 1712s, 1602w, 1587w, 1506m, 1452m, 1427m, 1320m, 1275s, 1110s. ¹H-NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃; assignments based on a DQFCOSY spectrum): 1.00 (s, t-Bu); 1.55 – 1.65 (m, irrad. at 3.91 \rightarrow NOE of 3.1%, H_{exo}-C(6), H- $C(7)$); 1.82–1.89 (*m*, H'–C(7)); 2.01 (br. *t*, $J \approx 10.5$, irrad. at 2.60 \rightarrow NOE of 4.0%, H_{endo}–C(6)); 2.29 (br. $d, J \approx 3$, irrad. at 3.91 \rightarrow NOE of 7.3%, irrad. at 2.60 \rightarrow NOE of 2.3%, H-C(4)); 2.60 (br. t, $J \approx 7$, irrad. at $2.29 \rightarrow \text{NOE}$ of 4.4%, H-C(5)); 3.11 (br. s, exchange with CD₃OD, OH); 3.55 (d, J=6.9, irrad. at 2.29 \rightarrow NOE of 1.2%, irrad. at 2.60 \rightarrow NOE of 2.6%, CH₂-C(5)); 3.91 (br. s, irrad. at 2.29 \rightarrow NOE of 7.1%, H-C(3)); 4.43 (br. d, H-C(2)); 4.96 (br. d, $J \approx 12.5$), 5.03 (d, $J=11.8$) (PhCH₂); 5.13

(br. s, exchanges with CD₃OD, NH); 7.30 – 7.92 (m, 20 arom. H). ¹³C-NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃): 19.30 (s, $Me₃C$); 26.92 (q, $Me₃C$); 35.00, 35.41 (2t, C(6), C(7)); 40.75 (d, C(4), C(5)); 62.98 (s, C(1)); 66.54 (t, PhCH₂, CH₂-C(5)); 80.32 (d, C(3)); 84.67 (d, C(2)); 127.67 (4d); 128.01 (3d); 128.52 (4d); 129.63 (s and 4d); 133.39 (d); 133.72 (2s); 135.65 (s and 4d); 167.55 (s, O-C=O). HR-ESI-MS: 672.2761 $([M+Na]^+, C_{39}H_{43}NNaO_6Si^+$; calc. 672.2757).

(1RS,2SR,3SR,4SR,5SR)-1-{[(Benzyloxy)carbonyl]amino}-2-hydroxy-5-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo- $[2.2.1]$ hept-3-yl Benzoate (14). A soln. of 13 (64 mg, 0.099 mmol) and NH₄F (91 mg, 2.5 mmol) in MeOH (20 ml) was stirred for 2.5 h at 50 $^{\circ}$, treated with NH₄F (100 mg, 2.7 mmol), stirred for 20 h, and evaporated. The residue was triturated with AcOEt and filtered, and the filtrate evaporated. FC (hexane/ AcOEt 1:2) yielded 14 (36 mg, 89%). Colourless foam. R_f (cyclohexane/AcOEt 1:2) 0.29. IR $(CHCl₃)$: 3435w, 1709s. 1602w, 1513m, 1300s. ¹H-NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): 1.04 (dd, J = 12.1, 5.0, H_{exo}-C(6)); 1.81 (d, J=10.0, H-C(7)); 1.90 (br. s, exchange with D₂O, OH); 2.00 (d, J=9.7, H'-C(7)); 2.03–2.08 (m, H–C(5)); 2.38 (br. s, H–C(4)); 2.50 (br. t, $J \approx 10$, H_{endo}–C(6)); 3.47–3.60 (m, CH₂– $C(6)$; 4.22 (br. s, H–C(2)); 4.47 (br. s, exchange with D₂O, OH); 4.60 (br. s, H–C(2)); 5.02, 5.03 (2d, $J=12.2$, PhCH₂); 5.43 (br. s, exchange with D₂O, NH); 7.28 – 8.02 (m, 10 arom. H). ¹³C-NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): 29.08 (t, C(6)); 36.41 (t, C(7)); 40.12 (d, C(5)); 41.53 (d, C(4)); 64.31 (s, C(1)); 65.27 (t, $CH_2-C(5)$; 66.96 (t, PhCH₂); 81.66 (d, C(2)); 84.95 (d, C(3)); 128.00 (2d); 128.16 (d); 128.27 (2d); 128.47 (2d); 129.50 (2d); 129.81 (s); 133.04 (s); 135.89 (d); 156.59 (s, N-C=O); 166.30 (s, O-C=O). $HR-ESI-MS: 434.1580 ([M+Na]⁺, C₂₃H₂₅NNaO₆⁺; calc. 434.1580). Anal. calc. for C₂₃H₂₅NO₆ (411.45):$ C 67.14, H 6.12, N 3.40; found: C 67.00, H 6.23, N 3.42.

Benzyl N-[(1RS,2SR,3SR,4SR,5SR)-2,3-Dihydroxy-5-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[2.2.1]hept-1-yl]carbamate (15) . A soln. of 14 $(34 \text{ mg}, 0.083 \text{ mmol})$ in MeOH (5 ml) was treated with MeONa $(5.5 \text{ mg},$ 0.10 mmol), stirred for 24 h at 23° , treated with MeONa (3 mg, 0.06 mmol), stirred for 10 h, treated with MeONa (3 mg, 0.06 mmol), treated with AcOH (12.5 mg, 0.21 mmol), and evaporated. FC (AcOEt/MeOH 10:0.5 \rightarrow 10:1) gave 15 (25 mg, 98%). Colourless powder. R_f (AcOEt/MeOH 10:1) 0.48. IR (CH₂Cl₂): 3603m, 3427m, 2927m, 1701s, 1605m, 1514s, 1454w, 1358w. ¹H-NMR (300 MHz, CD₃-OD): 0.94 (dd, J = 12.1, 4.4, H_{exo}-C(6)); 1.66 (td, J = 10.6, 2.2, H-C(7)); 1.97 – 2.03 (m, H-C(4), H-C(5). $H' - C(7)$); 2.21 (br. t, $J \approx 10$, $H_{endo} - C(6)$); 3.40 (d, $J = 7.5$, $CH_2 - C(5)$); 3.46 (br. s, $H - C(2)$); 3.93 (br. s, H-C(3)); 4.87 (s, PhCH₂); 7.23–7.34 (m, 5 arom. H). ¹³C-NMR (75 MHz, CD₃OD): 29.43 (t, C(6)); 35.56 (t, C(7)); 40.98 (d, C(5)); 44.90 (d, C(4)); 64.93 (s, C(1)); 65.51 (t, CH₂-C(5)); 67.00 (t, PhCH₂); 82.31 (d, C(2)); 84.10 (d, C(3)); 128.36 (2d); 128.52 (d); 128.99 (2d); 137.80 (s); 158.21 (s, C=O). HR-ESI-MS: 330.1308 ($[M + Na]^+$, C₁₆H₂₁NNaO₅⁺; calc. 330.1317). Anal. calc. for C₁₆H₂₁NO₅ (307.35): C 62.53, H 6.89, N 4.56; found: C 62.37, H 6.78, N 4.60.

(1RS,2SR,3SR,4SR,5SR)-1-Amino-5-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[2.2.1]heptane-2,3-diol (4). A suspension of 15 (44 mg, 0.143 mmol) and 10% Pd/C (5 mg) in EtOH (5 ml) was hydrogenated for 20 h at 21° under H₂, filtered, and evaporated. Ion-exchange chromatography (*Amberlite CG-120*; H₂O/NH₃ $1:0 \rightarrow 95:5$) gave 4 (23 mg, 93%). Colourless solid. pK_{HA} 8.40. IR (KBr): 3600–2400s (br.), 1598m, 1449s, 1332s, 1207m, 1040s. ¹H-NMR (300 MHz, D₂O): 1.01 (br. *dd*, *J* \approx 12.4, 4.0, H_{exo}-C(6)); 1.63 (br. d, $J=10.4$, $H-C(7)$); 1.71 – 1.82 (m, $H-C(4)$, $H-C(5)$); 2.00 – 2.06 (m, $H_{endo} - C(6)$, $H'-C(7)$); 3.36 (d, $J=7.4$, CH₂-C(5)); 3.46 (br. s, H-C(2)); 3.79 (br. s, H-C(3)). ¹³C-NMR (75 MHz, D₂O): 26.79 $(C(6))$; 33.15 $(C(7))$; 39.02 $(C(5))$; 43.58 $C(4)$); 62.53 $(C(1))$; 63.62 $(CH_2-C(5))$; 80.44, 80.96 $(C(2),$ C(3)). ESI-MS: 174.1 $([M+H]^+); 196.0 ([M+Na]^+).$

(1RS,2SR,3SR,4SR,5SR)-1-(Benzylamino)-5-(hydroxymethyl)bicyclo[2.2.1]heptane-2,3-diol (16). A suspension of $15(36 \text{ mg}, 0.117 \text{ mmol})$ and 10% Pd/C (5 mg) in EtOH (5 ml) was hydrogenated for 2.5 h at 21 \degree under H₂, filtered, and evaporated. A soln. of the residue in MeOH (2 ml) was treated with PhCHO (19 mg, 0.18 mmol) and MgSO₄ (100 mg), stirred for 22 h at 21 $^{\circ}$, and filtered (washing with 1 ml of MeOH). The filtrate was treated with NaBH4 (25 mg, 0.661 mmol), stirred for 20 h, acidified with 1.25M HCl in MeOH until pH 2, and evaporated. Ion-exchange chromatography (Amberlite CG-120, H_2O/NH_3 1:0 \rightarrow 95:5) gave 16 (23 mg, 75%). Colourless solid. pK_{HA} 7.90. IR (KBr): 3600–2400s (br.), 1952w, 1877w, 1811w, 1774w, 1637w, 1605w, 1453s, 1332m, 1202m, 1030s. ¹ H-NMR (300 MHz, D_2O): 0.97 (ddd, J = 12.3, 4.6, 2.0, H_{exo}-C(6)); 1.46 (br. d, J = 10.6), 1.68 (br. d, J = 10.3) (2 H-C(7)); 1.77 – 1.93 (m, H – C(5), H_{endo} – C(6)); 1.96 (br. s, H – C(4)); 3.44 (d, J = 7.4, CH₂ – C(5)); 3.54 (br. s, H –

 $C(2)$); 3.74 (s, PhCH₂); 3.89 (br. s, H-C(3)). ¹³C-NMR (300 MHz, D₂O): 27.63 (C(6)); 33.06 (C(7)); 39.43 $(C(5))$; 43.01 $(C(4))$; 47.94 (PhCH₂); 64.17 $(C(1))$; 67.68 $(CH₂-C(5))$; 81.10, 81.78 $(C(2), C(3))$; 127.04; 128.23 (2 C); 128.46 (2 C); 139.37. HR-ESI-MS: 264.1596 $([M + H]^+, C_{15}H_{22}NO_3^+$; calc. 264.1600).

Determination of the Inhibition Constants. Inhibition constants were determined in the same way as reported in [7] at pH 6.8 using a 0.06M KH₂PO₄/K₂HPO₄ buffer and 4-nitrophenyl β -D-glucopyranoside as the substrate.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Deslongchamps, Pure Appl. Chem. 1975, 43, 351; P. Deslongchamps, 'Stereoelectronic Effects in Organic Chemistry', Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1983; S. G. Li, A. J. Kirby, P. Deslongchamps, Tetrahedron Lett. 1993, 34, 7757.
- [2] A. J. Kirby, R. J. Martin, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1978, 803; A. J. Kirby, R. J. Martin, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1979, 1079; A. J. Kirby, 'The Anomeric Effect and Related Stereoelectronic Effects at Oxygen', in 'Reactivity and Structure: Concepts in Organic Chemistry', Eds. K. Hafner, C. W. Rees, B. M. Trost, J.-M. Lehn, P. von Ragué Schleyer, R. Zahradnik, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983, Vol. 15.
- [3] C. S. Rye, S. G. Withers, Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol. 2000, 4, 573.
- [4] A. Vasella, G. J. Davies, M. Böhm, Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol. 2002, 6, 619.
- [5] F. Vincent, T. M. Gloster, J. Macdonald, C. Morland, R. V. Stick, F. M. V. Dias, J. A. M. Prates, C. Fontes, H. J. Gilbert, G. J. Davies, ChemBioChem 2004, 5, 1596.
- [6] A. Varrot, J. Macdonald, R. V. Stick, G. Pell, H. J. Gilbert, G. J. Davies, Chem. Commun. 2003, 946.
- [7] M. Böhm, E. Lorthiois, M. Meyyappan, A. Vasella, *Helv. Chim. Acta* 2003, 86, 3818.
- [8] S. Buser, A. Vasella, Helv. Chim. Acta 2005, 88, 3151.
- [9] M. Böhm, A. Vasella, *Helv. Chim. Acta* 2004, 87, 2566.
- [10] F. Mohamadi, N. G. J. Richards, W. C. Guida, R. Liskamp, M. Lipton, C. Caufield, G. Chang, T. Hendrickson, W. C. Still, J. Comput. Chem. 1990, 11, 440.
- [11] D. M. F. van Aalten, D. Komander, B. Synstad, S. Gåseidnes, M. G. Peter, V. G. H. Eijsink, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 2001, 98, 8979.
- [12] S. Hanessian, P. Lavallée, Can. J. Chem. 1975, 53, 2975.
- [13] D. B. Dess, J. C. Martin, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1991, 113, 7277.
- [14] A. G. Martinez, E. T. Vilar, A. G. Fraile, S. D. Cerero, P. M. Ruiz, Tetrahedron: Asymmetry 1998, 9, 1737.
- [15] W. J. Zhang, M. J. Robins, Tetrahedron Lett. 1992, 33, 1177.
- [16] L. M. Jackman, S. Sternhell, 'Applications on NMR Spectroscopy in Organic Chemistry', Pergamon Press, 1969.
- [17] M. Böhm, E. Lorthiois, M. Meyyappan, A. Vasella, *Helv. Chim. Acta* 2003, 86, 3787.
- [18] J. K. Lee, A. D. Bain, P. J. Berti, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 3769.
- [19] Y. Blériot, S. K. Vadivel, A. J. Herrera, I. R. Greig, A. J. Kirby, P. Sinaÿ, Tetrahedron 2004, 60, 6813.

Received November 25, 2005