A New Taraxastane-Type Triterpene from Vitex trifolia var. simplicifolia

by Ming-Yu Huang, Lin-Jing Zhong, Jie-Ming Xie, Fei Wang, and Yong-Hong Zhang*

School of Pharmacy, Fujian Medical University, Fuzhou 350004, P. R. China (phone/fax: þ 86-591-22862016; e-mail: zhangyh@mail.fjmu.edu.cn)

3-Oxotaraxer-14-en-30-al (1), a new taraxastane-type triterpene, together with 14 known compounds, taraxerone (2), 3-epiursolic acid (3), $2\alpha,3\beta$ -dihydroxyurs-12-en-28-oic acid (4), lupeol (5), betulinic acid (6), casticin (7), artemetin (8), luteolin (9), 4-hydroxybenzoic acid (10), docosanoic acid (11), tetracosanoic acid (12), cerotic acid (13), β -sitosterol (14), and β -daucosterol (15), was isolated from the leaves and twigs of Vitex trifolia var. simplicifolia. Compounds 2-6 were found for the first time in this plant. Their structures were established by spectroscopic analysis, including 2D-NMR techniques. Cytotoxic activities of compounds 3 , and $5 - 10$ were tested on the three cancer cell lines, PANC-1, K562, and BxPC-3. Results revealed that 7 exhibited cytotoxicity against PANC-1, K562, and BxPC-3, with IC_{50} values of 4.67, 0.72, and 4.01 μ g/ml, respectively, whereas 8 was inactive against these cancer cell lines. The structure-activity relationship of compound 7 and 8 indicated that the 3'-OH group in polymethoxyflavonoids is essential for antitumor activity.

Introduction. - Vitex trifolia L. var. simplicifolia CHAM. (Verbenaceae) is distributed in tropical and subtropical areas along the sea in many countries, including southern China, and its fruits are used as a Traditional Chinese Medicine to treat headaches, colds, migraine, and eye pain [1]. Vitex trifolia var. simplicifolia mainly contains diterpenes, flavonoids, and phenolic compounds $[2-5]$. The present investigation on this plant led to the isolation of a novel taraxastane-type triterpene, 3 oxotaraxer-14-en-30-al (1) , as well as of 14 known compounds (*Fig. 1*), taraxerone (2) [6], 3-epiursolic acid (3) [7], $2\alpha,3\beta$ -dihydroxyurs-12-en-28-oic acid (4) [8] [9], lupeol (5) [10], betulinic acid (6) [11], casticin (7) [12], artemetin (8) [12], luteolin (9) [13], 4 hydroxybenzoic acid (10) [14], docosanoic acid (11) [15], tetracosanoic acid (12) [16], cerotic acid (13) [16], β -sitosterol (14), and β -daucosterol (15). Compounds 2–6 were found for the first time in this plant. This article mainly deals with the isolation and structure elucidation of compound 1, the cytotoxicities of compounds 3, and $5 - 10$, as well as with the discussion of the structure–activity relationship of compounds **7**–9.

Results and Discussion. – Compound 1 was obtained as a white amorphous powder. It gave rise to a positive *Liebermann–Burchard* coloration test, indicating a triterpenoid structure. Its molecular formula was determined as $C_{30}H_{46}O_2$ from its HR-ESI-MS (m/z 461.3384 ($[M + Na]$ ⁺)), which was confirmed by ¹³C-NMR and DEPT analysis, corresponding to eight degrees of unsaturation. The IR specturm of 1 exhibited CHO (1710, 2660 cm⁻¹), and C=O (1700 cm⁻¹) absorptions. The ¹H- and $13C-NMR$ data of 1 (Table 1) indicated a pentacyclic triterpenoid, assignments being confirmed with the help of 2D-NMR (HMBC, HSQC, and NOESY) experiments (Fig. 2).

^{© 2013} Verlag Helvetica Chimica Acta AG, Zürich

Fig. 1. Compounds 1-15, isolated from Vitex trifolia var. simplicifolia

The ¹ H-NMR spectrum exhibited the characteristic signals of triterpenoids in the higher field, *i.e.*, seven *singlets* for Me groups $(\delta(H) 0.82, 0.92, 1.04, 1.06, 1.08, 1.10,$ and 1.16). In addition, a signal of one H-atom on a C=C bond at $\delta(H)$ 5.56 (dd, J = 8.0, 2.8, H–C(15)), together with typical ¹³C-NMR resonances at δ (C) 157.6 and 117.2, suggested the compound 1 was a taraxer-14-ene derivative [17]. Its ¹H-NMR spectrum showed an aldehyde *singlet* (δ (H) 9.50), while its mass spectrum showed a low-intensity M^+ peak at m/z 438, and a base peak at m/z 409 ([$M-\text{CHO}]^+$). Comparison of the ¹Hand ¹³C-NMR spectra of compound 1 with 2×6 , suggests that compound 1 is different from 2, with which it shares the same basic skeleton, in the presence of an aldehyde group at C(20). The ¹³C-NMR spectrum of compound 1 showed a *singlet* at δ 217.6 ppm, assigned to a C(3). A signal at δ 206.9 was attributed to an aldehydic C-atom at C(30). The remaining 28 signals in the 13C-NMR and DEPT spectra indicated the

Position $\delta(H)$		$\delta(C)$	Position $\delta(H)$		$\delta(C)$
1	$1.30-1.32$ (<i>m</i>), $1.74-1.77$ (<i>m</i>)	38.3 (t)	16	$1.58 - 1.60$ (<i>m</i>), $1.78 - 1.84$ (<i>m</i>)	37.5(t)
2	$2.22 - 2.24$ (<i>m</i>), $2.27 - 2.30$ (<i>m</i>)	34.1 (t)	17		38.8 (s)
3		217.6(s)	18	$0.86 - 0.89$ (<i>m</i>)	48.6 (d)
4		47.5 (s)	19	$1.33 - 1.35$ (<i>m</i>), $1.96 - 2.02$ (<i>m</i>)	40.6 (t)
5	$1.23 - 1.25$ (<i>m</i>)	55.7 (d)	20		48.7(s)
6	$0.96 - 0.98$ (<i>m</i>), $1.48 - 1.50$ (<i>m</i>)	19.9 (t)	21	$1.27 - 1.29$ (<i>m</i>), $1.55 - 1.60$ (<i>m</i>)	33.0 (t)
7	$1.19 - 1.22$ (<i>m</i>), $1.86 - 1.88$ (<i>m</i>)	36.6 (t)	22	$0.93 - 0.95$ (<i>m</i>), $1.26 - 1.28$ (<i>m</i>)	35.1 (t)
8		37.7(s)	23	1.06(s)	26.0(q)
9	$1.43 - 1.55$ (<i>m</i>)	48.6 (d)	24	1.08(s)	21.3 (q)
10		35.7(s)	25	1.04(s)	14.8 (q)
11	$0.99-1.00 (m)$, 1.40 $-1.42 (m)$	17.4 (t)	26	1.10(s)	29.8 (q)
12	$1.52 - 1.54$ (<i>m</i>)	33.5 (t)	27	0.92(s)	25.5 (q)
13		37.6(s)	28	0.82(s)	30.1 (q)
14		157.6(s)	29	1.16 (s)	21.4 (q)
15	5.56 (dd, $J = 8.0, 2.8$)	117.2 (d)	30	9.50(s)	206.9(d)

Table 1. ^{*IH*} and ¹³C-NMR (600 and 150 MHz, resp.) Data of Compound 1. Recorded in CDCl₃; δ in ppm, J in Hz.

presence of eight quaternary, five tertiary (CH) , ten secondary (CH_2) , and eight primary (CH₃) C-atoms. The HMBCs (*Fig. 2*) revealed that compound 1 exhibited three-bond couplings between $H-C(2)$ and $C(3)$, and between $H-C(23)$ and $C(3)$, confirming the structure of ring A. The H-atoms of the angular $Me(29)$ group coupled with the aldehydic C-atom, locating CHO at C(20). The linkage of the CHO group to C(20) was evident from the HMBC from the downfield-shifted aldehydic H-atom at signal δ 9.50 to the quaternary C-atom signal at δ 48.7 (C(20)). The mass spectrum exhibited the molecular-ion peak at m/z 438, with other significant peaks at 409 ([$M CHO$ ⁺), 300, and 285, representing a fragment resulting from the cleavage of ring D, followed by loss of H, 218, 205, and 204. Based on these findings and comparisons with spectral data in the literature [6], the structure of compound 1 was elucidated as 3 oxotaraxer-14-en-30-al.

Compounds 3 and $5 - 10$ were tested for their *in vitro* cytotoxicities against human pancreatic cancer cells PANC-1, human leukemia cells K562, and pancreatic carcinoma cells BxPC-3, using 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyl-2H-tetrazolium bromide (MTT) assay [18], the results of which are presented in Table 2, revealing that compound 7 exhibited significant cytotoxicity against these tumor cells.

In addition, the cytotoxicity of 7 was more prominent than that of 9 against PANC-1, K562, and BxPC-3 cells. Compound 7 is a polymethoxyflavonoid, while compound 9 is a polyhydroxy substituted flavonol. Thus, polymethoxy substituents could enhance the antitumor activity. As shown in $Fig. 1$, compounds 7 and 8 differ only in the substitution at $C(3')$. In agreement with findings reported by others [4], we found that a free HO-C(3') group is essential for significant cytotoxicity of polymethoxyflavonoids (see Table 2).

This work was sponsored by the Natural Sciences Foundation of Fujian Province (No. 2010J01179) and the Science and Technology Project of Fujian Province (No. 2012Y0035).

Compound	IC_{50} [µg/ml]				
	PANC-1	K ₅₆₂	$BxPC-3$		
3	15.05	6.99	14.80		
5	24.85	20.85	32.91		
6	22.31	19.83	36.09		
7	4.67	0.71	4.01		
8	> 80.00	61.25	> 80.00		
9	11.67	16.65	12.59		
10	> 80.00	> 80.00	> 80.00		

Table 2. Cytotoxic Activities of Compounds 3, and $5-10$

Experimental Part

General. Column chromatography (CC): silica gel (SiO₂; 100 – 200 or 200 – 300 mesh; *Qingdao* Marine Chemical Factory), Sephadex LH-20 gel (Amersham Pharmacia Biotech), and MCI gel CHP-20P (75-150 µm; Mitsubishi Chemical Co.). TLC: silica gel G (Qingdao Marine Chemical Factory); visualization under UV light and by spraying with 5% H_2SO_4 in EtOH (v/v), followed by heating. Optical rotations: JASCO-20 polarimeter. UV Spectra: UV -210A spectrometer; λ_{max} in nm. IR Spectra: Nicolet 170SX FT-IR spectrometer; KBr pellets; $\tilde{\nu}$ in cm⁻¹. NMR spectra: *Bruker NMR* spectrometer; at 400 or 600 (1 H), and 100 or 150 MHz (13 C), Me₄Si as internal standard; δ in ppm, J in Hz. HR-ESI-MS: *Bruker* $APEX II$ mass spectrometer, EI-MS: $HP-5988$ mass spectrometer, in m/z .

Plant Material. The plants of Vitex trifolia L.var. simplicifolia CHAM. were collected at the beach of Lang-Qi Island in Fuzhou, Fujian Province, P. R. China, in September 2010, and identified by Y.-H. Z., Fujian Medical University. A voucher specimen was deposited with the Laboratory of the Natural Products, Fujian Medical University, P. R. China.

Extraction and Isolation. Dried and powdered leaves and twigs of V. trifolia var. simplicifolia (8 kg) were extracted three times with MeOH at r.t. After evaporation of the solvent under reduced pressure, the residue was suspended in H₂O and extracted with petroleum ether (PE), AcOEt, and BuOH, successively. The residue of the PE layer (75.5g) was fractionated by CC (silica gel; stepwise gradient PE/ AcOEt $1:0-0:1$) to yield 15 fractions, *Frs.* $1-15$, and compound **15** (40.0 mg) was isolated from *Fr.* 11. Fr. 6 (11 g) was purified by repeated CC (silica gel) to give 1 (6.0 mg) and 2 (5.0 mg). Fr. 7 (13.5 g) was subjected to CC (silica gel; PE/AcOEt $1:0-0:1$) to furnish $5(15.0 \text{ mg}), 11(10.0 \text{ mg}), 12(16.0 \text{ mg}),$ and 14 (15.0 mg).

The AcOEt layer (28.8g) was fractionated by CC (silica gel; stepwise gradient of PE/AcOEt (1:0– 0 : 1) to yield 17 fractions, Frs. $1 - 17$, and compound 3 (23.0 mg) was isolated from Fr. 7. Fr. 12 (2.8g) was subjected to CC (silica gel; stepwise gradient of PE/AcOEt 1:0-0:1) to afford seven fractions, Fr. 12.1-12.7. Fr. 12.5 was subjected to CC (Sephadex LH-20; CHCl₃/MeOH 1:1) to afford 8 (8.0 mg). Fr. 16 (1.7 g) was subjected to CC (silica gel) to give $9(10.0 \text{ mg})$, Fr. 13 was subjected to CC (MCI; stepwise gradient H₂O/MeOH $1:0-0:1$) to yield 7 (130.0 mg). Frs. 8 and 11 were purified by repeated CC (silica gel and on Sephadex LH-20) to give 6 (12.0 mg) and 10 (100.0 mg), resp.

3-Oxotaraxer-14-en-30-al (1). White amorphous powder. M.p. 216–218°. $\left[\alpha\right]_{\rm D}^{23} = +26.0$ (c = 0.1, CHCl₃). IR: 2926, 2825, 2660, 1710, 1700, 1660, 1454, 1363. ¹H- and ¹³C-NMR: see *Table 1*. EI-MS: 438 $(M^+),$ 409 ([M – CHO] $^+),$ 300, 285, 218, 205, 204. HR-ESI-MS: 461.3384 ([M + Na] $^+$, C₃₀H₄₆NaO $^+_2$; calc. 461.3395).

Taraxerone (2). White amorphous powder. M.p. 245 – 248°. IR: 2930, 2839, 1702, 1665, 1454, 1362. ${}^{1}H\text{-NMR}$ (600 MHz, CDCl₃): 5.56 (dd, J = 8.0, 2.8, H–C(15)); 1.14 (s, Me(26)); 1.11 (s, Me(25)); 1.08 (s, $Me(24)$; 1.07 (s, Me(23)); 0.96 (s, Me(29)); 0.91 (s, Me(30)), 0.83 (s, Me(28)). EI-MS: 424 (M^+), 409 $([M-\text{Me}]^+)$, 300, 285, 218, 205,121.

3-Epiursolic Acid (3). White amorphous powder. M.p. 273 – 275°. IR: 3392, 2926, 1693, 1457, 1369, 1018. ¹H-NMR (400 MHz, (D₆)DMSO): 0.87, 0.89, 0.91, 0.98, 1.04, 1.28, 1.31 (7s, 7 Me); 3.00 (t, $J = 8.0$, $H-C(3)$); 5.13 (d, J = 4.0, H–C(12)). ESI-MS: 456 (M⁺).

2a,3*ß-Dihydroxyurs-12-en-28-oic Acid* (4). White amorphous powder. M.p. 245–248°. ¹H-NMR $(400 \text{ MHz}, (D_6) \text{ DMSO})$: 0.76, 0.80, 0.82, 0.84, 0.92, 0.98, 1.10 (7s, 7 Me). ESI-MS: 471 ($[M-H]$).

Lupeol (5). Colorless amorphous powder. M.p. 205 – 206°. ¹H-NMR (400 MHz, CD₃OD): 0.76, 0.83, 0.86, 0.94, 0.98, 1.26, 1.70 (7s, 7 Me); 4.62 (s, H_a-C(29)); 4.75 (s, H_b-C(29)); 3.21 (dd, $J = 8.0, 4.0$, H-C(3)); 2.20 (s, H-C(19)). EI-MS: 426 (M⁺).

Betulinic Acid (6). Colorless amorphous powder. M.p. 228 – 230°. IR: 3441, 2942, 2871, 1693, 1692, 1452. ¹H-NMR (400 MHz, (D₆)DMSO): 0.82, 0.85, 0.94, 0.96, 1.09, 1.63 (6s, 6 Me); 4.67 (s, H_a–C(29)); 4.55 (s, H_b-C(29)). ESI-MS: 455 ([M – H]⁻).

Casticin (7). Yellow crystals. M.p. 188 – 190°. IR: 3463, 3444, 2931, 2849, 1655, 1676, 1587, 1430, 1282, 1210. UV (MeOH): 351, 258. ¹ H-NMR (400 MHz, (D6)DMSO): 3.72, 3.79, 3.86, 3.91 (4s, 4 MeO); 6.87 $(d, J = 2.0, H-C(8))$; 7.12 $(d, J = 9.2, H-C(5'))$; 7.58 $(d, J = 2.0, H-C(2'))$; 7.59 $(s, H-C(6'))$. ESI-MS: 374 (M^+) .

Artemetin (8). Yellow crystals. M.p. $161 - 162^{\circ}$. ¹H-NMR (400 MHz, (D₆)DMSO): 3.73 – 3.92 (s, 5) MeO); 6.93 (s, H–C(8)); 7.16 (d, $J = 8.8$, H–C(5')); 7.65 (d, $J = 2.0$, H–C(2')); 7.72 (dd, $J = 8.8$, 2.0, H–C(6′)). ESI-MS: 388 (M^+) .

Luteolin (9). Yellow needles. M.p. > 300°. IR (KBr): 3392, 1665, 1611, 1507, 1445, 1340, 1305, 1262, 1161, 804. UV (MeOH): 353, 263. ¹H-NMR (400 MHz, (D₆)DMSO): 12.79 (s, HO–C(5)); 7.42 (dd, J = 8.0, 2.0, H–C(6')); 7.39 (d , J = 2.0, H–C(2')); 6.89 (d, J = 8.0, H–C(5')); 6.67 (s, H–C(3)); 6.44 (d, J = 2.0, H–C(8)); 6.18 $(d, J = 2.0, H–C(6))$. ESI-MS: 286 (M^+) .

4-Hydroxybenzoic Acid (10). White needles. M.p. 188-191°. IR: 3388, 1676, 1510, 1422, 1320, 1168. ${}^{1}H\text{-}NMR$ (400 MHz, CD₃OD): 7.89 (d, $J = 8.8$, H-C(2,6)); 6.82 (d, $J = 8.4$, H-C(3,5)). EI-MS: 138 $(M^+), 121 \; ([M-OH]^+), 93 \; ([M-COOH]^+).$

Docosanoic Acid (11). White amorphous powder. M.p. 78°. EI-MS: 340 (M^+) , 312, 284, 213, 199, 185, 171, 157, 143.

Tetracosanoic Acid (12). White amorphous powder. M.p. 82°. EI-MS: 367 ($[M-H]$), 353 ($[M-$ COOH]⁺). ¹H-NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): 0.88 (t, $J = 5.7$, Me(24)); 1.25 (m, H-C(4-23)); 1.63 (m, $CH₂(3)$; 2.34 (d, $J = 5.9$, CH₂(2)).

Cerotic Acid (13). White amorphous powder. M.p. 84° . EI-MS: 396 (M^{+}), 382, 368, 354, 340, 289, 275, 253, 173, 159.

REFERENCES

- [1] Institute of Materia Medica, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Chinese Materia Medica, People's Medical Publishing House, Beijing, 1984, Vol. 3, p. 679.
- [2] M. Ono, M. Yamamoto, T. Yanaka, Y. Ito, T. Nohara, Chem. Pharm. Bull. 2001, 49, 82.
- [3] M. Ono, T. Yanaka, M. Yamamoto, Y. Ito, T. Nohara, J. Nat. Prod. 2002, 65, 537.
- [4] W. G. Ko, T. H. Kang, S. J. Lee, N. Y. Kim, Y. C. Kim, D. H. Sohn, B. H. Lee, Food Chem Toxicol. 2000, 38, 861.
- [5] T. Yoshioka, T. Inokuchi, S. Inokuchi, Y. Kimura, Naturforsch., C 2004, 59, 509.
- [6] N. B. Sakurai, Y. S. Yaguchi, T. K. Inoue, Phytochemistry 1987, 26, 217.
- [7] F. B. Luciane, T. G. Felipe, B. F. Sidnei, S. M. Fábio, L. M. Davyson, *Quim. Nova* 2003, 26, 922.
- [8] Z. Z. Liang, R. Aquino, V. D. Feo, F. D. Simone, C. Pizza, Planta Med. 1990, 56, 330.
- [9] R. Aquino, F. D. Simone, F. F. Vincieri, C. Pizza, E. Gacs-Baitz, J. Nat. Prod. 1990, 53, 559.
- [10] W. F. Reynolds, S. McLean, J. Poplawski, R. G. Enriquez, L. I. Escobar, I. Leon, Tetrahedron 1986, 42, 3419.
- [11] I. Akira, I. Hideji, *Phytochemistry* **1988**, 27, 2813.
- [12] Azizuddin, M. Talat, I. C. Muhammad, Turk. J. Chem. 2010, 119.
- [13] Y. H. Kuo, S. M. Lee, J. S. Lai, J. Chin. Chem. Soc. 2000, 47, 241.
- [14] T. S. Wu, Y. L. Tsai, P. L. Wu, F. W. Lin, J. K. Lin, *J. Nat. Prod.* 2000, 63, 692.
- [15] A. M. Ivan, A. Hans, Phytochemistry 1985, 24, 1817.
- [16] W. W. Fu, D. Q. Dou, S. Noriko, T. Tadahiro, Y. H. Pei, Y. J. Chen, J. Nat. Med. 2006, 60, 68.
- [17] I. J. Momo, T. H. Dufat, J. Wandji, S. Michel, D. D. Chiozem, Nat. Prod. Res. 2013, 27, 137.
- [18] M. J. Tang, D. D. Shen, Y. C. Hu, S. Gao, S. S. Yu, J. Nat. Prod. 2004, 67, 1969.

Received November 19, 2012