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#### Abstract

A series of 2-aminoalkylethers prepared as potential antiarrhythmic agents is described. The present compounds are mixed sodium and potassium ion channel blockers and exhibit antiarrhythmic activity in a rat model of ischemia-induced arrhythmias. Structure-activity studies led to the identification of three compounds $\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{1 8}$, and 26, which were selected based on their particular in vivo electrophysiological properties, for studies in two canine atrial fibrillation (AF) models. The three compounds converted AF in both models, but only compound 26 was shown to be orally bioavailable. Resolution of the racemate 26 into its corresponding enantiomers 40 and 41 and subsequent biological testing of these enantiomers led to the selection of (1S,2S)-1-(1-naphthalenethoxy)-2-(3-ketopyrrolidinyl)cyclohexane monohydrochloride (41) as a potential atrial selective antiarrhythmic candidate for further development.


Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most prevalent survivable arrhythmia in the Western world, with an incidence that increases significantly with age. Recent estimates, suggest that AF affects about $6 \%$ of individuals over age 65, and about $10 \%$ of those over the age of $80 .{ }^{1}$ While AF is rarely fatal, it can impair cardiac function and is a major cause of stroke. ${ }^{2,3}$

Class Ia, Ic, and III antiarrhythmic drugs have been used to convert AF to sinus rhythm and prevent recurrence of the arrhythmia. ${ }^{4}$ However, drug therapy is often limited by the adverse effects of these drugs, including the possibility of increased mortality and inadequate efficacy. ${ }^{5-8}$ Conversion rates for Class I antiarrhythmics range between 50 and $90 \% .^{4,9,10}$ Class III antiarrhythmics, more effective for terminating atrial flutter (FL) than AF, are generally regarded as less effective than Class I drugs for terminating AF. ${ }^{4,10}$ Examples of Class III antiarrhythmic drugs include ibutilide, dofetilide, and sotalol. Conversion rates for these drugs range between 30 and $50 \%$ for the recent onset of $\mathrm{AF},{ }^{10,11}$ but they are also associated with a risk of inducing the potentially fatal ventricular tachyarrhythmia commonly called Torsades de Pointes. For ibutilide, the risk of this ventricular arrhythmia is estimated at $\sim 4.4 \%$, with $\sim 1.7 \%$ of patients requiring cardioversion for refractory ventricular arrhythmias. ${ }^{12}$ Such events are particularly tragic in the case of AF , as this arrhythmia is rarely fatal in itself.
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Figure 1. Structures of $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-(2-morpholinyl)-1-cyclohexyl 1-naphthylacetate monohydrochloride (I) and $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-( 2 -mor-pholinyl)-1-cyclohexyl 4-bromophenylacetate monohydrochloride (II).

The recent description of the ultra-rapid delayed rectifier potassium current ( $I_{\mathrm{Kur}}$ ) in animals ${ }^{13}$ and man ${ }^{14,15}$ hints that it may be possible to separate the pro- and antiarrhythmic actions of these drugs. $I_{\text {Kur }}$ is abundant in the atria, but scarce in the ventricle. In addition, the transient outward current $\left(I_{\text {to1 }}\right)$ is an important current for repolarisation in the atria. ${ }^{16,17}$ Blockade of currents that are predominantly found in the atria might prolong atrial action potentials without substantially influencing ventricular action potentials. A profile such as this might be effective for AF therapy, without the proarrhythmic risk associated with prolongation of ventricular action potentials.

Originally focused on ischemia-selective ventricular antiarrhythmics, our laboratory has developed a number of in vivo models of acute ischemia capable of detecting antiarrhythmic activity with sufficient precision and accuracy to serve as useful bioassays. ${ }^{18}$ These models have been characterized using reference antiarrhythmic agents. As a result, we have chosen coronary occlusion in anaesthetized rats as a primary screen. The applicability of such a model for the screening of AF agents is based on the dependence of the rat ventricular action potential on early potassium currents ( $I_{\mathrm{to}}, I_{\mathrm{Kur}}$ ) for repolarization, as in human atria. However, the efficacy of antiarrhythmic compounds in rat models have to be corroborated in a large animal experimental model of AF. AF has been produced in a number of different models by interventions that either induce atrial stretch (e.g., secondary to heart failure), heterogeneous atrial refractoriness (e.g., vagal stimulation), or other changes in electrophysiological substrate (e.g., pericarditis and rapid pacing). $I_{\mathrm{to1}}, I_{\mathrm{to} 2}$, and both components of $I_{\mathrm{K}}$ are present in dog atrium, and the properties of two important repolarizing currents

Table 1. Aminoalcohols 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cmpd | $\mathrm{R}^{1}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{3}$ | yield, \% | ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, \mathrm{ppm}, \mathrm{APT}\right)$ |
| $2 \mathbf{a}^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | 92 | $\begin{aligned} & 70.5(-), 68.3(-), 67.4(+), \\ & 48.7(+), 33.1(+), 25.4(+), \\ & 23.9(+), 22.1(+) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2b | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | 87 | $\begin{aligned} & 70.4(-), 64.8(-), 47.4(+), \\ & 33.1(+), 25.1(+), 24.2(+), \\ & 24.0(+), 21.1(+) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 c | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | 70 | $\begin{aligned} & 75.0(-), 74.5(-), 67.5(+), \\ & 52.5(+), 35.5(+), 28.5(+), \\ & 21.5(+) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2d | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ |  | 77 | $\begin{aligned} & 72.0(+), 69.5(-), 67.8(-), \\ & 58.7(-), 50.0(+), 33.0(+), \\ & 25.5(+), 24.2(+), 23.3(+) \end{aligned}$ |
| $2 \mathrm{e}^{a}$ |  |  |  | 79 | $\begin{aligned} & 115.5(+), 70.0(-), 65.0(-), \\ & 64.5(+), 57.0(+), 46.5(+), \\ & 36.0(+), 33.5(+), 25.0(+), \\ & 24.0(+), 21.5(+) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 f | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{~N}$ | ) $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | 87 | $\begin{aligned} & 168.5(+), 70.0(-), 68.2(-), \\ & 48.3(+), 47.7(+), 46.5(+), \\ & 41.6(+), 32.9(+), 25.1(+), \\ & 23.6(+), 22.0(+), 21.0(-) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 g | $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}$ |  |  | 90 | $\begin{aligned} & 107.0(+), 70.0(-), 69.0(-), \\ & 64.0(+), 46.0(+), 36.0(+), \\ & 33.0(+), 26.0(+), 24.0(+), \\ & 22.0(+) \end{aligned}$ |
| $2 \mathbf{h}^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | 100 | $\begin{aligned} & 154.6(-), 79.6(-), 70.4(+), \\ & 68.4(+), 48.2(-), 33.1(-), \\ & 32.7(-), 28.3(+), 25.3(-), \\ & 23.9(-), 22.3(-) \end{aligned}$ |
| $2 \mathbf{i}^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}$ | 2 $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | H | 90 | $\begin{aligned} & 66.5(+), 65.6(-), 64.5(+), \\ & 53.3(+), 34.2(+), 27.3(+), \\ & 22.4(+), 13.6(-) \end{aligned}$ |
| $2 \mathbf{j}^{a}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  |  | 47 | $\begin{aligned} & 71.0(-), 69.0(-), 55.0(+), \\ & 53.0(+), 33.0(+), 31.0(+), \\ & 26.0(+), 25.0(+), 23.0(+) \end{aligned}$ |

${ }^{a}$ See Experimental Section.
( $I_{\mathrm{to1}}$ and $I_{\mathrm{K}}$ ) previously described in human atrium are similar to those in dog atrium. ${ }^{19}$ The canine sterile pericarditis ${ }^{20}$ and vagal $\mathrm{AF}^{21}$ models were selected as surrogates for clinical efficacy in conversion of atrial fibrillation/flutter (AF/FL) in man.

We hypothesized that potency and selectivity for AF could be achieved through a greater potency for early repolarizing potassium channels ( $\mathrm{IC}_{50} \leq 2 \mu \mathrm{M}$ for $I_{\mathrm{Kur}}$ and $I_{\mathrm{to}}$ ) than sodium channels at $1 \mathrm{~Hz}\left(\mathrm{IC}_{50}>10 \mu \mathrm{M}\right.$ for the block of $\left.I_{\mathrm{Na}}\right)$. This activity profile might provide selectivity for AF, because the block of sodium channels would be targeted to the rapidly activating fibrillating tissue, and the effects on repolarization would be targeted to the atria, as discussed above.

From our original program of ischemia-selective ventricular antiarrhythmics, two compounds, I and II (Figure 1) were shown to have the right attributes for selectively suppressing ischemiainduced arrhythmias in several species. ${ }^{18,22-24}$ However, these two compounds, sensitive to ester hydrolysis, would limit their use solely to acute i.v. treatment of arrhythmias. We then designed new compounds to have increased chemical and possibly metabolic stability, by replacing the ester linkage by an ether linkage but with improved electrophysiological attributes compared to I and II (Table 3). The antiarrhythmic actions of these novel 2-aminoalkylethers were compared with known antiarrhythmic drugs such as quinidine (Class Ia), lidocaine (Class Ib), flecainide (Class Ic), and amiodarone (Class III; Figure 2). ${ }^{10}$

Chemistry. From the aminoalcohols $\mathbf{2 a - j}$ (Table 1) and alcohols $\mathbf{3 a - w}$ (Table 2) were prepared the antiarrhythmic
aminoethers $\mathbf{4 - 5 3}$ (Table 3) by using general methods $\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{G}$ and specific experimental procedures provided below.

Method A. Williamson ether synthesis, ${ }^{25}$ condensing an activated form of aminoalcohol $\mathbf{2 a} \mathbf{- d}$ and $\mathbf{2 f}$ with the alkoxide of an alcohol 3 in a polar solvent such as DMF (Scheme 1) provided the corresponding aminoethers $\mathbf{4 - 1 7}$ and $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 5}$ in moderate to low yields (Table 3). The stereochemical outcome of the ether coupling could be rationalized by a mechanism involving a double $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ displacement and an aziridinium ion intermediate (Scheme 2). That is, the neighboring nitrogen would displace the mesylate to give an aziridinium ion, which is subsequently attacked by the incoming sodium alkoxide. The lack of discrimination between the two aziridine carbons for attack by the alkoxide affords an $\sim 1: 1$ mixture of stereoisomers having trans-geometry.

Method B. Aminoethers 18, 30, 32, 39, 42, 51, and 52 or ketals of compounds $26-28,34,35,37,38,43-45,48$, and 53 were obtained from reaction of the appropriate activated form of aminoalcohol (2) and the sodium salt of alcohol (3) in moderate to high yields (Scheme 3) in ethylene glycol dimethyl ether (DME) instead of dimethylformamide (DMF), as previously described (Method A). Compounds 26-28, 34, 35, 37, $38,43-45$, and 48 were obtained by deprotecting the corresponding ketals by treatment with 6 M HCl in 2-butanone (Scheme 3), whereas compound $\mathbf{5 3}$ was prepared by subjection of the $N$-Boc derivative to trifluoroacetic acid.

Method C. This method was used to prepare cis-cyclohexylaminoethers 31 and 33 and acyclic aminoether 29. Successive Swern oxidation ${ }^{26}$ of aminoalcohol 2a and reduction $\left(\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}\right.$,

Table 2. Alcohols 3

| $\mathrm{RCHR}^{5}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{n} \mathrm{OH}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cmpd | R | $\mathrm{R}^{5}$ | $n$ | yield, \% | ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, \mathrm{ppm}\right)$ |
| 3a | 2-naphthyl | H | 1 |  |  |
| 3b | 1-naphthyl | H | 1 |  |  |
| 3c | 4-bromophenyl | H | 1 |  |  |
| 3d | 2-naphthoxy | H | 1 |  |  |
| 3e | 4-bromophenoxy | H | 1 |  |  |
| 3f | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | H | 1 |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3 g}{ }^{a}$ | 3-benzo[b]thiophenyl | H | 1 | 92 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.80-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 7.00(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), \\ & 3.80\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), 3.00\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), \\ & 2.20(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |
| $\mathbf{3 h}^{b}$ | 4-benzo[ $b$ ]thiophenyl | H | 1 | 64 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.80-7.00(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.80\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \text {, } \\ & 3.00\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 2.20(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 3 i | 3-bromophenyl | H | 1 |  |  |
| 3j | 2-bromophenyl | H | 1 |  |  |
| 3k | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | H | 2 |  |  |
| $31^{c}$ | 3,4-dichlorophenyl | H | 1 | 81 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.40-7.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.80\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), \\ & 2.80\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 1.80(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |
| $3 \mathrm{~m}^{a}$ | 2,4-dimethoxyphenyl | H | 2 | 73 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.40-6.40(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.80\left(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{O}\right) \text {, } \\ & 3.60\left(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), 2.70\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), \\ & 1.80\left(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 1.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |
| $3 \mathbf{n}^{b}$ | 4-benzo[b]furanyl | H | 1 | 38 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.60-6.80(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.90\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \text {, } \\ & 3.10\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 2.10(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |
| $3 \mathbf{o}^{a}$ | 4-bromophenyl | H | 2 | 83 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.40-6.80(\mathrm{q}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.60-3.30\left(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), \\ & 2.50\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 1.80\left(\mathrm{q}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), \\ & 1.20(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |
| $3 \mathbf{p}^{a}$ | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | H | 3 | 47 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.05-6.60(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.70\left(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{O}\right) \\ & 3.45\left(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), 2.24\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \\ & 2.20(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 1.50\left(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ |
| $3 q$ | 2,4-dichlorophenyl | $\mathrm{H}$ | 1 |  |  |
| $3 \mathbf{r}^{a}$ | 2,6-dichlorophenyl | H | 1 | 97 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.40-7.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.80\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), \\ & 3.20\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 2.10(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |
| $3 \mathbf{s}^{c}$ | 2,4-dibromophenyl | H | 1 | 29 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.70-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.90\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \text {, } \\ & 3.00\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 1.40(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 3 t | 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl | H | 1 |  |  |
| $3 \mathbf{u}^{a}$ | phenyl | phenyl | 1 | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.40-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 4.30-4.10(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \\ & \left.\mathrm{CHCH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), 2.20(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |
| $3 v^{b}$ | 4-bromonaphth-1-yl | H | 1 | 48 | $\begin{aligned} & 8.29-7.17(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.92\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \text {, } \\ & 3.26\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 1.77(\mathrm{br}, \mathrm{~s} 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 3w | cyclohexyl | H | 2 |  |  |

${ }^{a}$ Obtained from reduction $\left(\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}\right.$ or $\left.\mathrm{B}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{6}\right)$ of the corresponding carboxylic acid. ${ }^{b}$ See Supporting Information. ${ }^{c}$ See Experimental Section.
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Figure 2. Structures of quinidine (a), flecainide (b), lidocaine (c), and amiodarone (d).

2-propanol) gave a cis/trans-mixture of 2-(4-morpholinyl)-cyclohexan-1-ol (Scheme 4). Subsequent esterification with a substituted phenylacetic acid mediated by $p-\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in toluene yielded a cis/trans-mixture of esters. The cis/transmixture was resolved by chromatography, and the trans-ester was identified by comparison with an authentic sample of the trans-ester obtained by direct esterification of $\mathbf{2 a}$ with the same substituted phenylacetic acid.

Finally, compounds $\mathbf{3 1}$ and $\mathbf{3 3}$ were obtained by reduction $\left(\mathrm{NaBH}_{4} \text { and } \mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)^{27}$ of the cis-ester precursor. Similarly,
successive esterification of $\mathbf{2 i}$ with 4-bromophenylacetic acid and reduction gave compound 29.

Method D. Cyclohexene oxide ring opening with 3b in the presence of $\mathrm{Mg}\left(\mathrm{ClO}_{4}\right)_{2}{ }^{28}$ followed by oxidation with pyridinium chlorochromate (PCC) ${ }^{29}$ gave ( $2 R / 2 S$ )-2-(1-naphthalenethoxy)-cyclohexan-1-one (Scheme 5). Subsequent enamine formation with $\mathbf{1 e}$ in the presence of poly(4-vinylpyridine) (PVP) and hydrogenation on $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ yielded $(1 R, 2 S) /(1 S, 2 R)$-1-(1-naphtha-lenethoxy)-2-(1,4-dioxo-7-azaspiro[4.4]non-7-yl)cyclohexane as the major component. Identification of the minor trans-isomer was made by comparison with an authentic sample of the transisomer 32. Successive purification of the cis-ketal by chromatography and treatment with 6 M HCl in 2-butanone gave aminoether 46.

Method E. Reduction of compounds 26 and 28 with $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ in 2-propanol provided, respectively, compounds 50 and 47 (Scheme 3). Similarly, reduction of 46 gave aminoether 49 (Scheme 5).

Method F. Successive reduction $\left(\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}, 2\right.$-propanol) of compound 26 and acetylation gave aminoether 36 (Scheme 3).

Method G. Resolution of $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-1-(1-naphthale-nethoxy)-2-(1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4,4]non-7-yl)cyclohexane with di-p-toluoyl-D-tartaric acid in 2-butanone (Scheme 6) provided crystals that were recrystallized in a mixture of 2-butanoneMeOH . A single-crystal X-ray analysis allowed unambiguous assignment of the absolute configuration in $(1 R, 2 R)-1-(1-$ naphthalenethoxy)-2-(1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4,4]non-7-yl)cyclohexane di-p-toluoyl-d-hemitartrate based on the connec-

Scheme 1. General Synthesis of trans-Aminoethers, Method A


Scheme 2. Proposed Mechanism Involving a Double $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ Displacement and an Aziridinium Ion Intermediate in Methods A and B

tivity. ${ }^{30}$ Thus, this direct determination confirmed the postulated trans relative configuration of the aminoethers prepared via methods A or B. Recovery of the free amine and hydrolysis ( $6 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HCl}, 2$-butanone) of the ketal gave enantiomer 40. Resolution of the mother liquor enriched in ( $1 S, 2 S$ )-ketal using di-p-toluoyl-L-tartaric and subsequent ketal hydrolysis provided enantiomer 41.

Preparation of Aminoalcohols 2. Aminoalcohols 2a-i were prepared by typical $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{N}} 2$ epoxide openings with the secondary amine of choice in the presence of water (Scheme 7), which, when $\mathrm{R}^{3}$ and $\mathrm{R}^{4}$ form a cycloalkyl ring, provide aminoalcohols $\mathbf{2 a}-\mathbf{h}$ with a trans-relationship relative to the cycloalkyl ring. Interestingly, it should be noted that, for the preparation of aminoalcohol $\mathbf{2} \mathbf{j}$, prior activation of the epoxide with a Lewis acid (i.e., $\left.\mathrm{Mg}\left(\mathrm{ClO}_{4}\right)_{2}\right)^{28}$ was necessary to circumvent the weak basicity of thiazolidine.

Aminoalcohol 2 e required the preparation of amine $\mathbf{1 e}$ (Scheme 8). 3-Hydroxypyrrolidinol 1a was N -protected by
carbamoylation with benzylchloroformate to give 1b, and Swern oxidation ${ }^{26}$ to $\mathbf{1 c}$ followed by ketalisation with ethylene glycol provided 1d, which was then hydrogenolyzed to give $\mathbf{1 e}$.

Preparation of Alcohols 3. Reduction of the commercially available carboxylic acids or cinnamic acids with $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ provided, respectively, alcohols $\mathbf{3 g}, \mathbf{3 1}, \mathbf{3 p}, \mathbf{3 r}$, and $\mathbf{3 u}$ and $\mathbf{3 m}$ and 30. Alcohols $\mathbf{3 h}$ and $\mathbf{3 n}$ were, respectively, accessible from 4-keto-4,5,6,7-tetrahydrothianaphthene in three steps ${ }^{31}$ and 1,3cyclohexanedione in four steps. ${ }^{32-34}$ Alcohol 3s was obtained in seven steps from 2,4-dibromoaniline. ${ }^{35}$ 2,4-Dibromoaniline was reacted with potassium nitrite and then potassium cyanide in the presence of copper(I) cyanide to provide 2,4-dibromobenzonitrile. ${ }^{36}$ Subsequent reduction to the aldehyde with diisobutylaluminum hydride (DIBAL) followed by reduction with $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ provided 2,4-dibromobenzyl alcohol. Further activation through the mesylate, reaction with potassium cyanide, and basic hydrolysis provided 2,4-dibromophenylacetic acid, which was then reduced with borane to the desired 2,4-dibromophenethyl alcohol 3s. Finally, 3v was obtained via alkylation of 1,4dibromonaphthalene with ethylene oxide in the presence of $n$-BuLi. ${ }^{37}$

Biological. The compounds were evaluated for antiarrhythmic activity against ischemia-induced arrhythmias and for convulsive activity in rats (Table 4). ${ }^{18}$ In the ischemia-induced arrhythmia model, the dose producing a $25 \%$ reduction in systemic blood pressure ( $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{BP}$ ) was monitored to reflect undesired hemeodynamic effects. In addition, the arrhythmia scores (AS) ${ }^{38}$ at infusion rates of $1.0,2.0$, and $4.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ were listed to aid in the evaluation of compounds with similar $\mathrm{ED}_{50}$. Compounds for which the antiarrhythmic activity could not be estimated or the threshold for convulsion was low were not studied further. The other compounds were evaluated for their electrophysiological effects in vivo in electrical stimulation studies in the rat and for toxicity (MTD) in mice (Table 5). Putative ion channel blocking actions were assessed in terms of changes in the ECG and electrical stimulation variables. An increase of the PR interval of the ECG and of the current threshold for induction of an extrasystole (iT) were used as indicators of sodium channel blocking actions, and a lengthened QT interval was used as an indicator of potassium channel

Scheme 3. General Synthesis of trans-Aminoethers, Methods B, E, and F


Scheme 4. General Synthesis of cis-Aminoethers, Method C


Table 3. Aminoethers 4-36

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cmpd | $\mathrm{R}^{1} \quad \mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{3}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{4}$ | rel./abs. <br> conf. $\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | $n$ | $\mathrm{R}^{5}$ | R | method | $\text { yield, }{ }^{b}$ \% | formula | elem. anal. |
| 4 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthyl | $\mathrm{A}^{a}$ | 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 70.29; found, 69.57 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | A | 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 70.29; found, 69.78 |
| 6 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-bromophenyl | A | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 7 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthoxy | A | 13 | $\underset{\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \cdot}{ }$ | C, H, N |
| 8 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-bromophenoxy | A | 44 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Br} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 9 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | A | 29 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{NO}_{4} . \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 62.24; found, 61.69 |
| 10 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | A | 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 11 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3-benzo[b]thiophenyl | A | 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{~S} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 62.89 ; found, 60.87 |
| 12 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-benzo[b]thiophenyl | A | 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{~S} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 62.89; found, 62.53 |
| 13 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3-bromophenyl | A | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 14 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-bromophenyl | A | 9 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \cdot 1 / 3 \mathrm{EtOH} \end{aligned}$ | C, H; N: calcd, 3.40; found, 4.01 |
| 15 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2-}$ $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2-}$ <br> $\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ $\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthyl | A | 9 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | HPLC: 92.6\%; <br> CE: $94.2 \%$ |
| 16 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | A | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 63.06; found, 62.45 |
| 17 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{3}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthyl | A | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 69.69; found, 69.23 |
| 18 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dichlorophenyl | $\mathrm{B}^{a}$ | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} . \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 19 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | 2,4-dimethoxyphenyl | A | 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{NO}_{4} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 63.06; found, 62.52 |
| 20 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-benzo[b]furanyl | A | 8 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 65.65 ; found, 64.50 |
| 21 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | 4-bromophenyl | A | 10 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 54.49; found, 54.94 |
| 22 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 3 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | A | 18 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{NO}_{4}{ }^{-} \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 23 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{~N}\left(\mathrm{COCH}_{3}\right)- \\ \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthyl | A | 25 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 63.63; found, 62.93 |
| 24 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,4-dichlorophenyl | A | 13 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} . \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 25 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,6-dichlorophenyl | A | 9 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} . \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 26 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | $\mathrm{B}^{a}$ | 57 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 27 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3-benzo[b]thiophenyl | B | 14 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{~S} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 28 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-bromophenyl | B | 38 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 29 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | H | $n-\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{9}$ |  | 1 | H | 4-bromophenyl | $\mathrm{C}^{a}$ | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 30 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,4-dibromophenyl | $\mathrm{B}^{a}$ | 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{2} . \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 31 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | cis | 1 | H | 4-bromophenyl | C | 53 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 32 |  |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | $\mathrm{B}^{a}$ | 49 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 68.97; found, 68.49 |
| 33 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | cis | 1 | H | 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl | $\mathrm{C}^{\text {a }}$ | 38 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{NO}_{2} . \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 34 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | cyclohexyl | B | 35 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 35 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,4-dibromophenyl | B | 19 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{2} . \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 36 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}\left(\mathrm{OCOCH}_{3}\right)- \\ \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | $\mathrm{F}^{\text {a }}$ | 65 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | H, N; C: calcd, 68.97; found, 67.52 |

Table 3. (Continued) Aminoethers 37-53


| cmpd | $\mathrm{R}^{1} \quad \mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{3} \quad \mathrm{R}^{4}$ | rel./abs. <br> conf. $\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | $n$ | $\mathrm{R}^{5}$ | R | method | $\underset{\%}{\text { yield, }^{b}}$ | formula | elem. anal. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-bromophenyl | B | 20 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br} \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 38 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | B | 56 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{4} . \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N} ; \mathrm{C}$ : calcd, 62.57; found, 60.32 |
| 39 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl | B | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 40 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | $1 R, 2 R$ | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | $\mathrm{G}^{a}$ | 30 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 41 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | $1 S, 2 S$ | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | $\mathrm{G}^{a}$ | 37 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{2} . \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 42 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{SCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,6-dichlorophenyl | $\mathrm{B}^{a}$ | 39 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{NOSCl}_{2} . \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 43 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | phenyl | phenyl | B | 39 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 44 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl | B | 19 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 45 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-bromo-naphth-1-yl | $\mathrm{B}^{\text {a }}$ | 21 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 46 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | cis | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | $\mathrm{D}^{a}$ | 59 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | C, H, N |
| 47 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHOHCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-bromophenyl | E | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Br} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | HPLC: $99.1 \%$; <br> CE: $98.7 \%^{a}$ |
| 48 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | B | 17 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N} ; \mathrm{C}$ : calcd, 68.05; found, 69.35 |
| 49 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHOHCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | cis | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | E | 57 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | HPLC: $96.7 \%$; <br> CE: $98.7 \%^{a}$ |
| 50 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHOHCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | $\mathrm{E}^{a}$ | 79 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | HPLC: $98.9 \%$; <br> CE: $98.9 \%^{a}$ |
| 51 |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | B | 87 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{NO}_{5} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | HPLC: $84.2 \%$; <br> CE: $98.5 \%{ }^{a}$ |
| 52 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | B | 27 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N} ; \mathrm{C}$ : calcd, 64.94; found, 63.04 |
| 53 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NHCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | $\mathrm{B}^{a}$ | 37 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{Cl} \cdot \\ & \mathrm{HCl} \end{aligned}$ | HPLC: $97.2 \%$; <br> CE: $95.3 \%^{a}$ |

${ }^{a}$ See Experimental Section. ${ }^{b}$ Overall yield from aminoalcohol 2 (methods A-D).
blocking action. Some of the compounds tested with promising antiarrhythmic actions and a range of apparent (in vivo) sodium and potassium channel blocking actions were further evaluated on cloned human heart sodium (Nav1.5) and potassium ( hKv 1.5 ) channels and on cloned rat potassium channels (Kv4.2 and Kv2.1) expressed in HEK cells (Table 6). Voltage-dependent potassium channels of the supergene family for calcium and sodium channels ${ }^{39}$ have regions of homology in the pore and voltage-sensing regions around the $\mathrm{S} 4-\mathrm{S} 6$ transmembrane domains. Two important currents involved in controlling the rat ventricle action potential duration are $I_{\text {to }}$ (transient outward) and $I_{\mathrm{Kur}}$ (ultrarapid delayed rectifier) currents. Kv4 class genes encode for the rapidly recovering $I_{\mathrm{to}}$. The $I_{\mathrm{Kur}}$ current appears to correlate with the product of the hKv 1.5 gene, ${ }^{15}$ although the role of the relatively noninactivating Kv2.1 in this current is still unclear. Concentration-response curves of selected compounds blocking actions were assessed on Nav1.5 sodium, hKv1.5, Kv4.2, and Kv2.1 potassium ion channels.

The efficacy for conversion of AF of the same group of compounds was evaluated in two canine AF models (Table 7). The vagal model ${ }^{21}$ is a method in which continuous vagal stimulation is combined with a burst of rapid atrial pacing to induce AF in otherwise normal canine hearts. Additionally, the effects of these compounds on the atrial and ventricular effective refractory period (ERP) were assessed (Figure 4). The canine sterile pericarditis AF model was also used. ${ }^{20}$ This canine model is prepared by dusting surgically exposed atria with talcum
powder, allowing the animal to recover, and then "burst" pacing the atria over a period of days after recovery. AF is inducible two days after surgery, however, by the fourth day after surgical preparation, sustainable FL is the predominant inducible rhythm.

Finally, a pharmacokinetic study of the selected compounds was performed in rats (Table 8).

## Results and Discussion

The antiarrhythmic activity in ischemia-induced arrhythmias and the threshold for convulsions in the rat for aminoethers $4-53$ are described in Table 4.

Most of the compounds tested in this focused library exhibited some antiarrhythmic activity in the ischemia-induced arrhythmia model, with $\mathrm{ED}_{50}$ values ranging from $0.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ for the most potent to $8.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ for the least potent. The safety of the compounds was then assessed by comparing the potency against arrhythmias $\left(\mathrm{ED}_{50}\right)$ with that for hemeodynamic effects $\left(\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{BP}\right)$ in the same anaesthetized rat model (when available) and with the threshold dose for convulsions in conscious rats (cumulative convulsive dose).

The following compounds were the most active aminoethers when tested intravenously ( $\mathrm{ED}_{50} \leq 1.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ ): 4, 5, 1012, 14, 26, 39, and 47-50.

However, 26 showed the best separation between antiarrhythmic efficacy ( $\mathrm{ED}_{50}=0.43 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ ) and threshold dose for convulsions (cumulative dose $=225 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ ). Another compound of interest 53 had the highest threshold for convul-

Scheme 5. Synthesis of cis-Aminoethers 46 and 49, Methods D and E


Scheme 6. Method for the Resolution of $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)-1$ -(1,4-Dioxa-7-azaspiro[4,4]non-7-yl)-2-(1-naphthalenethoxy)cyclohexane with Di-p-toluoyl-D/L-tartaric Acid and Preparation of Enantiomers 40 and 41

sions ( $392 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ ) and was also efficacious in the ischemiainduced arrhythmia model $\left(\mathrm{ED}_{50}=1.6 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}\right)$.

In comparison, quinidine, flecainide, lidocaine, and amiodarone showed poor separation between doses showing antiarrhythmic protection relative to side effects (Table 4).

Electrophysiological effects in electrically induced arrhythmias in the rat and maximum tolerated dose in mice are described in Table 5. $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ for the PR interval and $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ for the current threshold for induction of a systole (iT) are comparable throughout the series. Potency values for effects on PR interval

Scheme 7. General Synthesis of Aminoalcohols 2


2a-i
and iT range from $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{PR}=1.1 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ and $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{i} \mathrm{T}=0.8$ $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ for the most potent 10 to $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{PR}=23-26 \mu \mathrm{~mol} /$ $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ and $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{i} T=25 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ for the least potent pair 40 and 41.

All compounds lengthened the QT interval and prolonged ERP in the rat as shown in Table 5. Compounds $\mathbf{9}$ and $\mathbf{1 8}$ were most potent in this regard, with a $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ of $0.8,1.0$, and 0.5 and $1.4,1.4$, and $1.7 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$, respectively. The same compounds ( $\mathbf{9}$ and $\mathbf{1 8}$ ) showed a relatively weak effect on iT, with a $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ of 8.0 and $6.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$, respectively. All compounds were more potent in their effect on ERP than on the PR interval of the ECG.

Quinidine and flecainide decreased the systemic BP at the same low doses as they produce changes in ECG parameters, Flecainide was particularly toxic $\left(\mathrm{LD}_{50}=20 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}\right)$ and lidocaine lacked potency in that model (Table 5).

Electrical stimulation studies uncovered compounds with unique electrophysiological characteristics.

Compound 5 displayed good potency $\left(\mathrm{ED}_{50}=0.8 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} /\right.$ min ) and a steep dose response curve (Hill coefficient, $H=3$, Figure 3A) against ischemia-induced arrhythmias in the rat. It produced little effect on systemic arterial BP or ECG intervals when infused at a rate equal to the antiarrhythmic $\mathrm{ED}_{50}$. At this dose, it did not significantly alter ( $<10 \%$ increase) the current threshold for capture (iT) or ventricular ERP measured during electrical stimulation. Compound $\mathbf{5}$ affected indicators of block of both sodium and potassium channels when infused at a rate producing full protection ( $\mathrm{AS}=0$ at $4.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ ) against ischemia-induced arrhythmias in the rat. At this dose, indicators of possible channel blockade included a reduction in $\mathrm{BP}(-15 \%)$ accompanied by significant ( $+40 \%$ ) QT interval prolongation and less marked $(+10 \%)$ PR interval prolongation. Commensurate with these effects, the infusion rate producing a $25 \%$ change $\left(\mathrm{D}_{25}\right)$ in iT was $0.9 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$, and the $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ for ERP was $1.3 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$.

In conscious rats compound 5 caused convulsions when infused at a rate of $16 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ (cumulative dose $=93$


Figure 3. Antiarrhythmic activity ( $\mathbf{\Delta}$ ), iT or current threshold for induction of an extrasystole ( $\boldsymbol{\square}$ ), arterial BP ( $\boldsymbol{\bullet}$ ), and QT interval ( $\boldsymbol{\bullet}$ ) expressed as the $\%$ change from control following an incremental i.v. infusion in $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min} \pm \mathrm{SD}$ for compounds 5 (A), 18 (B), and 26 (C).

Scheme 8. Synthetic Pathway for the Preparation of 1,4-Dioxa-7-azaspiro[4.4]nonane 1e

$\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg})$. In mice, the maximum tolerated dose was $42 \mu \mathrm{~mol} /$ kg i.v. Compound $\mathbf{5}$ is an example of a compound with apparent combined sodium and potassium channel blocking actions, with partial ischemia selectivity.

18 displayed good potency $\left(\mathrm{ED}_{50}=1.5 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}\right)$ and a fairly steep dose response curve ( $H=2.3$, Figure 3B) against ischemia-induced arrhythmias in the rat. It produced no effect on BP or PR intervals, but did widen the QT interval when infused at a rate equal to the antiarrhythmic $\mathrm{ED}_{50}$. At this dose, it had no effect on iT, but did increase ERP ( $20 \%$ ) measured during electrical stimulation, an effect likely resulting from the blockade of cardiac potassium channels.

Compound $\mathbf{1 8}$ potently and selectively produced signs of blockade of the potassium channel when infused at a rate giving full protection ( $\mathrm{AS}=0.3$ at $4.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ ) against ischemiainduced arrhythmias in the rat. At this dose, there was no reduction in BP or increases in PR intervals, however, QT intervals were significantly prolonged ( $\sim 50 \%$ ). In keeping with these effects, the infusion rate producing a $25 \%$ change ( $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ ) in iT was $6.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ and the $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ for ERP was $1.7 \mu \mathrm{~mol} /$
$\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ (Table 5). In conscious rats, compound 18 caused convulsions at an infusion rate of $16 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ (cumulative dose $=118 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ ). In mice, the maximum tolerated dose was $228 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.v. This compound is an example of a compound with apparently more potent potassium channel than sodium channel blocking actions.

Finally, 26 is an example of a compound with potent potassium channel blocking actions combined to sodium channel blocking properties, the latter being elicited under ischemic conditions. Compound 26 also displayed good potency $\left(\mathrm{ED}_{50}\right.$ $=0.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ ) and a reasonable dose response curve ( $H$ $=1$, Figure 3C) against ischemia-induced arrhythmias in the rat, but had no effects on BP or any ECG intervals prior to ischemia when infused at a rate equal to the $\mathrm{ED}_{50}$. At this infusion rate, it also did not affect iT or ERP measured during electrical stimulation protocols in anaesthetized rats.
Compound $\mathbf{2 6}$ showed signs of preferential potassium channel block when infused at a rate giving full protection ( $\mathrm{AS}=0.7$ at $4.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ ) against ischemia-induced arrhythmias in the rat. At this dose, there were only minor reductions in BP

Table 4. Convulsion Threshold (CNS Toxicity) and Antiarrhythmic Activity (Ischemia-Induced Arrhythmia) in the Rat

$$
R^{3} \overbrace{2}^{4} \mathrm{NR}^{1} \mathrm{R}^{2} \mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{CHR}^{5} \mathrm{R}
$$

| cmpd | $\mathrm{R}^{1} \quad \mathrm{R}^{2}$ | R | $\mathrm{R}^{3} \quad \mathrm{R}^{4}$ | rel/abs conf. $\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | $n$ | $\mathrm{R}^{5}$ | R | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cum. } \\ & \text { conv. }{ }^{a} \end{aligned}$ | antiarrhythmic act. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | arrh. score ${ }^{d}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D}_{25} \\ & \mathrm{BP}^{b} \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{ED}_{50}{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 |
| 4 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthyl | 85 | 8.0 | 0.8 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 0.5 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 93 | ne ${ }^{g}$ | 0.8 | 4.9 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 0 |
| 6 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-bromophenyl | 91 | ne | 2.5 | 5.0 | nd ${ }^{h}$ | 3.0 | 2.3 |
| 7 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthoxy | 62 | 6.9 | ne | 6.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | nd |
| 8 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-bromophenoxy | 83 | ne | 2.5 | 4.8 | nd | 3.7 | 1.3 |
| 9 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | 113 | ne | 1.5 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| 10 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | nd | 2.0 | 0.9 | 5.8 | 2.6 | 0 | nd |
| 11 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3-benzo[b]thiophenyl | 65 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0 |
| 12 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-benzo[b]thiophenyl | 54 | ne | 0.7 | 6.3 | 2.7 | 1.0 | nd |
| 13 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3-bromophenyl | 131 | 7.8 | 1.9 | 6.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 1.0 |
| 14 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-bromophenyl | 125 | 8.0 | 1.0 | 6.3 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 15 | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2-} & \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2-} \\ \mathrm{OCH}_{3} & \mathrm{OCH}_{3} \end{array}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthyl | 83 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 6.3 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 7.0 |
| 16 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | 109 | 8.9 | 1.5 | 6.0 | 3.3 | 2.3 | 0.7 |
| 17 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthyl | 187 | ne | 1.5 | 6.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 1.7 |
| 18 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dichlorophenyl | 118 | ne | 1.5 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 0.3 |
| 19 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | 2,4-dimethoxyphenyl | 94 | 4.8 | 1.2 | 7.0 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 0 |
| 20 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4-benzo }[b]- \\ & \text { furanyl } \end{aligned}$ | nd | ne | 1.4 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 0.3 | 1.7 |
| 21 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | 4-bromophenyl | 143 | ne | 3.5 | 5.0 | nd | 4.3 | 2.7 |
| 22 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 3 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | 67 | ne | 1.5 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 |
| 23 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{~N}\left(\mathrm{COCH}_{3}\right)- \\ \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthyl | 67 | 6.0 | ne | 4.8 | 3.1 | 5.0 | 1.0 |
| 24 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,4-dichlorophenyl | 94 | 7.4 | 2.1 | 6.3 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 1.3 |
| 25 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,6-dichlorophenyl | 86 | 5.4 | 1.2 | 7.0 | 4.3 | 2.0 | 0 |
| 26 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 225 | 10 | 0.4 | 5.3 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 0.7 |
| 27 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3-benzo[b]thiophenyl | 203 | 5.0 | ne | 5.6 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 0 |
| 28 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-bromophenyl | 155 | 6.9 | ne | 4.3 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 0.7 |
| 29 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | H | $n-\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{9}$ |  | 1 | H | 4-bromophenyl | 193 | ne | ne | 6.0 | nd | 3.0 | 4.3 |
| 30 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,4-dibromophenyl | 123 | ne | ne | 6.0 | nd | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| 31 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | cis | 1 | H | 4-bromophenyl | 67 | ne | 2.0 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 1.0 |
| 32 |  |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | $41^{e}$ | ne | nd | nd | nd | nd | nd |
| 33 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | cis | 1 | H | 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl | 102 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 6.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 0.7 |
| 34 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | cyclohexyl | 300 | 5.3 | ne | 4.3 | nd | 2.7 | 4.0 |
| 35 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,4-dibromophenyl | 246 | ne | ne | 6.3 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 3.7 |
| 36 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}\left(\mathrm{OCOCH}_{3}\right)- \\ \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 65 | ne | 1.4 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 1.7 | 0 |
| 37 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-bromophenyl | 161 | ne | 8.0 | 6.3 | nd | 4.7 | 3.3 |
| 38 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | 235 | ne | 4.5 | 7.0 | nd | 5.0 | 2.7 |
| 39 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl | 134 | ne | 1.0 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| 40 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | $1 R, 2 R$ | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 193 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 6.5 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 0.7 |

Table 4. (Continued)


| cmpd | $\mathrm{R}^{1} \quad \mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{3} \quad \mathrm{R}^{4}$ | rel/abs conf. $\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | $n \quad \mathrm{R}^{5}$ |  | R | cum. conv. ${ }^{a}$ | antiarrhythmic act. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | arrh. score ${ }^{d}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D}_{25} \\ & \mathrm{BP}^{b} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\mathrm{ED}_{50}{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 |
| 41 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | $1 S, 2 S$ | 1 | H |  | 1-naphthyl | 150 | ne | 1.9 | 6.0 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 1.3 |
| 42 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{SCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H |  | 2,6-dichlorophenyl | 331 | ne | 6.5 | 7.0 | nd | 5.7 | 5.7 |
| 43 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | phenyl | phenyl | 155 | ne | 2.5 | 6.0 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 2.0 |
| 44 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl | 225 | ne | 2.7 | 6.3 | nd | 3.7 | 2.0 |
| 45 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-bromo-naphth-1-yl | 246 | 8.0 | 2.8 | 6.0 | nd | 4.3 | 1.3 |
| 46 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | cis | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 145 | 7.0 | 1.6 | 5.3 | nd | 3.0 | 0 |
| 47 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHOHCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-bromophenyl | 67 | ne | 0.4 | 5.5 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 0 |
| 48 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 75 | ne | 0.9 | 6.3 | 3.3 | 0 | nd |
| 49 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHOHCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | cis | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | $70^{f}$ | ne | 0.4 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 1.7 | nd |
| 50 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHOHCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 67 | ne | 0.8 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 1.3 | nd |
| 51 |  | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | 91 | ne | 1.6 | 6.5 | 3.7 | 2.0 | 0 |
| 52 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | 118 | ne | 1.3 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 2.3 | nd |
| 53 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NHCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | 392 | ne | 1.6 | 6.3 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 2.0 |
| quinidine |  |  |  |  |  |  | 317 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 3.2 | 2.8 |
| flecainide ${ }^{i}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 113 | 2.5 | ne |  | 4.3 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| lidocaine |  |  |  |  |  |  | 190 | 5.9 | 4.5 |  | 3.6 | 4.8 | 3.8 |
| amiodarone |  |  |  |  |  |  | ne | $4.0{ }^{j}$ | ne | 5.7 | nd | nd | 4.3 |

${ }^{a}$ Cumulative convulsion dose, $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.v. ${ }^{b}$ Lowest dose ( $D$ ) producing a $25 \%$ change in BP from the predrug value ( $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{BP}$ ), expressed in $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ i.v. The precision of estimates (SEM/mean) $\times 100$ is $38 \%$. ${ }^{c}$ Dose $(D)$ required to provide $50 \%$ of maximum protection, expressed in $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ i.v. The precision of estimates (SEM/mean) $\times 100$ is $52 \%$. ${ }^{d}$ See Experimental Section for scoring system. ${ }^{e}$ Paralyzed. ${ }^{f}$ Died. ${ }^{g}$ Not estimable. ${ }^{h}$ Not done. ${ }^{i}$ Doses for antiarrhythmic score are $0.75,1.5$, and $3.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ i.v. ${ }^{j}$ Dose $(D)$ producing a $10 \%$ change in BP from the predrug value ( $\mathrm{D}_{10} \mathrm{BP}$ ), expressed in $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ i.v.
and slight increases in PR intervals, however, QT intervals were significantly prolonged ( $20-40 \%$ ). The infusion rate producing a $25 \%$ change $\left(\mathrm{D}_{25}\right)$ in iT was $5 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ and the $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ for ERP was $1.6 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ (Table 5). In conscious rats, compound 26 caused convulsions when infused at a rate of 32 $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ (cumulative dose $=225 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ ). In mice, the maximum tolerated dose was $227 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.v.

The blocking actions of compounds $\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{1 8}$, and $\mathbf{2 6}$ on cloned sodium and potassium channels were studied on transfected HEK cells (Table 6). Compound $\mathbf{5}$ inhibited sodium ( $\mathrm{IC}_{50} \mathrm{Nav} 1.5$ $=4.0 \mu \mathrm{M})$ and potassium $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{50}\right.$ s for hKv 1.5 , rKv 4.2 , and rKv 2.1 were $1.3,17$, and $3.2 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively) currents in a similar way as observed in vivo (vide supra), supporting the concept of compound $\mathbf{5}$ being a combined sodium and potassium channel blocker. Compounds 18 and 26 showed a preference for potassium currents ( $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ s for hKv 1.5 , rKv 4.2 , and rKv 2.1 were 3.6, 11, and 2.4 and $4.3,8.9$, and $2.8 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively) as opposed to sodium current $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{50} \mathrm{Nav} 1.5\right.$ of 15 and $25 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively). These results agreed with in vivo electrophysiological data and suggest compounds $\mathbf{1 8}$ and $\mathbf{2 6}$ as compounds with relatively more potent potassium channel than sodium channel blocking actions. This sets the two compounds apart from other comparable reference antiarrhymthic agents (Table 6), quinidine, flecainide, and lidocaine, which are all more potent sodium than potassium channel blocking agents. In addition, neither flecainide nor lidocaine have therapeutically signifinant action on Kv1.5 channels, an important atria-selective potassium channel target.

Compounds 5, 18, and 26, characterized by a range of potassium channel versus sodium channel blocking actions, were then studied in the vagal and sterile pericarditis canine AF models to elucidate which relative balance of channel blockade was the most appropriate for termination of AF.

Canine Models of Atrial Fibrillation. None of the compounds 5, 18, and $\mathbf{2 6}$ reduced BP or heart rate at the median dose for termination of vagal AF. The heart rate response to vagal nerve stimulation was similar in all groups and was not influenced by any of the compounds tested. Vagal nerve stimulation at $60 \%$ of the voltage required to produce asystole ( $10 \pm 1 \mathrm{~V}$ ) produced a $1.3 \pm 0.1 \mathrm{~s}$ pause.

All drugs tested were effective, but the efficacy for terminating AF was slightly greater for $\mathbf{1 8}$ than for 5 and 26 (Table 7). The dose required to terminate AF depended on the drug tested (Table 7). At effective doses, all of the drugs tested prolonged atrial ERP (Figure 4). In all cases, ERP was reduced during vagal nerve stimulation and none of the compounds had a significant effect on ERP of the ventricle (Figure 4).

The same compounds were effective in terminating episodes of $\mathrm{AF} / \mathrm{FL}$ in the sterile pericarditis-induced AF model (Table 7). Compounds $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{1 8}$ terminated eight out of eight episodes of AF/FL after $8 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ and seven out of seven episodes after $10 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$, respectively. Compound 26 was slightly less potent and efficacious, terminating four out of five episodes of AF/ FL at $14 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$. The efficacy of these compounds is likely

Table 5. Activities on BP, ECG Parameters ( $\mathrm{PR}, \mathrm{QT}_{1}, \mathrm{QT}_{2}$ ), and Electrical Stimulations (iT, ERP) in Electrically-Induced Arrhythmias in the Rat and Maximum Tolerated Dose (MTD) in Mice


| cmpd | $\mathrm{R}^{1} \quad \mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{R}^{3} \quad \mathrm{R}^{4}$ | rel/abs conf. $\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | $n$ | $\mathrm{R}^{5}$ | R | activities: $\mathrm{D}_{25}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | MTD ${ }^{\text {g }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{BP}^{b}$ | $\mathrm{PR}^{c}$ | $\mathrm{QT}_{1}{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $\mathrm{QT}_{2}{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $\mathrm{iT}^{e}$ | ERPf |  |
| 4 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthyl | 8.0 | ne ${ }^{h}$ | 2.8 | 1.5 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 130 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 5.0 | 5.6 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 42 |
| 6 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-bromophenyl | 16 | 32 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 4.0 | 103 |
| 8 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-bromophenoxy | 11 | 15 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 1.8 | $n d^{i}$ |
| 9 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | 21 | 21 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 8.0 | 0.5 | 97 |
| 10 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 2.8 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | nd |
| 11 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3-benzo[b]thiophenyl | 5.2 | 7.1 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 52 |
| 12 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 4-benzo [b]thiophenyl | 5.4 | 4.6 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 38 |
| 13 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3-bromophenyl | 24 | 32 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 1.5 | nd |
| 14 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-bromophenyl | 22 | 32 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 11 | 1.5 | 86 |
| 16 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl | ne | 11 | 2.8 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 112 |
| 17 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-naphthyl | 23 | 45 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 2.5 | nd |
| 18 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3,4-dichlorophenyl | ne | ne | 1.4 | 1.4 | 6.4 | 1.7 | 228 |
| 19 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | 2,4-dimethoxyphenyl | 9.4 | 8.1 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 56 |
| 20 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4-benzo }[b]- \\ & \text { furanyl } \end{aligned}$ | 7.0 | 5.8 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 1.3 | nd |
| 21 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 2 | H | 4-bromophenyl | 24 | 23 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 14 | 1.6 | 209 |
| 24 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,4-dichlorophenyl | 18 | ne | 3.5 | 4.1 | 7.4 | 3.6 | nd |
| 25 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,6-dichlorophenyl | 4.6 | 10 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 76 |
| 26 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | ne | 16 | 4.4 | 2.4 | 5.0 | 1.6 | 227 |
| 27 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 3-benzo[b]thiophenyl | 12 | 24 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.0 | nd |
| 40 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | $1 R, 2 R$ | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 7.6 | 26 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 25 | 2.9 | nd |
| 41 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | $1 S, 2 S$ | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | ne | 23 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 25 | 2.3 | nd |
| 42 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{SCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2,6-dichlorophenyl | 25 | 2.3 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 5.4 | nd |
| 47 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CHOHCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 2-bromophenyl | > 16 | 2.4 | 0.75 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.8 | nd |
| 48 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{4}$ | trans | 1 | H | 1-naphthyl | 7.0 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.3 | nd |
| quinidine |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 100 |
| flecainide |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.7 | 2.8 | ne | 3.2 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 20 |
| lidocaine |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.0 | ne | ne | ne | 11 | 6.9 | 64 |

${ }^{a}$ Corresponds to the lowest dose $(D)$ required to produce a $25 \%$ change from the predrug value, expressed in $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ i.v. ${ }^{b}$ Arterial BP. The precision of estimates (SEM/mean) $\times 100$ is $38 \%$. ${ }^{c} \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}$ interval. The precision of estimates (SEM/mean) $\times 100$ is $23 \%$. ${ }^{d} \mathrm{QT}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{QT}_{2}$ intervals. The precision of estimates (SEM/mean) $\times 100$ are $23 \%$. ${ }^{e}$ Current threshold for induction of an extrasystole. The precision of estimates (SEM/mean) $\times 100$ is $25 \%$. ${ }^{f}$ Effective refractory period. The precision of estimates (SEM/mean) $\times 100$ is $21 \% .{ }^{g}$ Dose producing $50 \%$ lethalities in mice, expressed in $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.v. ${ }^{h}$ Not estimable. ${ }^{i}$ Not done.
connected to their ability to prolong atrial refractoriness. The compounds were well tolerated, with no adverse cardiovascular events.

From those results, it was difficult to select one compound over the others because of their similar efficacy in both canine AF models. Thus, pharmacokinetics studies were carried out to evaluate the oral bioavailability and, hence, the clinical utility of compounds 5,18 , and 26 .

Pharmacokinetics Studies. In rats, compounds 5 and 18 had a very low absolute oral bioavailability, 4 and $7 \%$, respectively, whereas the racemate 26 displayed a moderate plasma clearance, a high volume of distribution at steady-state, and a moderate to high bioavailability ( $58 \%$, Table 8 ). Because the pharmacoki-
netics of single enantiomers can be stereospecific, and a superior pharmacokinetics of one enantiomer compared to the other or to the racemate cannot be excluded per se, the pharmacokinetics of the pure enantiomers (compounds 40 and 41 ) of racemate 26 were examined. The mean plasma clearance following i.v. administration was moderate for enantiomer $41(30.2 \pm 5.2 \mathrm{~mL} /$ $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min})$ and high for enantiomer $40(59.3 \pm 4.5 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min})$. The mean volume of distribution at steady-state $\left(\mathrm{Vd}_{\mathrm{ss}}\right)$ for racemate 26 and enantiomer $41(4.5 \pm 1.1 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{kg}$ and $2.6 \pm 0.9$, respectively) was high, while that for enantiomer $\mathbf{4 0}(8.3 \pm 4.6$ $\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{kg}$ ) was even higher, indicating an extensive distribution into tissues. Absolute oral bioavailability was moderate to high for racemate $26(58 \%)$ as well as for enantiomer 41 (32\%), whereas


Figure 4. Atrial selectivity in the vagal AF canine model. The \% change from control for right A-ERP without vagal stimulation (gray), right A-ERP with vagatonic stimulation (black), and left V-ERP (white) at the effective dose for compounds $\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{1 8}, \mathbf{2 6}$, and $\mathbf{4 1}$. $*$ *Data are from the top dose $8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$. Values are shown as the mean $\pm \mathrm{SEM}, n=$ 4-6.

Table 6. $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ for Cloned Channels Expressed in HEK Cells for Compounds 5, 18, 26, 40, 41, and Three Reference Compounds

|  | $\mathrm{IC}_{50}, \mu \mathrm{M}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cmpd | $\mathrm{Nav1.5}^{a}$ | $\mathrm{hKv} 1.5^{a}$ | $\mathrm{rKv} 4.2^{b}$ | $\mathrm{rKv} 2.1^{b}$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 4.0 | 1.3 | 17 | 3.2 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 15 | 3.6 | 11 | 2.4 |
| $\mathbf{2 6}$ | 25 | 4.3 | 8.9 | 2.8 |
| $\mathbf{4 0}$ | 11 | 5.9 | 11 | 6.0 |
| $\mathbf{4 1}$ | 13 | 7.7 | 9.0 | 8.0 |
| quinidine | 6.9 | 7.3 | 2.2 | $\mathrm{nd}^{c}$ |
| flecainide | 6.5 | 51 | 10.1 | $\mathrm{nd}^{1}$ |
| lidocaine | 108 | 2188 | 1210 | nd |

${ }^{a}$ Cloned human channel. The precision of estimates (SEM/mean) $\times 100$ is $15 \%$ for Nav1.5 and $14 \%$ for Kv1.5. ${ }^{b}$ Cloned rat channel. The precision of estimates (SEM/mean) $\times 100$ is $7 \%$ for Kv4.2 and Kv2.1. ${ }^{c}$ Not done.

Table 7. Efficacy in Conversion of $\mathrm{AF} / \mathrm{FL}^{a}$ in Canine AF Models by Compounds 5, 18, and 26

|  | vagal AF model |  |  | sterile pericarditis AF model |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cmpd | efficacy $^{b}$ | mean dose $^{c}$ |  | efficacy $^{b}$ | mean dose $^{c}$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $5 / 6$ | $16 \pm 7$ |  | $8 / 8$ | $8 \pm 2$ |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $6 / 6$ | $17 \pm 5$ |  | $7 / 7$ | $10 \pm 3$ |
| $\mathbf{2 6}$ | $4 / 6$ | 20 |  | $4 / 5$ | $14 \pm 6$ |

${ }^{a}$ FL stand for atrial flutter. ${ }^{b}$ Efficacy expressed as [number of dogs that converted from AF or FL to normal sinus rhythm]/[number of treated dogs]. ${ }^{c}$ Mean dose $\pm$ standard deviation for the converted dogs in $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.v.

Table 8. Pharmacokinetic Parameters for Compounds 5, 18, 26, 40, and 41

| cmpd | iv dose, ${ }^{a}$ <br> $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | $T_{1 / 2},{ }^{,}$ <br> h | $\mathrm{Vd}_{\mathrm{ss}},{ }^{c}$ <br> $\mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{kg}$ | $\mathrm{CL},{ }^{d}$ <br> $\mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ | p.o. dose, ${ }^{a}$ <br> $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ | $F,{ }^{e}$ <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $12(2)$ | 6.5 | $29 \pm 13$ | $50.1 \pm 7.0$ | $24(2)$ | 4 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $12(3)$ | 4.5 | $19 \pm 3$ | $48.5 \pm 6.8$ | $24(3)$ | 7 |
| $\mathbf{2 6}$ | $17(3)$ | 6.3 | $4.5 \pm 1.1$ | $38.7 \pm 8.1$ | $34(3)$ | 58 |
| $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $17(3)$ | 3.8 | $8.3 \pm 4.6$ | $59.3 \pm 4.5$ | $34(3)$ | 6 |
| $\mathbf{4 1}$ | $17(3)$ | 1.0 | $2.6 \pm 0.9$ | $30.2 \pm 5.2$ | $34(3)$ | 32 |

${ }^{a}$ Number of animals in parentheses. ${ }^{b}$ Half-life expressed as the harmonic mean. ${ }^{c}$ Mean volume of distribution at steady-state $\pm$ standard deviation. ${ }^{d}$ Mean plasma clearance $\pm$ standard deviation. ${ }^{e}$ Absolute oral bioavailability.
enantiomer 40 showed a very low absolute oral bioavailability ( $6 \%$ ). Assuming a blood to plasma ratio of about $0.9,{ }^{40}$ a hepatic blood flow of $60 \pm 11 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$, and solely hepatic metabolism, maximal achievable oral bioavailability of enantiomer $\mathbf{4 1}$ would be $44 \%$. If this assumption holds
true for enantiomer 40, clearance would be in the range of hepatic blood flow and, therefore, would explain the very low oral bioavailability.

Atrial selectivity of enantiomer 41 in the vagal AF model was then examined (Figure 4). Preliminary results showed that compound 41 was atrial selective at the maximum dose of 8 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, but failed to convert AF at the same dose in the canine vagal model.

Structure-Activity Relationships. The ischemia-induced arrhythmias and threshold for convulsion rat data (Table 4) and electrically induced arrhythmias rat data (Table 5) suggested the following structure-activity relationships.
$\mathbf{R}^{1}$ and $\mathbf{R}^{2}$ Substituents. The presence of a pyrrolidinyl group in compound $\mathbf{1 0}$ provided the same antiarrhythmic protection as that observed with a morpholinyl group (compound 5), but this substitution resulted in greater potency for PR interval widening and systemic arterial hypotension. Similarly, replacement of the 3-pyrrolidinone group in compound 26 with the 4-piperidone group (compound 48) did not affect the antiarrhythmic activity but decreased the threshold for convulsion and $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{PR}$, indicative of potentially increased sodium channel block in the brain. Reduction of the 3-pyrrolidinone group (compound 26) to 3-pyrrolidinol (compound 50) increased CNS toxicity, and acetylation of the 3-pyrrolidinol (compound 36) did not improve the safety toward the CNS nor did it affect antiarrhythmic actions.

Interestingly, replacement of the morpholinyl group in compound 9 by a 1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4,4]non-7-yl or pyrrolidinyl groups (compound 51 and 52, respectively) did not affect threshold for convulsions or antiarrhythmic actions. However, substitution with a 3-pyrrolidinone group (compound 38) increased threshold for convulsion but significantly reduced antiarrhythmic protection. Replacement by a piperazinyl group (compound 53) dramatically increased the therapeutic index, both thresholds for convulsions and antiarrhythmic potency increased by approximately 3 -fold, relative to compound 38.

In another series, replacement of the morpholinyl group of compound $\mathbf{4}$ with a bis(2-methoxyethyl)amino (compound 15) or a N -acetylpiperazinyl group (compound 23) resulted in a loss in antiarrhythmic activity. Yet in another series, replacement of the morpholinyl group of compound $\mathbf{2 5}$ with a thiazolidinyl group (compound 42) increased the CNS safety but to the detriment of the antiarrhythmic efficacy.
$\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{3}}$ and $\mathbf{R}^{4}$ Substituents. Replacement of the cyclohexyl linker of compound $\mathbf{4}$ with a cyclopentyl linker (compound 17) led to a less active compound and decreased sodium channel block ( $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{PR}$ ) but greater safety in terms of reduced CNS toxicity and hemeodynamic effects $\left(\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{BP}\right)$.

Replacement of the cyclohexyl linker of compound 6 with an acyclic linker (compound 29) resulted in a complete loss of antiarrhythmic activity. Switching from a trans-geometry in compounds 6, 26, 39, and 50 to a cis-geometry (compounds $\mathbf{3 1}, \mathbf{4 6}, \mathbf{3 3}$, and 49, respectively) did not alter significantly the antiarrhythmic activity, but tended to slightly reduce the threshold dose for convulsions.

The influence of the absolute configuration was evaluated for enantiomers 40 and 41 . There were no significant differences in terms of antiarrhythmic activity or in vivo electrophysiological profile. In vitro electrophysiological studies in HEK cells (Table 6) of the two enantiomers 40 and 41 confirmed these findings. However, pharmacokinetics studies showed some stereospecificity with superior pharmacokinetics for enantiomer 41 (Table 8).

Homologation. The 3,4-dimethoxyphenethoxy substituent in 9 was homologated by increasing (analogues 16 and 22) the number of methylene groups between the oxygen atom and the phenyl ring. Similarly, the 4-bromophenethoxy substituent in 6 was homologated by adding one methylene group (analogue 21). In all cases, the analogues 16, 22, and 21 exhibited similar antiarrhythmic actions and a threshold dose for convulsions relative to that of $\mathbf{9}$ and $\mathbf{6}$, respectively. Nevertheless, compounds 16 and 21 showed a concomitant slight increase in apparent sodium channel block (reduced $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{PR}$ ) and a slight decrease in apparent potassium channel block (increased $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{QT}$ ) relative to that of 9 and $\mathbf{6}$, respectively.

The effect of introducing branching into the phenethoxy substituent was tested by examining the 2,2-diphenylethoxy derivative $\mathbf{4 3}$ and was found to result in reduced antiarrhythmic activity as compared to that of $\mathbf{2 6}$.

The effect of introducing an oxygen atom between the phenyl ring and the ethoxy linker was evaluated by comparing analogues 7 (2-naphthoxy) and 8 (4-bromophenoxy) with 4 (2naphthyl) and 6 (4-bromophenyl), respectively. Although the antiarrhythmic activity of $\mathbf{8}$ was comparable to that of $\mathbf{6}$, all $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ values of $\mathbf{8}$ relative to $\mathbf{6}$ in electrical stimulation studies were reduced, which was indicative of an apparent increase of potency for sodium and potassium channel block, effects which were presumed to be deleterious to the safety of the compound.

R Substituent. Isosteric replacement of the 1-naphthyl group in 5 with the 4-benzo[b]thiophenyl or the 4-benzo[b]furanyl groups resulted in analogues $\mathbf{1 2}$ and $\mathbf{2 0}$, respectively. The antiarrhythmic activities of $\mathbf{1 2}$ and $\mathbf{2 0}$ in ischemia- and electrically induced arrhythmias in the rat were comparable to 5 . Similarly, replacement of the 4-benzo[b]thiophenyl group in $\mathbf{1 2}$ with the isomeric 3-benzo[b]thiophenyl substituent resulted in analogue 11, which exhibited identical antiarrhythmic properties as those of 12. Comparison of the 3-benzo[b]thiophenyl analogue 27 with the 1-naphthyl analogue 26 led to the same observation, both compounds were equally efficacious against ischemia- and electrically induced arrhythmias.

Attachment at the 1-position of the naphthalene for $\mathbf{5}$ or at the 2-position for $\mathbf{4}$ did not have any significant changes in terms of antiarrhythmic protection. However, attachment to the 1-position (compound 5 ) resulted in a slight increase in sodium channel block, as indicated by a reduced $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{i} \mathrm{T}$, and was corroborated by a concomitant higher toxicity $\left(\mathrm{LD}_{50}\right)$ compared to 4 .

The effect of the nature of the substituents on the phenethoxy group was evaluated by comparing analogues 9 (3,4-dimethoxy), 14 (2-bromo), and $\mathbf{2 4}$ (2,4-dichloro) with 18 (3,4-dichloro), 39 (2-trifluoromethyl), and $\mathbf{3 0}$ (2,4-dibromo) in the morpholino ether series, respectively. In all cases, no significant changes in antiarrhythmic actions were observed. The same statement can be made when comparing analogues 28 (2-bromophenyl) and 44 (2-trifluoromethyl) in the 3-pyrrolidinone series.

The effect of the position of the substituents on the phenethoxy group was tested by examining derivatives 6 (4-bromo), 13 (3-bromo), and 14 (2-bromo), as well as derivatives 16 (3,4dimethoxy) and 19 (2,4-dimethoxy), and derivatives 18 (3,4dichloro), 24 (2,4-dichloro), and 25 (2,6-dichloro) in the morpholino ether series. The bromine derivatives did not differ from one another in terms of antiarrhythmic properties, whereas the 2,4-dimethoxy derivative seemed to be characterized by a slight increase in potency for indicators of channel blockade (sodium and potassium) accompanied by an increased toxicity $\left(\mathrm{LD}_{50}\right)$. Interestingly, the dichloro derivatives showed some in vivo electrophysiological differences. Within this series, the 3,4-
disubstitution (compound 18) had the most potassium blocking effects, whereas the 2,6-disubstitution (compound 25) led to the most sodium blocking effects and most toxicity $\left(\mathrm{LD}_{50}\right)$ of these three dichloro derivatives. The 2,4-disubstituted derivative (compound 24) combined both the sodium and the potassium blocking actions of $\mathbf{1 8}$ and $\mathbf{2 5}$, respectively. In the 3-pyrrolidinone series, analogue 28 (2-bromo) and 37 (4-bromo) were both poor antiarrhythmics. Finally, bromination of the naphthyl ring in the 4-position (compound 45) diminished antiarrhythmic activity compared to $\mathbf{2 6}$, and substitution of the aromatic ring by an alicyclic ring (compound 34 ) abolished all antiarrhythmic properties.

It is apparent from the structure-activity relationships that for a molecule to be active in our screening platform, it should have the following attributes: (1) an aromatic ring, (2) a basic nitrogen, and (3) a linker to connect the aromatic ring and the basic nitrogen in a "semirigid folded conformation". The necessity of an aromatic ring (1) is exemplified by compound 34, which has an alicyclic ring instead of an aromatic ring and was inactive in the ischemia-induced arrhythmia model. Compound 42 illustrated the need of a basic nitrogen (2); the lone pair of the nitrogen is delocalized by the transannular effect of the sulfur, which was deleterious to antiarrhythmic activity. Finally, the prerequisite of a "semirigid folded conformation" was demonstrated by acyclic derivative $\mathbf{2 9}$, which did not have any antiarrhythmic actions.

More specifically, a trans-configuration seemed to be preferred to a cis-configuration in terms of toxicity. All cis-isomers $(31,33,46$, and 49$)$ showed a slightly lower threshold dose for convulsions compared to their respective trans-isomers ( $\mathbf{6}, \mathbf{3 9}$, 26, and 50).

The potency on sodium channel activity correlates well with the basicity of the nitrogen. For example, compound $\mathbf{1 0}$, which has a pyrrolidine ring, was characterized by low $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ values for BP, PR interval, and iT, indicative of potent sodium channel block. The lone pair of the nitrogen in the morpholino group of analogue 5 is delocalized by the transannular and inductive effect of the oxygen atom, which results in a slightly lower pKa and a higher $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ value for the PR interval (Table 5). For analogue 26, the lone pair of the nitrogen is even more delocalized by the ketone in 3-position, than in $\mathbf{5}$, and resulted in increased $\mathrm{D}_{25}$ values for the PR interval and iT, compared to those of 5 .

However, the nature of prerequisites (1) and (2) have to be combined judiciously to design an effective and safe antiarrhythmic. For example, a combination of the 3-pyrrolidinone fragment with the naphthalene ring generated compound 26 which was potent $\left(\mathrm{ED}_{50}=0.43 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}\right)$ and relatively safe (cumulative convulsive dose $=225 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ ). However, on one hand, an increase of the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ and of the hydrophilic surrounding of the nitrogen, as in $\mathbf{5 0}$, was deleterious to the safety (cumulative convulsive dose $=67 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg}$ ). On the other hand, replacement of the hydrophobic 1-naphthyl group by the more hydrophilic 3,4-dimethoxyphenyl group, as in 38, was detrimental to the antiarryhthmic activity $\left(\mathrm{ED}_{50}=4.5 \mu \mathrm{~mol} /\right.$ $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ ).

In conclusion, the antiarrhythmic properties of a new class of antiarrhythmic agents has been described. Structure-activity studies in this aminoether series led to the identification of three compounds, $\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{1 8}$, and 26, that exhibited novel and potentially promising antiarrhythmic properties in two AF canine models. Of these analogues, the racemate 26 was selected on the basis of its absolute oral bioavailability. The racemate 26 was subsequently resolved into its two enantiomers 40 and 41, and
each one of them was profiled for their antiarrhythmic activity and pharmacokinetics. ( $1 S, 2 S$ )-1-(1-Naphthalenethoxy)-2-(3ketopyrrolidinyl)cyclohexane monohydrochloride (41) through a frequency dependent block of sodium channels ( $\mathrm{IC}_{50} \mathrm{Nav} 1.5$ $>10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ at 1 Hz ) and a concomitant block of rapid potassium channels $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{50}<10 \mu \mathrm{M}\right.$ for $\mathrm{Kv} 1.5,2.1$ and 4.2$)$ can potentially convert AF episodes back to normal sinus rhythm and was chosen for further investigation.

## Experimental Section

Melting points were determined on a Fisher-Johns apparatus and are uncorrected. NMR spectra were acquired in the indicated solvent on a Bruker AC-200, Varian XL-300, Bruker AV-300, or AV-400. Mass spectra were recorded for EI on a Kratos MS50, for FAB/LSIMS on a Kratos Concept IIHQ and for ES on a Micromass (Waters) Quattro (I) MS/MS, connected to a HP1090 Series 2 LC (Agilent), controlled by Masslynx version 3.3 software. Elemental analyses were performed on an Element Analyzer 1108 by D. \& H. Malhow, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB. Where analyses are indicated only by symbols of the elements, analytical results were within $\pm 0.4 \%$ of the theoretical values. Whenever elemental analyses were not available, purity was determined by HPLC and capillary electrophoresis (CE). HPLC analyses were performed using a Gilson HPLC system (Gilson, Middleton, WI) with UV detection at 200 nm . A C 18 column with $150 \times 4.6 \mathrm{~mm}$, $5 \mu$ particle size was used. The mobile phase was delivered isocratically or as a gradient at a flow rate of $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ and consisted of a combination of phosphate buffer (low or high pH ) and acetonitrile. Samples were prepared at $\sim 100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ in mobile phase, and $20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ were injected into the HPLC. Purity was expressed in area \%. CE analyses were performed using a P/ACE System MDQ (Beckman Coulter, Fullerton, CA). Uncoated silica capillaries with a 60 ( 50 to detector) cm length and a $75 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ internal diameter were used for chemical purity. The run buffer used was 100 mM sodium phosphate ( pH 2.5 ). The separation voltage was either 23 or 25 kV (normal polarity), and the capillary cartridge temperature was maintained at $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Samples $(\sim 0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ in water) were injected by pressure at 0.5 psi for 6 s. Detection was by UV at 200 or 213 nm . Purity was expressed in area \%. Enantiomeric excess was determined by chiral CE using 5\% highly sulfated $\gamma$-cylodextrin at 20 kV (reverse polarity) with a 30 ( 20 to detector) cm length and a $50 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ internal diameter capillary at 214 nm . IR was recorded on a Perkin-Elmer 983 G spectrophotometer. Optical rotations were performed by F. Hoffman-La Roche, Ltd. (CH, Basel). Thin layer chromatography (TLC) was performed on E. Merck, TLC aluminum sheets $20 \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}$, silica gel $60 \mathrm{~F}_{254}$ plates, using $\mathrm{UV}_{254 \mathrm{~nm}}$ and/or $\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}$ as visualizing agents. Flash chromatography ${ }^{41}$ was performed on E. M. Science silica gel 60 (70-230 mesh). Dry flash chromatography ${ }^{42}$ was performed with Sigma silica gel type H. Chromatotron chromatography (Harisson Research, U.S.A.) was performed on 4 mm plate with E. M. Science silica gel 60P $\mathrm{F}_{254}$ with gypsum or aluminum oxide 60P $\mathrm{F}_{254}$ with gypsum (type E). Preparative HPLCs were performed on a Waters Delta Prep 4000 with a cartridge column (porasil, $10 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 125 \AA, 40 \mathrm{~mm} \times 100$ $\mathrm{mm})$. GC analyses were performed on a Hewlett-Packard HP 6890 equipped with $30 \mathrm{~m} \times 0.25 \mathrm{~mm} \times 0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ capillary column HP35 (crosslinked 35\% PH ME siloxane) and a flame-ionization detector. Chemicals were purchased from Aldrich, Lancaster, or Acros. High-boiling solvents (DMF, DMSO) were Sure/Seal from Aldrich, and tetrahydrofuran (THF) and DME were distilled from sodium-benzophenone ketyl. Organic extracts were dried with $\mathrm{Na}_{2}-$ $\mathrm{SO}_{4}$ unless otherwise noted. All moisture-sensitive reactions were performed in dried glassware under a nitrogen or argon atmosphere.

Chemistry. $N$-Benzyloxycarbonyl-3-pyrrolidinol (1b). To a cold $\left(-60{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of $\mathbf{1 a}(20.0 \mathrm{~g}, 225 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(79$ $\mathrm{mL}, 560 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise a solution of benzyl chloroformate ( $34 \mathrm{~mL}, 225 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(80 \mathrm{~mL})$. After the addition was completed within 45 min , the reaction mixture (a yellow suspension) was allowed to warm up to room temperature and was stirred under argon at room temperature
overnight. The reaction mixture was then quenched with 1 M aq $\mathrm{HCl}(350 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic layer was collected. The acidic aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were dried. Evaporation in vacuo of the solvent provided 59.6 g of pale yellow oil, which was further pumped under high vacuum for 15 min to yield 58.2 g ( $17 \%$ over theoretical yield) of $\mathbf{1 b}$ suitable for the next step without any further purification. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.42\left(\mathrm{EtOAc}-i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}, 98: 2, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (200 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.40-7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.10(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.40(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.60-3.40(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.80(\mathrm{~d}, J=15 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.00-1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 137.0(+), 128.5(-), 127.5(-)$, $71.0(-), 70.0(-), 66.5(+), 55.0(+), 54.5(+), 44.0(+), 43.5$ $(+), 34.0(+), 33.5(+)$; IR (film) 3415 (broad), $1678 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
$\boldsymbol{N}$-Benzyloxycarbonyl-3-pyrrolidinone (1c). To a chilled (-60 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) solution of oxalyl chloride ( $23 \mathrm{~mL}, 258.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(400 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise a solution of DMSO $(36.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 517.3$ mmol) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ at such a rate to keep the temperature below $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was then stirred at $-60{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min . Then a solution of $\mathbf{1 b}(58.2 \mathrm{~g}$, no more than 225.0 $\mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(80 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise, keeping the reaction mixture temperature below $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixture was then stirred at $-60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min before adding $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(158.3 \mathrm{~mL}, 1125.0$ $\mathrm{mmol})$. The resulting mixture was allowed to warm up to room temperature and then washed with water $(600 \mathrm{~mL}), 1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{aq} \mathrm{HCl}$ $(580 \mathrm{~mL})$, and water $(400 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried and concentrated in vacuo to leave 54.5 g of amber oil, which was further pumped under high vacuum with stirring at room temperature for 25 min to give $52 \mathrm{~g}(5.6 \%$ over theoretical yield $)$ of $\mathbf{1 c}$ suitable for the next step without any further purification. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.81$ $\left(\mathrm{EtOAc}-i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}, 98: 2, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.40-$ $7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.20(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.90-3.80(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.60(\mathrm{t}, J=7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 136.0(+), 128.5(-)$, $128.0(-), 67.0(+), 52.5(+), 42.5(+), 36.5(+)$; IR (film) 1759, $1708 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

7-Benzyloxycarbonyl-1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4.4]nonane (1d). A mixture of $\mathbf{1 c}(52 \mathrm{~g}$, no more than 225.0 mmol ) and ethylene glycol $(18.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 337.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ in toluene $(180 \mathrm{~mL})$ with a catalytic amount of $p-\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 5.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ was refluxed in a Dean-Stark apparatus for 16 h . The reaction mixture was then diluted with more toluene $(250 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with saturated aq $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(150 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine $(2 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined aqueous layers were backextracted with toluene $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried and concentrated in vacuo to leave 79.6 g of dark oil. The crude product was dissolved in $\mathrm{EtOH}(500 \mathrm{~mL})$, and running it through a bed of activated carbon ( 80 g ) decolorized the resultant solution. The charcoal was washed with more EtOH ( 1000 mL ) and toluene $(500 \mathrm{~mL})$. The filtrate was concentrated in vacuo and further pumped under high vacuum for 1 h to yield $63.2 \mathrm{~g}(6.8 \%$ over theoretical yield) of $\mathbf{1 d}$ suitable for the next step without any further purification. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.78\left(\mathrm{EtOAc}-i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}, 98: 2, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}$ $\left(200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.40-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 5.20(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.00(\mathrm{~s}$, $4 \mathrm{H}), 3.60-3.50(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.50-3.40(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.10-2.00(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$; ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 137.0(+), 128.5(-), 128.0$ $(-), 67.0(+), 65.0(+), 55.0(+), 45.0(+), 34.5(+) ;$ IR (film) $1703 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

1,4-Dioxa-7-azaspiro[4.4]nonane (1e). A mixture of 1d (34.8 g , no more than 124.0 mmol$)$ and $10 \% \mathrm{Pd}-\mathrm{C}(14.0 \mathrm{~g})$ in EtOH $(90 \mathrm{~mL})$ was hydrogenolyzed ( 60 psi ) in a Parr shaker apparatus at room temperature for 1.5 h . The catalyst was filtered off, the solvent was evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was pumped under high vacuum for 20 min to yield $\mathbf{1 e}\left(15.9 \mathrm{~g}\right.$, quant. yield). $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.14$ $\left(\mathrm{EtOAc}-i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}, 95: 5, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 4.00$ $(\mathrm{s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.10(\mathrm{t}, J=7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.90(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.00(\mathrm{t}, J=7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 64.5(+), 55.0(+), 45.5$ (+), $37.0(+)$; IR (film) $3292 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
(1R,2R)/(1S,2S)-2-(1,4-Dioxa-7-azaspiro[4.4]non-7-yl)cyclo-hexan-1-ol (2e). A mixture of $\mathbf{1 e}(23.5 \mathrm{~g}$, no more than 182.0 mmol ), cyclohexene oxide ( $23 \mathrm{~mL}, 220.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and water ( 8 mL ) was heated at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h . The reaction mixture was then partitioned between $40 \%$ aq $\mathrm{NaOH}(60 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(120 \mathrm{~mL})$. The basic aqueous layer was extracted twice more with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times$
$120 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was then heated under high vacuum at $50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h with stirring (to remove the excess of cyclohexene oxide) to yield 32.8 g of $\mathbf{2 e}$ ( $79 \%$ yield). $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.33\left(\mathrm{EtOAc}-i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right.$, 98:2, v/v); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 115.5(+), 70.0$ $(-), 65.0(-), 64.5(+), 57.0(+), 46.5(+), 36.0(+), 33.5(+)$, $25.0(+), 24.0(+), 21.5(+)$; IR (film) $3457 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

The aminoalcohol $\mathbf{2 g}$ (Table 1) was prepared by following the procedure described above.
$(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-2-(4-Morpholinyl)cyclohexan-1-ol (2a). A mixture of cyclohexene oxide ( $206 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol}$ ) and morpholine (175 $\mathrm{mL}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol})$ in water $(60 \mathrm{~mL})$ was refluxed for 3.5 h . Morpholine $(5.3 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.06 \mathrm{~mol})$ was added to the reaction mixture, which was then further refluxed for 1.5 h to complete the reaction. The cooled reaction mixture was then partitioned between $40 \%$ aq NaOH ( 100 $\mathrm{mL})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was separated from the organic layer and extracted twice more with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 100$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. Vacuum distillation yielded $342.0 \mathrm{~g}(92 \%$ yield) of 2a. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 70.5(-), 68.3$ $(-), 67.4(+), 48.7(+), 33.1(+), 25.4(+), 24.0(+), 22.1(+)$.
(1R,2R)/(1S,2S)-2-[1-(4-t-Butyloxycarbonylpiperazinyl)]-cyclohexan-1-ol (2h). A mixture of cyclohexene oxide ( $6.0 \mathrm{~g}, 60.0$ mmol ) and tert-butyl 1-piperazinecarboxylate ( $3.8 \mathrm{~g}, 20.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in water ( 3 mL ) was refluxed for 16 h . The cooled reaction mixture was then partitioned between 5 M aq $\mathrm{NaOH}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The aqueous layer was extracted twice more with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times$ 50 mL ), the combined organic extracts were dried, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The excess of cyclohexene oxide was removed under high vacuum at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2.5 h to yield $\mathbf{2 h}(6.8 \mathrm{~g}$, no more than 20.0 mmol ) suitable for the next step without any further purification. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(100 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 154.6$ $(-), 79.6(-), 70.4(+), 68.4(+), 48.2(-), 33.1(-), 32.7(-)$, $28.3(+), 25.3(-), 23.9(-), 22.3(-) ;$ EIMS $m / z$ (relative intensity) 284 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}, 18$ ).
$\mathbf{( 2 R}) /(\mathbf{2 S})$-2-(4-Morpholinyl)hexan-1-ol (2i). A mixture of 1,2epoxyhexane $(12.4 \mathrm{~g}, 120.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ and morpholine $(10.6 \mathrm{~g}, 120.0$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ in water ( 4 mL ) was refluxed for 2 h . The cooled reaction mixture was then partitioned between $20 \%$ aq $\mathrm{NaOH}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(60 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was separated and extracted twice more with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 60 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried over potassium carbonate, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. Full vacuum distillation yielded 20.0 g ( $90 \%$ yield) of the title compound $2 \mathbf{i}$ as a colorless oil. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.16$ (EtOAc-hexanes, 1:4, $\left.\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $66.5(+), 65.6(-), 64.5(+), 53.3(+), 34.2(+), 27.3(+), 22.4$ $(+), 13.6(-)$.

The aminoalcohols $\mathbf{2 b}-\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{2 f}$ (Table 1) were prepared by using the procedures described above.
(1R,2R)/(1S,2S)-2-(3-Thiazolidinyl)cyclohexan-1-ol (2j). To $\mathrm{Mg}\left(\mathrm{ClO}_{4}\right)_{2}(12.9 \mathrm{~g}, 53.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added a solution of cyclohexene oxide ( $6.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 59.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the resultant mixture was stirred at room temperature for 20 min . Then a solution of thiazolidine ( $5.2 \mathrm{~g}, 55.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ was added and the reaction mixture was heated at $35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 16 h . The reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was partitioned between water ( 350 mL ) and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(350 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was separated and extracted once more with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(350 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried and concentrated in vacuo to provide the crude product. The crude aminoalcohol was purified by dry-column chromatography with a mixture of EtOAc -hexanes $\left(1: 1, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right)$ as eluent to yield $4.8 \mathrm{~g}(47 \%$ yield $)$ of $\mathbf{2 j}$ suitable for the next step without further purification. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 71.0(-), 69.0(-), 55.0(+), 53.0$ $(+), 33.0(+), 31.0(+), 26.0(+), 25.0(+), 23.0(+)$.

3,4-Dichlorophenethyl Alcohol (31). To a solution of $\mathrm{LiAlH}_{4}$ $(7.8 \mathrm{~g}, 195.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(435 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added slowly as a powder, via a solid dropping funnel, 3,4-dichlorophenyl acetic acid ( $27.2 \mathrm{~g}, 130.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). When the addition was completed, the reaction mixture was refluxed for 12 h . The reaction was quenched by cautious addition of saturated aq $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$, the resultant
insoluble was then filtered off, and the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo to yield quantitatively $31(25.0 \mathrm{~g}) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 200 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.40-7.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.80\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2}\right), 2.80(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), $1.80(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH})$.

Alcohols 3m, 3o,p, 3r, and 3u (Table 2) were prepared by using the procedure described above.

2,4-Dibromophenethyl Alcohol (3s). To a chilled $\left(<0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of $90 \% \mathrm{HNO}_{3}(67 \mathrm{~mL})$ and water $(33 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added a solid mixture of 2,4-dibromoaniline ( 25.6 g , 100.0 mmol ) and $\mathrm{KNO}_{2}$ $(9.2 \mathrm{~g}, 105.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ over an 80 min time period. The reaction mixture was stirred for another 20 min and then poured into ice water $(500 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resultant mixture was filtered and the cold filtrate was added slowly to a solution of $\mathrm{CuCN}(10.9 \mathrm{~g}, 120.0$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{KCN}(24.2 \mathrm{~g}, 360.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in water $(400 \mathrm{~mL})$ at 70 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. During the addition, the temperature of the reaction mixture was kept at $62-70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and the reaction mixture was always kept basic by adding 12 M aq KOH . The stirred reaction mixture was maintained at $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for another 30 min and then was allowed to cool to room temperature. The aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 700 \mathrm{~mL})$, the combined organic extracts were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. Purification by flash chromatography with hexanes and mixtures of EtOAchexanes ( $1: 19,1: 9$, v/v) yielded 17.9 g ( $69 \%$ yield) of 2,4dibromobenzonitrile. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.10\left(\mathrm{EtOAc}-\right.$ hexanes, $1: 99$, v/v); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 135.9$ ( - ), 134.9 ( - ), 131.1 ( - ), $128.2(+), 126.0(+), 116.5(+), 114.7(+)$; IR (film) $2229 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; EIMS $m / z$ (relative intensity) $263\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 48\right), 261\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 100\right), 259$ ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}, 50$ ), 182 (45), 180 (48), 100 (77), 75 (43).

To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of 2,4-dibromobenzonitrile ( 25.9 g , 93.0 mmol ) in THF ( 140 mL ) was added 1 M DIBAL solution in hexanes $(98 \mathrm{~mL})$ over a 30 min time period. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h and then at room temperature for 20 h . A total of 300 mL of 1 M aq HCl was added to quench the reaction, and the organic solvents were evaporated under reduced pressure. The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 300 \mathrm{~mL})$, the combined organic extracts were dried, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The crude aldehyde was used for the next step without any further purification. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.53$ ( EtOAc -hexanes, $1: 19, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v})$.

To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ suspension of $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}(1.38 \mathrm{~g}, 36.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 50 mL ) was added a solution of 2,4-dibromobenzaldehyde in THF ( 150 mL ) over a 20 min time period. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h and then at room temperature for 2.5 h before adding water $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $10 \%$ aq $\mathrm{HCl}(4.8 \mathrm{~mL})$ to quench the reaction. The organic solvents were evaporated under reduced pressure, and the aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times$ 200 mL ). The combined organic extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. Purification by dry-column with hexanes and a mixture of EtOAc-hexanes (1:19, v/v) yielded 14.0 g (yield $56 \%, 2$ steps) of 2,4-dibromobenzyl alcohol. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.30$ (EtOAchexanes, $1: 6, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 138.8(+)$, $134.8(-), 130.7(-), 129.7(-), 122.8(+), 121.6(+), 64.4(+)$; IR (film) $3218 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of 2,4-dibromobenzyl alcohol (3.84 $\mathrm{g}, 14.1 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(1.58 \mathrm{~g}, 15.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF $(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise neat $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{SO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}(1.81 \mathrm{~g}, 15.5 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h and then at room temperature for 50 min . The reaction mixture was quenched with water (40 mL ), and the organic solvents were evaporated under reduced pressure. The aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 40$ mL ), the combined organic extracts were dried over potassium carbonate, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo.

A mixture of the crude 2,4-dibromobenzyl mesylate, KCN (2.0 $\mathrm{g}, 30.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in DMF $(30 \mathrm{~mL})$, and water $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was stirred at room temperature for 3.5 h . The reaction mixture was extracted with EtOAc $(1 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ and $2 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$, the combined organic extracts were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The crude nitrile was used for the next step without any further purification. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.29(\mathrm{EtOAc}$-hexanes, $1: 9$, v/v).

A mixture of crude 2,4-dibromophenyl acetonitrile, KOH (2.52 $\mathrm{g}, 39.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{EtOH}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and water $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was refluxed
for 3 h . The organic solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure, and the aqueous layer was diluted with water $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with $\mathrm{EtOAc}(2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The pH of the aqueous layer was adjusted to pH 4 with $10 \%$ aq HCl , and the resultant aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 60 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo to yield 3.1 g ( $53 \%$ yield, over 3 steps) of 2,4-dibromophenyl acetic acid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.73$ (d, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}$ ), 7.40 (dd, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 7.15(\mathrm{~d}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.77\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , APT, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 175.9(+), 135.2(-), 132.5(-), 130.8(-), 125.6$ $(+), 121.9(+), 40.7(+) ;$ EIMS m/z (relative intensity) $296\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}\right.$, 14), $294\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 28\right), 292\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}, 14\right)$.

To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of 2,4-dibromophenyl acetic acid $(2.93 \mathrm{~g}, 10.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF $(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added a $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{BH}_{3}$ solution in THF $(13 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min and at room temperature for 16 h . The reaction was quenched with 1 M aq HCl , and the organic solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure. The aqueous layer was diluted with water to 60 mL and extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 80 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo to yield $2.74 \mathrm{~g}(98 \%$ yield $)$ of $3 \mathrm{~s} . R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.58(\mathrm{EtOAc}-$ hexanes, $1: 2$, v/v). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.70-7.10(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.90(\mathrm{t}$, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 3.00\left(\mathrm{t}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 1.40(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH})$.

Method A. $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-1-(2-Naphthalenethoxy)-2-(4-morpholinyl)cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (4). To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of $2 \mathbf{a}(6.0 \mathrm{~g}, 32.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(6.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 48.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added via cannula a solution of $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{SO}_{2^{-}}$ $\mathrm{Cl}(3.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 40.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The addition was completed in 10 min , and the reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and then at room temperature for 4 h . The $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ mixture was washed with water $(2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the combined aqueous washings were back-extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried and concentrated in vacuo to provide 8.5 g of the crude mesylate suitable for the next step without any further purification.

To $\mathrm{NaH}, 80 \%$ oil dispersion, previously washed with hexanes $(3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.24 \mathrm{~g}, 51.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ in DMF $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added via cannula a solution of $3 \mathbf{a}(6.8 \mathrm{~g}, 40.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in DMF $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resultant reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 30 min . Then the stirred reaction mixture was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, while the solution of mesylate dissolved in DMF ( 50 mL ) was rapidly (3 min ) added via cannula. The reaction mixture was heated overnight at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and then cooled to room temperature. The resulting yellow solution was poured into ice water ( 800 mL ) and extracted with $\mathrm{EtOAc}(3 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were backwashed with brine ( 300 mL ) and dried. Evaporation of the solvent in vacuo provided 13.4 g of an amber oil that was dissolved in water $(150 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the pH of the solution was adjusted to pH 2 with 1 M aq HCl . The acidic aqueous solution was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and then basified to pH 10 with $50 \%$ aq NaOH . The basic aqueous solution was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were dried and concentrated in vacuo to leave 7.16 g of the crude title compound as a free base. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography with a mixture of $\mathrm{EtOAc}-\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}(1: 1, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v})$ as eluent to yield 4.37 g of the pure compound. The product was dissolved in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(80 \mathrm{~mL})$ and converted to the HCl salt by treatment with ethereal HCl . The solvent was evaporated in vacuo, the residue was dissolved in the minimum amount of warm EtOH , and then addition of a large volume of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ triggered crystallization. The crystals were collected to afford 4 ( $3.83 \mathrm{~g}, 31 \%$ yield); mp $158-160{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 $\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 11.80\left(\right.$ br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{HN}^{+}$), $7.80-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar})$, 4.25-1.50 (m, 22H, aliph); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $135.9(+), 133.3(+), 132.1(+), 128.2(-), 127.5(-), 127.3(-)$, 127.2 ( - ), 126.7 ( - ), 126.1 ( - ), $125.5(-), 77.2(-), 69.6(-)$, $68.1(+), 63.7(+), 63.0(+), 53.4(+), 47.8(+), 36.4(+), 30.3$ $(+), 26.6(+), 24.4(+), 23.1(+) ;$ HRMS (EI) mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{2}$, 339.21982; found, 339.21992 (100\%); Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{30^{-}}\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}$ : C, 70.29. Found: C, 69.57.

The aminoethers $\mathbf{5 - 1 7}$ and $\mathbf{1 9 - 2 5}$ (Table 3) were prepared by using the procedure described above, method A.

Method B. $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)-1-(3,4-D i c h l o r o p h e n e t h o x y)-2-(4-$ morpholinyl)cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (18). To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of $\mathbf{2 a}(40.8 \mathrm{~g}, 220.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(36.6 \mathrm{~mL}$, $260.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(400 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise a solution of $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{SO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}(20.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 260.0 \mathrm{~mol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 45 min and then at room temperature for 3 h . The reaction mixture was then washed with water $(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined washings were backextracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo to yield the crude mesylate suitable for the next step without any further purification.

To $\mathrm{NaH}(6.0 \mathrm{~g}, 0.2 \mathrm{~mol}, 80 \%$ dispersion in oil) in DME (200 $\mathrm{mL})$ was added a solution of $31(38.9 \mathrm{~g}, 0.2 \mathrm{~mol})$ in DME (100 mL ). The resulting mixture was stirred for 3 h at ambient temperature under an argon atmosphere.

The mesylate in DME ( 100 mL ) was added quickly to the alkoxide and the resulting reaction mixture was refluxed for 16 h . To the cooled reaction mixture was added water $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The resulting aqueous solution was further diluted with water $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the pH was adjusted to pH 1.5 with $10 \%$ aq HCl . The acidic aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(500 \mathrm{~mL})$ to eliminate the unreacted $\mathbf{3 1}$. Further basification of the aqueous layer with 5 M aq NaOH to pH 5.7 followed by extraction with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ provided the crude title compound as a free base contaminated with some remaining mesylate. The solvent of the organic extract at pH 5.7 was evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was then refluxed in a mixture of EtOH - water $(1: 1, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}, 200 \mathrm{~mL})$ in the presence of $\mathrm{NaH}(4.12$ $\mathrm{g}, 0.1 \mathrm{~mol})$ for 2 h to hydrolyze the remaining mesylate. The cooled reaction mixture was diluted with water $(300 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the organic solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The pH of the residual aqueous solution was adjusted to pH 5.7 with 6 M aq HCl followed by extraction with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(700 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic extract was concentrated in vacuo to yield the pure title compound as a free base. The residual product was then partitioned between 1 M aq $\mathrm{HCl}(300$ $\mathrm{mL})$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(300 \mathrm{~mL})$. The acidic aqueous solution was extracted twice more with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 300 \mathrm{~mL})$, the combined organic layers were dried, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The residue was recrystallized from a mixture of EtOH -hexanes (3:7, v/v, 700 mL ) to yield 18 ( $49.3 \mathrm{~g}, 62 \%$ yield); mp 175-177 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 11.75$ (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{HN}^{+}$), $7.50-$ $7.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 4.50-1.00\left(\mathrm{~m}, 22 \mathrm{H}\right.$, aliph); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , APT, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 138.8(+), 132.3(+), 130.5(-), 130.4(-), 128.1$ $(-), 69.6(-), 67.7(+), 63.8(+), 63.2(+), 53.2(+), 48.3(+)$, $35.3(+), 30.2(+), 26.5(+), 24.3(+), 23.0(+)$; HRMS (EI) mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 357.12622$; found, 357.12624 (100\%); Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{3}\right) \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$.

The aminoethers $\mathbf{3 9}, \mathbf{4 2}, \mathbf{5 1}$, and $\mathbf{5 2}$ (Table 3) were prepared by using the procedure described above, method B.
(1R,2R)/(1S,2S)-1-(1-Naphthalenethoxy)-2-[1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro-[4.4]non-7-yl] cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (32) and (1R,2R)/ (1S,2S)-1-(1-Naphthalenethoxy)-2-(3-ketopyrrolidinyl)cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (26). To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of $\mathbf{2 e}$ $(27.5 \mathrm{~g}, 120.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(15.9 \mathrm{~g}, 156.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 240 mL ) was added dropwise $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{SO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}(18.2 \mathrm{~g}, 156.0 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 45 min and then at room temperature for 3 h . The reaction mixture was then washed with 2 M aq $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(120 \mathrm{~mL})$. The washing layer was collected and was back-extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(120 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried, the solvent was evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was pumped under high vacuum for 4 h to yield the crude mesylate suitable for the next step without any further purification.

To $\mathrm{NaH}(4.32 \mathrm{~g}, 144.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ suspended in DME $(80 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added a solution of $\mathbf{3 b}(25.3 \mathrm{~g}, 144.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in DME $(80 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resultant mixture was then stirred at room temperature for 4 h .

A solution of mesylate in DME ( 80 mL ) was added quickly to the alkoxide and then the resultant mixture was heated to reflux under argon for 66 h . The cooled reaction mixture was quenched with water $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The remaining aqueous solution was diluted with water ( 500 mL ) and acidified with $10 \%$ aq HCl to pH 0.5 . The acidic aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 500 \mathrm{~mL})$ to extract unreacted 3b. The pH of the aqueous solution was adjusted to pH 6.5 with 5 M aq NaOH and then extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 600 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried, the solvent was evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was pumped under high vacuum for 3.5 h to yield 35.8 g ( $75 \%$ yield) of $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-1-(1-naphthale-nethoxy)-2-[1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4.4]non-7-yl]cyclohexane suitable for the next step without any further purification.
$(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-1-(1-Naphthalenethoxy)-2-[1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro-[4.4]non-7-yl]cyclohexane ( $1.2 \mathrm{~g}, 3.14 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(80 \mathrm{~mL})$ was treated with ethereal HCl . The solvent was evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was taken up with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and triturated. The title compound 32 was precipitated from a mixture of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}-\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( $0.85 \mathrm{~g}, 65 \%$ yield); mp $117-118{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 MHz, free base, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.1-7.3(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.9-1.1$ (m, 23 H , aliph.); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}\right.$, free base, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 135.0(+), 133.7$ $(+), 132.0(+), 128.6(-), 126.8(-), 126.7(-), 125.7(-), 125.4$ $(-), 125.3(-), 123.7(-), 115.2(+), 79.1(-), 68.8(+), 64,2$ $(+), 63.8(-), 60.3(-), 49.8(+), 35.8(+), 33.9(+), 28.6(+)$, $26.9(+), 23.0(+), 22.7(+) ;$ HRMS (EI) mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, 381.23041$; found, 381.23008 (21.4\%); Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\right.$ $\mathrm{NCl}) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{NCl}: \mathrm{C}, 68.97$. Found: C, 68.49.

A solution of $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-1-(1-naphthalenethoxy)-2-[1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4.4]non-7-yl]cyclohexane (13.7 g, 36.0 mmol ) with $6 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{aq} \mathrm{HCl}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ in 2-butanone ( 200 mL ) was refluxed for 12 h . The butanone was evaporated in vacuo and the residual aqueous solution was diluted to 250 mL with water. The aqueous solution was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL})$ and then with $\mathrm{CH}_{2^{-}}$ $\mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL})$. The pooled $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The residual oil was azeotropically dried with toluene. The sticky product was triturated in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (500 mL ), the resultant solid was collected and solubilized in a small amount of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(\sim 10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and then addition of a large quantity of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\sim 400 \mathrm{~mL})$ triggered recrystallization. The solid was collected and dried under high vacuum for 3 h to yield 26 (9.3 g, $76 \%$ yield); mp $121-125{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomposes); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 12.80\left(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{HN}^{+}\right), 8.20-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 4.00-$ $1.00\left(\mathrm{~m}, 20 \mathrm{H}\right.$, aliph); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , APT, free base, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 215.1(+), 134.9(+), 133.7(+), 131.9(+), 128.7(-), 126.9$ $(-), 126.8(-), 125.8(-), 125.4(-), 123.6(-), 79.4(-), 68.6$ $(+), 63.7(-), 58.8(+), 47.9(+), 37.6(+), 33.8(+), 29.1(+)$, $26.9(+), 23.5(+), 23.0(+)$; HRMS (EI) mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27}-$ $\mathrm{NO}_{2}, 337.20419$; found, 337.20471 (100\%); Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}\right)$ $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$.

The aminoethers $27,28,34,35,37,38,43-45$, and 48 (Table 3) were prepared by using the procedure described above, method B.
$(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)-1-(2,4-D i b r o m o p h e n e t h o x y)-2-(4-m o r p h o l i n y l)-$ cyclohexane monohydrochloride (30). To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of $2 \mathbf{a}(1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 5.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(0.63 \mathrm{~g}, 6.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(15 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise neat $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{SO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}(0.7 \mathrm{~g}, 6.0 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h and then at room temperature for 1.5 h . The reaction mixture was then washed with water $(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was collected and back-extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo to yield the crude mesylate suitable for the next step without any further purification.

To $\mathrm{NaH}(0.12 \mathrm{~g}, 80 \%$ dispersion in mineral oil, 5.9 mmol$)$ suspended in DME $(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added a solution of $3 \mathrm{~s}(1.1 \mathrm{~g}, 3.6$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ in DME ( 8 mL ). The resultant mixture was then stirred at room temperature for 40 min .

A solution of mesylate in DME ( 10 mL ) was added quickly to the alkoxide, and the resultant mixture was heated to $75-95{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under argon for 20 h . The cooled reaction mixture was quenched
with water $(20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The residual mixture was acidified with 1 M aq $\mathrm{HCl}(15$ mL ), and the resultant acidic aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(1 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The pH of the aqueous solution was adjusted to pH 5.5 with 5 M aq NaOH and then extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ extract was dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. Purification by dry-column with hexanes and a mixture of $\mathrm{EtOAc}-$ hexanes $\left(1: 4, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right)$ yielded $0.69 \mathrm{~g}(43 \%$ yield $)$ of the title compound as a free base.

A total of $1.22 \mathrm{~g}(2.74 \mathrm{mmol})$ of the free base was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$ and stirred with 0.5 M aq $\mathrm{HCl}(11 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was separated and extracted twice more with $\mathrm{CH}_{2^{-}}$ $\mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried and concentrated in vacuo. Crystallization from a mixture of EtOH, acetone, and hexanes provided $30(0.97 \mathrm{~g}, 31 \%$ yield over 2 steps $)$. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.10\left(\mathrm{EtOAc}-\right.$ hexanes, $\left.1: 9, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 12.0\left(\mathrm{br}, \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NH}^{+}\right), 7.65-7.12(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, Ar), 4.48-1.05 (m, 22H, aliph); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 136.6(+), 135.2(-), 132.1(-), 130.5(-), 124.8(+), 120.7$ $(+), 77.4(-), 69.6(-), 66.4(+), 63.8(+), 63.2(+), 53.4(+)$, $47.7(+), 35.8(+), 30.1(+), 26.6(+), 24.3(+), 23.0(+)$; IR (film) 3403, 2933, 2862, 1576, 1466, 1371, 1096, $727 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (EI) mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{NO}_{2}, 445.02521$; found, 445.02188 (69.5\%); Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}\right) \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$.
$(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)-1-(2,6-D i c h l o r o p h e n e t h o x y)-2-(3-t h i a z o l i d i n y l)-~$ cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (42). To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of $\mathbf{2 j}(3.2 \mathrm{~g}, 17.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(3.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 22.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{SO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}(1.74 \mathrm{~mL}, 22.0 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h and then at ambient temperature for 3 h . The reaction mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2}-$ $\mathrm{Cl}_{2}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with water $(2 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined washings were back-extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic extracts were dried. Evaporation of the solvent in vacuo yielded the mesylate suitable for the next step without further purification.

To $\mathrm{NaH}, 80 \%$ oil dispersion $(0.61 \mathrm{~g}, 20.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ in DME (30 $\mathrm{mL})$, was added a solution of $\mathbf{3 r}(3.9 \mathrm{~g}, 20.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ in DME (15 $\mathrm{mL})$. The resultant mixture was stirred at room temperature under an argon atmosphere for 2 h .

The mesylate in DME ( 15 mL ) was quickly added to the alkoxide, and the reaction mixture was refluxed for 40 h . The cooled reaction mixture was poured into water $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the organic solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The residual aqueous solution was diluted with more water ( 100 mL ), and the pH was adjusted to pH 1.5 . The acidic aqueous solution was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (3 $\times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), the combined organic extracts were dried, and the solvent was removed in vacuo to provide the crude free base. Purification by dry-column chromatography with a mixture of EtOAc-hexanes (1:10, v/v, $\left.+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right)$ as eluent yielded 2.4 g ( $39 \%$ yield) of the title compound as free base. A total of 1.0 $\mathrm{g}(2.8 \mathrm{mmol})$ was converted to the HCl salt by treatment with ethereal HCl , and the resultant salt was recrystallized from a mixture of acetone $-\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to yield $42(0.69 \mathrm{~g}, 62 \%$ yield, $24 \%$ over two steps). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz , free base, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.60$ (br s, 1 H , $\left.\mathrm{HN}^{+}\right), 7.30-7.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 4.60-1.00(\mathrm{~m}, 20 \mathrm{H}$, aliph $) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (75 MHz, APT, free base, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 135.6(+), 134.1(+)$, $133.8(+), 128.2(-), 128.1(-), 77.5(-), 77.0(-), 67.5(-)$, $66.8(-), 65.5(+), 65.4(+), 56.4(+), 55.0(+), 52.8(+), 52.5$ $(+), 34.6(+), 30.2(+), 30.2(+), 29.3(+), 28.6(+), 28.2(+)$, $24.5(+), 24.4(+), 23.0(+), 22.9(+) ;$ HRMS (EI) mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{NOSCl}_{2}, 359.08774$; found, 359.08707 (4.5\%); Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{24-}\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{NOSCl}_{3}\right) \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$.
$(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-1-(3,4-Dimethoxyphenethoxy)-2-(1-piperazinyl)cyclohexane Dihydrochloride (53). To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of $\mathbf{2 h}(2.2 \mathrm{~g}, 7.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 10.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(18 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{SO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}(1.2 \mathrm{~g}, 10.0 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min and then at room temperature for 3 h . The reaction mixture was then washed with 2 M aq $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(1: 1, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}, 14 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was collected and back-extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined
organic extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo to yield the crude mesylate suitable for the next step without further purification.

To a mixture of $\mathrm{NaH}(280.0 \mathrm{mg}, 80 \%$ dispersion in mineral oil, $9.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathbf{3 f}(1.68 \mathrm{~g}, 9.23 \mathrm{mmol})$ was slowly added DME (30 $\mathrm{mL})$. The resultant mixture was then stirred at room temperature for 1.5 h .

A solution of mesylate in DME ( 20 mL ) was quickly added to the alkoxide, and the resultant mixture was refluxed under argon for 3.5 h . The cooled reaction mixture was quenched with water ( 80 mL ), and the organic solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The residual aqueous solution was acidified with 6 M aq HCl to pH 1 and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 90 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was collected, basified to pH 11 with 5 M aq NaOH , and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 140 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo to yield 2.37 g ( $89 \%$ yield) of $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-1-(3,4-dimethoxyphenethoxy)-2-[1-(4-t-butyloxycarbonylpiperazinyl)]cyclohexane, which was then mixed with $\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{H}(7.3 \mathrm{~g}, 63.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(6 \mathrm{~mL})$ and stirred at room temperature for 19 h . The volatile compounds were evaporated in vacuo, and the residue was partitioned between 5 M aq NaOH (12 $\mathrm{mL})$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(60 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was collected and extracted twice more with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 60 \mathrm{~mL})$, the combined organic extracts were dried, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. Purification by dry-column chromatography with a mixture of $\mathrm{EtOAc}-i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}(99.5: 0.5, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v})$ yielded $1.54 \mathrm{~g}(56 \%$ yield over two steps) of the title compound as a free base.

The free base ( $0.62 \mathrm{~g}, 1.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 16 mL ) was mixed with ethereal $\mathrm{HCl}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solvents were evaporated in vacuo, and the residual oil was azeotropically dried with benzene and under high vacuum for 4 h to yield 53 ( $0.45 \mathrm{~g}, 37 \%$ yield over two steps). $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.11(\mathrm{MeOH}) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 10.82($ br s, 2 H , $\mathrm{HN}^{+}$), $9.64\left(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{HN}^{+}\right), 6.88-6.78(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 3.87$ (s, 3H, $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 3.82\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 3.77-0.86\left(\mathrm{~m}, 22 \mathrm{H}\right.$, aliph); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 148.8(+), 147.5(+), 131.3(+), 121.1$ $(-), 112.9(-), 111.5(-), 76.3(-), 70.0(-), 68.9(+), 56.1(-)$, $55.9(-), 49.2(+), 45.6(+), 41.0(+), 40.9(+), 35.6(+), 30.2$ $(+), 26.3(+), 24.3(+), 22.8(+) ;$ LRMS (EI) m/z (relative intensity) 348 ( $\mathrm{M}^{+}$, 24), 306 (25), 183 (100), 166 (52), 125 (77); HPLC (Zorbax Extend C-18 $150 \times 4.6 \mathrm{~mm} ; 25 \mathrm{mM}$ phosphate buffer, pH 3 : ACN, 83:17) 97.2\%; CE 95.3\%.

Method C. (1R)/(1S)-1-(4-Bromophenethoxy)-2-(4-morpholinyl)hexane Monohydrochloride (29). A mixture of $\mathbf{2 i}(9.4 \mathrm{~g}, 50.0$ $\mathrm{mmol})$, 4-bromophenylacetic acid ( $13.0 \mathrm{~g}, 60.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and $p-\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50.0 \mathrm{mg})$ in toluene $(60 \mathrm{~mL})$ was refluxed for 16 h . After cooling to room temperature, the reaction mixture was washed with $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{aq} \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the aqueous layer was backextracted with EtOAc $(2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried over potassium carbonate and the solvents were evaporated in vacuo. Purification by dry-column with mixtures of EtOAc-hexanes ( $1: 9,1.4, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}$ ) yielded ( $1 R$ )/ (1S)-2-(4-morpholinyl)hex-1-yl 4-bromophenylacetate ( $18.5 \mathrm{~g}, 96 \%$ yield) as a pale yellow oil. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.33$ ( EtOAc -hexanes, $1: 4$, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+$ $0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}$ ); IR (film) $1734 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.

A mixture of $(1 R) /(1 S)$-2-(4-morpholinyl)hex-1-yl 4-bromophenylacetate $(7.7 \mathrm{~g}, 20.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}(1.4 \mathrm{~g}, 36.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 60 mL ) was refluxed for $40 \mathrm{~min} . \mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(25.3 \mathrm{~mL}, 200.0$ mmol ) was added dropwise to the refluxing reaction mixture over a 1 h period. Heating was continued for another 1.2 h and then the reaction mixture was poured into ice water $(150 \mathrm{~mL})$. After stirring for $50 \mathrm{~min}, 5 \mathrm{M}$ aq $\mathrm{NaOH}(\mathrm{ca} .38 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) was added to adjust the pH to pH 6.5 . The organic solvents were evaporated in vacuo, and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ and then 5 M aq NaOH were added to adjust the pH to pH 8.1. The aqueous layer was separated and extracted once more with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried and concentrated in vacuo. Purification by dry-column chromatography with a mixture of $\mathrm{EtOAc}-$ hexanes $(1: 9, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ $\left.i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right)$ yielded $1.33 \mathrm{~g}(18 \%$ yield $)$ of the title compound as a free base.

A total of $0.82 \mathrm{~g}(2.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ of the free base was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(35 \mathrm{~mL})$ and stirred with 0.5 M aq $\mathrm{HCl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The
aqueous layer was extracted twice more with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined organic layers were dried and concentrated in vacuo. Crystallization from EtOH-hexanes provided 29 ( 0.78 g, $16 \%$ yield). $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.29$ (EtOAc-hexanes, 1:9, v/v, $+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ $i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}$ ) ; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 12.7$ (br s, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{HN}^{+}$), 7.34 (dd, 2H, Ar), 7.07 (dd, 2H, Ar), 4.23-1.26 (m, 21H, aliph), $0.82\left(\mathrm{t}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 138.1$ (+), 131.2 ( - ), 130.7 ( - ), 119.9 (+), $74.3(-), 68.4(+), 63.5(+)$, $63.3(+), 61.2(+), 53.5(+), 52.5(+), 35.6(+), 30.7(+), 25.7$ $(+), 22.6(+), 13.8(-) ;$ IR (HCl salt, film) 2925, $2858 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (EI) mass cald for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{BrNO}_{2}, 369.13034$; found, 369.12901 ( $0.5 \%$ ); Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{BrNO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}\right) \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$.
$(1 R, 2 S) /(1 S, 2 R)-1-[2-(T r i f l u o r o m e t h y l) p h e n e t h o x y]-2-(4-m o r-~$ pholinyl)cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (33). To a cooled (-60 $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ solution of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(500 \mathrm{~mL})$ and oxalyl chloride ( $20 \mathrm{~mL}, 230.0$ mmol ) was added dropwise at a rapid rate a solution of DMSO ( $34 \mathrm{~mL}, 480.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. After 5 min of stirring, a solution of $\mathbf{2 a}(37.0 \mathrm{~g}, 200.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise over 10 min while the temperature was maintained at -50 to $-60{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 15 min of stirring, $\mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}(140 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise while keeping the temperature at or below $-50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Stirring was continued for 5 min , after which time the mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature and water ( 600 mL ) was added. The aqueous layer was separated and extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2}-$ $\mathrm{Cl}_{2}(500 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. High vacuum distillation yielded $35.1 \mathrm{~g}(96 \%$ yield $)$ of $(2 R) /(2 S)$-2-(4-morpholinyl)cyclohexan-1one.

To a chilled $\left(0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ suspension of $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}(0.92 \mathrm{~g}, 24.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $i-\operatorname{PrOH}(42 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added slowly a solution of $(2 R) /(2 S)-2-$ (4-morpholinyl)cyclohexan-1-one ( $11.0 \mathrm{~g}, 60.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $i-\mathrm{PrOH}$ $(42 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction mixture was stirred for 10 min , and then the ice bath was removed and the reaction mixture was further stirred at room temperature for 30 min . Water $(60 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added and the organic solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure. The aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc $(4 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$, the combined organic extracts were dried, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo to yield 11.1 g of a cis/trans-mixture of 2-(4-morpholinyl)cyclohexan-1-ol, suitable for use in the next step without further purification.

A mixture of the above material ( $7.4 \mathrm{~g}, 40.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenylacetic acid ( $10.2 \mathrm{~g}, 49.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and $p-\mathrm{TsOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(40.0 \mathrm{mg})$ in toluene $(60 \mathrm{~mL})$ was refluxed for 48 h in a DeanStark apparatus. After cooling to room temperature, the reaction mixture was washed with 2 M aq $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(40 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The cis/trans-mixture was purified by dry-column chromatography with mixtures of EtOAc-hexanes $(1: 19,1: 9,1: 3.9$, $\left.\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right)$ to yield 3.19 g of $(1 R, 2 S) /(1 S, 2 R)-2-(4-$ morpholinyl)cyclohex-1-yl 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenylacetate. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.26$ (EtOAc-hexanes, $\left.1: 2, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right)$.

To a mixture of $(1 S, 2 R) /(1 R, 2 S)$-2-(4-morpholinyl)cyclohex-1yl 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenylacetate ( $1.64 \mathrm{~g}, 4.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}$ ( $0.33 \mathrm{~g}, 8.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in THF ( 35 mL ) under reflux was added a solution of $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(8.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 65.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ over 1.5 h . The reaction mixture was quenched by addition of water ( $\sim 70 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), the organic solvent was evaporated in vacuo, and the pH of the residual aqueous solution was adjusted to pH 9.6 . The aqueous layer was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 70 \mathrm{~mL})$, the combined organic extracts were dried, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The residue was then partitioned between 0.5 M aq $\mathrm{HCl}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous solution was basified to pH 5.9 and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was collected and dried, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The resultant free base was converted to the HCl salt by partition between 0.5 M aq $\mathrm{HCl}(10$ $\mathrm{mL})$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The acidic aqueous solution was extracted once more with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, the combined organic extracts were dried, and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. Recrystallization from a mixture of EtOH -hexanes yielded 33 (0.64 g, $38 \%$ yield). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 12.39$ (br s, 1 H ,
$\mathrm{HN}^{+}$), $7.58-7.24(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 4.44-1.14$ (m, 22H, aliph); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 137.3$ (+), 131.7 (-), 131.3 (-), $128.6(+), 126.4(-), 126.2(+), 125.8(-), 72.5(-), 67.6(-)$, $67.5(+), 63.8(+), 63.3(+), 50.5(+), 49.3(+), 32.6(+), 27.3$ $(+), 24.6(+), 20.7(+), 18.6(+) ;$ HRMS (EI) mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{NO}_{2}, 357.19156$; found, 357.19160 (11.7\%); Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~F}_{3}-\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}\right) \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$.

Aminoether 31 (Table 3) was prepared using the procedure described above.

Method D. $(1 R, 2 S) /(1 S, 2 R)-1-(1-N a p h t h a l e n e t h o x y)-2-(3-k e-$ topyrrolidinyl) Cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (46). To a flask containing $\mathrm{Mg}\left(\mathrm{ClO}_{4}\right)_{2}(2.14 \mathrm{~g}, 0.95 \mathrm{mmol})$ vacuum flame-dried, cooled, and charged with argon was added via cannula a solution of $\mathbf{3 b}(21.6 \mathrm{~g}, 125.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resultant mixture was refluxed until all material had dissolved and then cyclohexene oxide $(1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 10.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added over a period of 2.5 h . The reaction mixture was then refluxed for 16 h , cooled to room temperature, and partitioned between water ( 150 mL ), saturated aq $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3},(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous layer was collected and extracted twice with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ extracts were back-washed with brine $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried, and concentrated in vacuo to yield 25.2 g of crude material, which solidified upon standing. The excess 3b was recovered by successive recrystallizations in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$-hexanes ( $1: 1, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ ). The resultant mother liquor $(7.5 \mathrm{~g})$ obtained after three recrystallizations was purified by chromatography using a mixture of EtOAchexanes $\left(1: 5, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right)$ to provide 1.5 g ( $55 \%$ yield) of crude $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-2-(1-naphthalenethoxy)cyclohexan-1-ol, which was used in the next step without further purification.

To a suspension of pyridinium chlorochromate or PCC (4.8 g, $22.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(35 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added at once a solution of $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-2-(1-naphthalenethoxy)cyclohexan-1-ol $(1.5 \mathrm{~g}, 5.5$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resultant dark brown mixture was stirred at room temperature for 16 h and then filtered through a plug of silica gel topped with $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$. The plug was further rinsed with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo to yield 2.0 g of crude material. The crude material was applied to a dry column of silica gel and eluted with a mixture of EtOAchexanes $\left(1: 6, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\operatorname{PrNH}_{2}\right)$ to yield 1.0 g of $(2 R / 2 S)$ -2-(1-naphthalenethoxy)cyclohexan-1-one (68\% yield). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (50 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 203.0(+), 135.0(+), 134.0(+), 132.0(+)$, $129.0(-), 127.0(-), 125.5(-), 125.0(-), 123.5(-), 113.0(-)$, $83.0(-), 70.0(+), 40.0(+), 34.5(+), 33.5(+), 28.0(+), 23.0$ (+); IR (film) $1720 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
(2R/2S)-2-(1-Naphthalenethoxy)cyclohexan-1-one (1.0 g, 3.7 $\mathrm{mmol}), 2 \mathrm{e}(1.2 \mathrm{~g}, 9.3 \mathrm{mmol})$, and PVP $(0.4 \mathrm{~g})$ in benzene $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ were refluxed in a Dean-Stark apparatus for 5 h . The cooled reaction mixture was then quickly transferred to a Parr shaker apparatus, Pd on activated carbon $(0.2 \mathrm{~g})$ was added, and the mixture was hydrogenated for 16 h . The catalyst was removed by filtration, the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo, and the resultant crude material (cis/trans, 87:13, area \%/GC) was purified by dry-column chromatography with a mixture of EtOAc-hexanes $(1: 2, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v},+$ $\left.0.5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} i-\mathrm{PrNH}_{2}\right)$ to provide $1.0 \mathrm{~g}(70 \%$ yield) of $(1 R, 2 S) /(1 S, 2 R)-$ 1-(1-naphthalenethoxy)-2-(1,4-dioxo-7-azaspiro[4.4]non-7-yl)cyclohexane, which was refluxed with $6 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{aq} \mathrm{HCl}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ in 2-butanone $(80 \mathrm{~mL})$ for 16 h . The cooled reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was diluted with water $(90 \mathrm{~mL})$. The aqueous solution was then extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 70 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. Trituration in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ provided $46\left(0.82 \mathrm{~g}, 84 \%\right.$ yield); mp $176-178{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 12.53\left(\right.$ br s, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{HN}^{+}\right), 8.06-7.32$ (m, $7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}$ ), 4.05-1.16 (m, 20H, aliph); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ $204.2(+), 204.0(+), 135.0(+), 134.9(+), 133.6(+), 131.9(+)$, $131.8(+), 128.7(-), 127.1(-), 127.0(-), 125.9(-), 125.8(-)$, $125.5(-), 125.4(-), 123.7(-), 123.6(-), 72.4(-), 71.7(-)$, $68.3(+), 68.2(+), 65.5(-), 64.9(-), 54.7(+), 54.3(+), 48.8$ $(+), 48.2(+), 35.5(+), 35.1(+), 32.9(+), 26.8(+), 26.7(+)$, $24.0(+), 22.5(+), 21.9(+), 18.3(+)$; Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}\right) \mathrm{C}$, $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$.

Methods E and F. $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)-1-(1-N a p h t h a l e n e t h o x y)-$ 2-(3-(R/S)-hydroxypyrrolidinyl)cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (50) and $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)-1-(1-N a p h t h a l e n e t h o x y)-2-(3-(R / S)$ acetoxypyrrolidinyl)cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (36). To a solution of $26(1.4 \mathrm{~g}, 3.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $i-\mathrm{PrOH}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added portion-wise at room-temperature $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}(0.5 \mathrm{~g}, 13.2 \mathrm{mmol})$. The resultant mixture was stirred at room temperature for 16 h . The reaction mixture was quenched with 1 M aq $\mathrm{HCl}(\sim 2 \mathrm{~mL})$ for 40 $\min$ and then concentrated in vacuo. The residue was taken up with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$, the insoluble material was filtered and washed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the combined filtrates were dried and split in two equal parts.

One part was treated with ethereal $\mathrm{HCl}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solvents were evaporated in vacuo and the residual oil was triturated in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(80 \mathrm{~mL})$ to yield $\mathbf{5 0}\left(0.55 \mathrm{~g}, 79 \%\right.$ yield) as a hygroscopic solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.10-7.35$ (m, 7H, Ar), 4.20-1.10 (m, 22H, aliph); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 135.0(+)$, $133.7(+), 132.0(+), 128.6(-), 126.9(-), 126.8(-), 125.8(-)$, $125.4(-), 123.7(-), 79.5(-), 79.3(-), 70.9(-), 70.7(-), 68.7$ $(+), 68.6(+), 63.3(-), 63.2(-), 59.6(+), 59.3(+), 48.6(+)$, $48.4(+), 34.3(+), 34.1(+), 33.8(+), 29.1(+), 29.0(+), 27.0$ $(+), 23.5(+), 23.4(+), 23.1(+), 23.0(+) ;$ HRMS (EI) mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~N}, 339.21983$; found, 339.21962 (100\%); HPLC (Supelco ODP-50 $150 \times 4.6 \mathrm{~mm}, 5 \mu ; 50 \mathrm{mM}$ phosphate buffer ( pH 11 )-acetonitrile (50:50)) $98.9 \%$; CE $98.9 \%$.

Aminoethers 47 and 50 (Table 3) were prepared by using the procedure described above, method E .

The other part was concentrated in vacuo, taken up with $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(15 \mathrm{~mL})$, and refluxed for 2 h . The excess $\mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was removed in vacuo, the residue was taken up with water $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the pH was adjusted to pH 1 with 1 M aq HCl . The resultant acidic aqueous solution was extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$, basified to pH 8 , and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ extracts at pH 8 were dried, concentrated under reduced pressure to $\sim 20$ mL volume, and then treated with ethereal HCl . The solvent was evaporated in vacuo, the resultant sticky material was redissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ triggered crystallization of $36\left(0.5 \mathrm{~g}, 65 \%\right.$ yield) as a hygroscopic solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz , free base, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.10-7.35(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 5.10(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH})$, 4.00-1.10 (m, 23H, aliph); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , APT, free base, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.7(+), 134.9(+), 133.6(+), 131.9(+), 128.5(-)$, $126.7(-), 126.6(-), 125.6(-), 125.3(-), 125.2(-), 123.6(-)$, $79.6(-), 79.2(-), 73.9(-), 73.7(-), 68.8(+), 68.7(+), 63.5$ $(-), 63.4(-), 56.9(+), 56.8(+), 49.4(+), 49.0(+), 33.8(+)$, $33.7(+), 31.3(+), 31.2(+), 28.9(+), 27.3(+), 26.9(+), 23.3$ $(+), 23.2(+), 22.9(+), 21.1(-), 21.0(-) ;$ HRMS (EI) mass calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~N}, 381.23041$; found, 381.23117 (62.2\%); Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{NCl}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{NCl}$ : C, 68.97 . Found: C, 67.52.

Method G. (1R,2R)-1-(1-Naphthalenethoxy)-2-(3-ketopyrrolidinyl)cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (40) and (1S,2S)-1-(1-Naphthalenethoxy)-2-(3-ketopyrrolidinyl)cyclohexane Monohydrochloride (41). A warm solution of $(1 R, 2 R) /(1 S, 2 S)$-1-(1-naphthalenethoxy)-2-(1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4,4]non-7$\mathrm{yl})$ cyclohexane ( $1.19 \mathrm{~g}, 3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 2-butanone ( 15 mL ) was mixed with a warm solution of di-p-toluoyl-D-tartaric acid (1.20 g, 3.1 mmol ) in 2-butanone ( 20 mL ). The mixture was allowed to cool down to room temperature and placed at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. The resultant precipitate (ee $73.7 \%$ ) was recrystallized from $\mathrm{MeOH}-$ butanone to yield $(1 R, 2 R)-1-(1-n a p h t h a l e n e t h o x y)-2-(1,4-d i o x a-7-$ azaspiro[4,4]non-7-yl)cyclohexane tartrate ( 0.73 g , ee $\geq 99 \%$ ). The residual mother liquor was concentrated in vacuo, and the residue was partitioned between $10 \%$ aq NaOH and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The combined organic extracts were dried and the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The residue $(0.61 \mathrm{~g}, 1.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in 2-butanone ( 8 mL ) and mixed with a warm solution of di-p-toluoyl-L-tartaric acid $(0.63 \mathrm{~g}, 1.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ in 2-butanone $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The mixture was allowed to cool down to room temperature overnight to yield $(1 S, 2 S)-1$ -(1-naphthalenethoxy)-2-(1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4,4]non-7-yl)cyclohexane tartrate $(0.89 \mathrm{~g}$, ee $97.5 \%)$.
$(1 R, 2 R)$-1-(1-naphthalenethoxy)-2-(1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4,4]non-7-yl)cyclohexane tartrate was partitioned between $10 \%$ aq NaOH and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, the organic layer was collected, dried, and concentrated in vacuo to provide the corresponding free base. Treatment with 6 M aq HCl in 2-butanone as previously described for $\mathbf{2 6}$ provided 40 in $97 \%$ yield. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.5$ (EtOAc-hexanes, $1: 1$, v/v, $+1 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v} \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$ ); ee $96.5 \% ;[\alpha]_{589 \mathrm{~nm}}-30.61^{\circ}(1, \mathrm{EtOH}) ; \mathrm{MS}\left[\mathrm{ES} ;\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)\right] 338.1$ ( $100 \%$ ); Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{NCl}\right) \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$. The same procedure was applied to the $(1 S, 2 S)$-1-(1-naphthalenethoxy)-2-(1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4,4]non-7-yl)cyclohexane tartrate to provide 41 in $98 \%$ yield. $R_{\mathrm{f}} 0.5\left(\mathrm{EtOAc}-\right.$ hexanes, $1: 1$, v/v, $\left.+1 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{Et}}^{3} \mathrm{~N}\right)$; ee $95.8 \%$; $[\alpha]_{589 \mathrm{~nm}}+30.32^{\circ}(1, \mathrm{EtOH}) ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 13.1$ (br s, 1H, $\mathrm{HN}^{+}$), $8.05-7.20(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ar}), 4.00-1.00(\mathrm{~m}, 20 \mathrm{H}$, aliph); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{APT}$, free base, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 215.2(+), 135.0$ $(+), 133.8(+), 132.0(+), 128.8(-), 127.0(-), 126.8(-), 125.8$ $(-), 125.4(-), 123.6(-), 79.4(-), 68.7(+), 63.7(-), 58.9(+)$, $48.0(+), 37.7(+), 33.8(+), 29.1(+), 26.9(+), 23.6(+), 23.1$ $(+) ; \operatorname{MS}\left[E S ;\left(\mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}\right)\right] 338.1(100 \%)$; Anal. $\left(\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{NCl}\right) \mathrm{C}$, H, N.

Single-Crystal X-ray Analysis of (1R,2R)-1-(1-Naphthale-nethoxy)-2-(1,4-dioxa-7-azaspiro[4,4]non-7-yl)cyclohexane as its Tartrate. Crystal Data. A clear needle crystal of $\mathrm{C}_{44} \mathrm{H}_{49} \mathrm{NO}_{11}$ having approximate dimensions of $0.40 \times 0.10 \times 0.05 \mathrm{~mm}$ was mounted on a glass fiber. All measurements were made on an ADSC CCD area detector coupled with a Rigaku AFC7 diffractometer with graphite monochromated Mo $\mathrm{K} \alpha$ radiation. Cell constants and an orientation matrix for data collection corresponded to a orthorhombic cell with dimensions: $a=10.991$ (4) A, $b=$ 11.861(4) $\AA, c=34.87(1) \AA, V=4545(2) \AA^{3}$.

For $Z=4$ and $\mathrm{FW}=767.87$, the calculated density is $1.12 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}$. Based on the systematic absences of h00, $h \pm 2 n ; 0 \mathrm{k} 0, k \pm 2 n$; and $001,1 \pm 2 n$ uniquely determine the space group to be: $P 2_{1} 2_{1} 2_{1}$ (\#19).

Crystallographic Measurements. The data were collected at a temperature of $-100 \pm 1{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to a maximum $2 \theta$ value of $41.6^{\circ}$. Data were collected in $0.30^{\circ}$ oscillations with 27.0 s exposures. A sweep of data was done using $\omega$ oscillations from -23.0 to $25.0^{\circ}$ at $\chi=-90.0^{\circ}$. A second sweep was performed using $\phi$ oscillations from 0.0 to $189.0^{\circ}$ at $\chi=-90.0^{\circ}$. The crystal-to-detector distance was 50.13 mm . The detector swing angle was $-5.91^{\circ}$. Of the 21987 reflections that were collected, 4718 were unique $\left(R_{\text {int }}=0.227\right.$, Friedels not merged); equivalent reflections were merged. Data were collected and processed using d*TREK. ${ }^{43}$ Net intensities and sigmas were derived as follows: $F^{2}=\left[\sum\left(P_{i}-m B_{\text {ave }}\right)\right] \times \mathrm{Lp}$, where $P_{i}$ is the value in counts of the $i$ th pixel, $m$ is the number of pixels in the integration area, $B_{\text {ave }}$ is the background average, and Lp is the Lorentz and polarization factor. $B_{\text {ave }}=\sum\left(B_{j}\right) / n$, where $n$ is the number of pixels in the background area and $B_{j}$ is the value of the $j$ th pixel in counts. $\sigma^{2}\left(F^{2} h k l\right)=\left[\left(\sum P_{i}\right)+m\left(\left(\sum\left(B_{\text {ave }}-B_{j}\right)^{2}\right) /(n-\right.\right.$ 1)) $] \cdot \mathrm{Lp} \cdot \mathrm{errmul}+\left(\operatorname{erradd} \cdot F^{2}\right)^{2}$, where erradd $=0.04$ and errmul $=$ 2.50. The linear absorption coefficient, $\mu$, for Mo $\mathrm{K} \alpha$ radiation is $0.8 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. An empirical absorption correction was applied that resulted in transmission factors ranging from 0.53 to 1.00. The data were corrected for Lorentz and polarization effects.

The material was very weakly diffracting, resulting in only a small fraction of observed reflections with very poor statistics. The structure was solved by direct methods ${ }^{44}$ and expanded using Fourier techniques. ${ }^{45}$ The nonhydrogen atoms were refined isotropically. Hydrogen atoms were included in fixed positions. The final cycle of full-matrix least-squares refinement ${ }^{46}$ on $F^{2}$ was based on 4718 observed reflections and 189 variable parameters and converged (largest parameter shift was 0.01 times its esd) with unweighted and weighted agreement factors of R1 $=\sum| | F_{\mathrm{o}}\left|-\left|F_{\mathrm{c}}\right|\right| /$ $\sum\left|F_{\mathrm{o}}\right|=0.386$ and wR $2=\left[\sum\left(w\left(F_{\mathrm{o}}^{2}-F_{\mathrm{c}}^{2}\right)^{2}\right) / \sum w\left(F_{\mathrm{o}}^{2}\right)^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}=0.663$. The standard deviation of an observation of unit weight ${ }^{47}$ was 1.16 . The weighting scheme was based on counting statistics. Plots of $\sum w\left(\left|F_{\mathrm{o}}\right|-\left|F_{\mathrm{c}}\right|\right)^{2}$ versus $\left|F_{\mathrm{o}}\right|$, reflection order in data collection, $\sin \theta / \lambda$, and various classes of indices showed no unusual trends. The maximum and minimum peaks on the final difference Fourier map corresponded to 0.61 and $-0.41 \mathrm{e}^{-} / \AA^{3}$, respectively. Neutral atom scattering factors were taken from Cromer and Waber. ${ }^{48}$

Anomalous dispersion effects were included in $F_{\text {calc }},^{49}$ the values for $\Delta f^{\prime}$ and $\Delta f^{\prime \prime}$ were those of Creagh and McAuley. ${ }^{50}$ The values for the mass attenuation coefficients are those of Creagh and Hubbell. ${ }^{51}$ All calculations were performed using the teXsan ${ }^{52}$ crystallographic software package of Molecular Structure Corporation and SHELXL-97. ${ }^{53}$ Experimental details and final positional and thermal parameters are listed at the end of the Supporting Information (Tables 1-4).

Biology. The following studies were performed with male Sprague-Dawley rats weighing $250-350 \mathrm{~g}$ unless otherwise specified. The protocols were approved by Animal Care Committee of the University of British Columbia.

Test for Convulsive Activity. A serious toxicity produced by several Class I antiarrhythmic drugs is CNS toxicity. To test for CNS toxicity, a method was developed to assess the convulsive activity of compounds. The maximum acutely tolerated dose in conscious rats was assessed using an ascending continuous infusion regimen. Under pentobarbitone anaesthesia ( $65 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.p.), rats were implanted with venous and arterial cannulae as well as ECG electrodes. Wound sites were infiltrated with bupivacaine and the animals were allowed to recover for 1 day before the drug was infused at a starting dose of $2 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$. The infusion rate was doubled every 5 min until (a) severe symptoms occurred, (b) the rat died, or (c) a maximum infusion rate of $64 \mu \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}$ was attained. Drug effects were assessed in terms of the dose that caused changes in breathing patterns, pupil dilation, exophthalmos, piloerection, paralysis, tremors, twitches, ataxia, loss of righting reflex, and convulsions as well as BP and an ECG. At the first sign of convulsions, an overdose of pentobarbitone was given to euthanize the animal.

Ischemia-Induced Arrhythmias. Regional ischemia was induced by occlusion of the left anterior descending coronary artery as previously described. ${ }^{54,55}$ Briefly, rats were anaesthetized with pentobarbital ( $65 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, i.p.) and a jugular vein and carotid artery were cannulated. Rats were intubated, via a tracheotomy, and ventilated with oxygen at 60 breaths $/ \mathrm{min}$ and $10 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{kg}$. The chest was opened and a polypropylene suture was loosely placed around the left anterior descending coronary artery. Thereafter, the chest was closed and the air evacuated from the chest.

Animals were allowed to recover for fifteen minutes before test compound or vehicle was infused continuously starting 5 min prior to occlusion. Monitoring continued for 20 min after occlusion to cover the first phase (5-10 min after occlusion) of ischemia-induced arrhythmias. ${ }^{56}$ ECG and BP measurements were taken at baseline and at 1 min prior to occlusion.

At the end of 20 min , the heart was excised and the size of the occluded zone was measured by perfusing the heart with cardiogreen dye $(0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL})$. The occluded zone size was calculated as a percentage of total ventricular mass. Animals were excluded if the occluded zone size was $<25 \%$ or $>50 \%$ of the total ventricular mass. All experiments were performed in a blinded fashion using a random block design.

Electrical Stimulation Studies. Haemodynamic, electrocardiographic (ECG), and electrophysiological variables were measured as previously described. ${ }^{57}$ Briefly, rats were anaesthetized with pentobarbital ( $65 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.p.) and a jugular vein and carotid artery were cannulated. The trachea was intubated, and the rats were ventilated with oxygen at 60 breaths/min and a stroke volume of $10 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{kg}$. A lead II ECG was recorded from subcutaneous pin electrodes. Mean BP, heart rate, and ECG intervals (PR and QT) were recorded via a customized Labview software.

Electrical stimulation of normal hearts in situ was facilitated by two fine Teflon coated silver wires inserted transthoracically into the apical wall of the left ventricle. Insertion was accomplished by passing electrodes via a transthoracic needle ( 27 gauge) into the left ventricle. Hearts were stimulated using square wave pulses of 0.5 ms duration at a rate of 7.5 Hz delivered from a custom built stimulator. The variables measured included threshold currents for capture (iT- $\mu \mathrm{A}$ ) and ERP-ms. All determinations were made in duplicate.

The value of iT was found by determining the lowest current required to capture the ventricle. ERP was determined at a cycle length of $133 \mathrm{~ms}(7.5 \mathrm{~Hz})$ using a stimulus strength twice iT. Hearts were paced for 10 beats after which an extrastimulus was introduced. The coupling interval was systematically increased from a starting value of 20 ms . ERP was defined as the shortest coupling interval that failed to produce a response. ${ }^{58}$ Drugs were infused in a dose-doubling regime. Each dose was administered for 5 min , variables were measured during the last 2 min of infusion, and the infusion rate was doubled to give the next dose.

We have previously found ${ }^{54,59-61}$ that such ECG and electrical stimulation studies give functional in vivo estimates of the ion channel (sodium and potassium) blocking actions of drugs. These data are consistent with data obtained in vitro in isolated rat cardiac myocytes.

Precision of estimates (SEM/mean) $\times 100$ for the variables measured in Table $4\left(\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{ED}_{50}\right)$, and in Table $5\left(\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{D}_{25}-\right.$ PR, $\mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{QT}_{1}, \mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{QT}_{2}, \mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{iT}, \mathrm{D}_{25} \mathrm{ERP}$ ) were calculated as described by Barrett et al. ${ }^{23}$ Dose-response curves for BP, ECG, as well as electrical stimulation variables were plotted using a best-fit algorithm (usually an exponential) for individual animals. From these curves the lowest dose $(D)$ required to produce a $25 \%$ change from predrug value $\left(D_{25 \%}\right)$ was interpolated. These values were pooled as appropriate for calculation of the mean.

Dose-response curves for antiarrhythmic actions were plotted using an arrhythmia score (AS) because the alternative data, such as quantal data incidence of ventricular tachycardia or fibrillation, are less precise. ${ }^{38}$ The Lambeth conventions recommend that such scores be used to summarize data. ${ }^{62}$ The AS used summarizes an animal's arrhythmic history as a single normally (Gaussian) distributed variable (score A), ${ }^{38}$ which takes into account the occurrence, severity, and duration of arrhythmias.

The antiarrhythmic response for each dose $\left(\mathrm{AS}_{\text {test }}\right)$ was expressed as the percent protection $\left(\% P_{\text {test }}\right)$ relative to the ArS in the control group ( $\mathrm{AS}_{\text {control }}$ ) according to eq 1 .

$$
\begin{equation*}
\% P_{\text {test }}=100-100 \times\left(\mathrm{AS}_{\text {test }} / \mathrm{AS}_{\text {control }}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

By expressing data in this way, the antiarrhythmic effect of the drug is easily seen as an increase in the percent protection. The dose-response data was then fit to a logistic function (eq 2) using Slide Write version 2.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\% P=\operatorname{maximum} \times D^{h} /\left(D^{h}+\mathrm{ED}_{50}{ }^{h}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In eq $2, D$ is the infused dose in $\mu \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{min}, h$ is the slope factor, and $\mathrm{ED}_{50}$ is the dose required to provide $50 \%$ of maximum protection. The baseline was defined as the occurrence of arrhythmias in controls (i.e., $0 \%$ protection, $\mathrm{AS}=5.7$ ), while the maximum response was defined as $100 \%$ protection (i.e., $\mathrm{AS}=0$, which corresponds to complete abolition of arrhythmias).

Maximum Tolerated Dose in Mice. The mice (female CD-1, approximately $25-30 \mathrm{~g}$ ) were preweighed and injected intravenously by the tail vein with a constant injection volume of 0.05 $\mathrm{mL} / 10 \mathrm{~g}$ of body weight, injected over 30 s . A heating lamp was used to warm the mice and help dilate the vein prior to injection in the lateral tail vein using a 1 mL syringe and a 27 G needle. An initial dose was injected into two mice; if both died, then the initial dose was diluted by $10 \times$ and the experiment was repeated. Doses were doubled $(n=2)$ until mortality of both mice was observed. The dose at which half of the mice would be expected to die is calculated as the $\mathrm{LD}_{50}$.

Electrophysiology. Cell Culture. Stable cell lines defrosted from frozen stocks and expressing specific ion channels (Nav1.5, hKv1.5, rKv2.1, and rKv4.2) were used in all experiments. To establish stable human embryonic kidney (HEK) cell lines expressing a specific ion channel, transiently transfected cells are maintained under high antibiotic selection (G418). After 2-3 weeks, cells are tested to evaluate their current levels. Once a stable line has been established, it can be further selected to obtain a monoclonal cell line, if required. The chosen cells are then kept and passaged for
electrophysiological recording. The cells were grown in minimal essential medium (MEM, Canadian Life Technologies, Bramalea, ON ) at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an air $/ 5 \% \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ incubator. The media contained $10 \%$ bovine serum and $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ G418 (Geneticin, Sigma-Aldrich, Ont Ca ). On the day before recording, cells were washed with MEM, treated with trypsin/EGTA for 1 min , and plated on 25 mm coverslips.

Solutions. For whole-cell (W/C) recordings, the control pipet was filled with $\mathrm{KCl}, 130$; EGTA, $5 ; \mathrm{MgCl}_{2}, 1 ;$ HEPES, $10 ; \mathrm{Na}_{2}-$ ATP, 4; GTP, 0.1 (all in mM), adjusted to pH 7.2 with KOH . The control bath solution contained (in mM ) $\mathrm{NaCl}, 135$; $\mathrm{KCl}, 5$; sodium acetate, $2.8 ; \mathrm{MgCl}_{2}, 1 ; \mathrm{HEPES}, 10 ; \mathrm{CaCl}_{2}, 1$, and was adjusted to pH 7.4 with NaOH . Studies were performed using concentrations ranging from 0.5 to $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$.

Recordings. Coverslips containing cells are removed from the incubator before experiments and placed in a superfusion chamber (volume $250 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) containing the control bath solution at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. W/C recordings were made via the patch-clamp technique, ${ }^{63}$ using an Axopatch 200B amplifier (Axon Instruments, CA). Patch electrodes were pulled from thin-walled borosilicate glass (World Precision Instruments, FL) on a horizontal micropipette puller, firepolished, and filled with appropriate solutions. Electrodes have resistances of $1.5-3.0 \mathrm{~m} \Omega$ when filled with control filling solution. Analog capacity compensation and $75-85 \%$ series resistance compensation were used in all W/C measurements. If necessary, leak subtraction was applied to data. Leak amplitude must be less than peak outward current or the preparation is discarded. Membrane potentials were corrected, where appropriate, for junctional potentials that arise between the pipet and bath solution. Data were filtered at 5 to 10 kHz before digitization and stored on a microcomputer for later analysis using the pClamp6 software (Axon Instruments, Foster City, CA). Pipettes are routinely fire-polished to reduce electrode capacitance and improve seal resistance.

Experimental protocols used to evaluate the properties of a cloned ion-channel (hKv1.5, rKv2.1, rKv4.2, and Nav1.5 sodium channels) and the potency of a compound on the channel are as follows.

Potassium Channel (hKv1.5, rKv2.1 and rKv4.2), Cycle Protocol. (Used for washing in/out drugs and eliciting cumulative concentration-response curves.) Cells are depolarized at 1 Hz from the holding potential of -80 mV to a voltage of +60 mV for 200 ms to fully open the channel. After control recording (200 pulses for Kv1.5, 100 pulses for Kv2.1 and 4.2) when a stable current level is reached, one concentration of drug is washed in. In the presence of the drug, the recording is maintained for 100 pulses or until the current level is stable. After the concentration-response curve is complete, the solution is returned to control to observe washout.

Sodium Channel, Cycle Protocol. (Used for washing in/out drugs and eliciting concentration-response curves.) Cells are depolarized at 1 Hz from the holding potential of -100 mV to a voltage of -30 mV for 10 ms to fully open the channel. After 50 pulses in control (usually $80-100$ traces), when the peak current is stable, the drug can be washed in. In the presence of the drug, at least 100 pulses are recorded or until the current is stable. When the drug effect is stable, the concentration can be increased in a half-log manner, and after several concentrations have been tested, the control solution can be used to test for reversibility of drug actions.

Data Analysis. The concentration-response curve for changes in peak current (sodium channel), steady-state current (hKv1.5, rKv2.1), and integrated current (rKv4.2) produced by a certain compound were computer-fitted to the Hill equation:

$$
f=1 /\left[1+\left(\mathrm{IC}_{50} /[D]^{n}\right)\right]
$$

where $f$ is the fractional current block $\left(f=1-I_{\text {drug }} / I_{\text {control }}\right)$ at drug concentration $[D], \mathrm{IC}_{50}$ is the concentration producing half-maximal inhibition, and $n$ is the Hill coefficient.

Canine Vagal-Induced AF Model. Mongrel dogs of either sex weighing $15-49 \mathrm{~kg}$ were anaesthetized with morphine $(2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ im initially, followed by $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.v. every 2 h ) and $\alpha$-chloralose
( $120 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.v. followed by an infusion of $29.25 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{h}$ ). Dogs were ventilated mechanically with room air supplemented with oxygen via an endotracheal tube at 20 to 25 breaths/min with a tidal volume obtained from a nomogram. Arterial blood gases were measured and kept in the physiological range $\left(\mathrm{SaO}_{2}>90 \%\right.$, pH 7.30-7.45). Catheters were inserted into the femoral artery for BP recording and blood gas measurement and into both femoral veins for drug administration and venous sampling. Catheters were kept patent with heparinized $0.9 \%$ saline solution. Body temperature was maintained at $37-40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with a heating blanket.

The heart was exposed via a medial thoracotomy, and a pericardial cradle was created. Three bipolar stainless steel, Tefloncoated electrodes were inserted into the right atria for recording and stimulation, and one was inserted into the left atrial appendage for recording. A programmable stimulator (Digital Cardiovascular Instruments, Berkeley, CA) was used to stimulate the right atrium with 2 ms , twice diastolic threshold pulses. Two stainless steel, Teflon-coated electrodes were inserted into the left ventricle, one for recording and the other for stimulation. A ventricular demand pacemaker (GBM 5880, Medtronics Minneapolis, MN) was used to stimulate the ventricles at 90 beats/min when (particularly during vagal-AF) the ventricular rate became excessively slow. A P23 ID transducer, electrophysiological amplifier (Bloom Associates, Flying Hills, PA) and paper recorder (Astromed MT-95000, Toronto, ON, Canada) were used to record ECG leads II and III, atrial and ventricular electrograms, BP, and stimulation artefacts. The vagi were isolated in the neck, doubly ligated, and divided, and electrodes were inserted in each nerve (see below). To block changes in $\beta$-adrenergic effects on the heart, nadolol was administered at an initial dose of $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.v., followed by $0.25 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ i.v. every 2 h .

Drug effects to terminate sustained AF maintained during continuous vagal nerve stimulation were assessed. Unipolar hook electrodes (stainless steel insulated with Teflon coating except for the distal $1-2 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) were inserted via a 21 gauge needle within and parallel to the shaft of each nerve. In most experiments, unipolar stimuli were applied with a stimulator (model DS-9F, Grass Instruments, Quincy, MA) set to deliver 0.1 ms square-wave pulses at 10 Hz and a voltage $60 \%$ of that required to produce asystole. In some experiments, bipolar stimulation was used. The voltage required to produce asystole ranged between 3 and 20 V . Under control conditions, a short burst of rapid atrial pacing ( 10 Hz , four times diastolic threshold) was delivered to induce AF, which was ordinarily sustained for more than 20 min . The vagal stimulation voltage was adjusted under control conditions and then readjusted after each treatment to maintain the same bradycardic effect. AF was defined as rapid ( $>500$ beats/min under control conditions), irregular atrial rhythm with varying electrogram morphology.

A diastolic threshold current was determined at a basic cycle length of 300 ms by increasing the current 0.1 mA incrementally until stable capture was obtained. For subsequent protocols, current was set to twice diastolic threshold. Atrial and ventricular ERP was measured with the extrastimulus method over a range of S 1 S 2 intervals at a basic cycle length of 300 ms . A premature extrastimulus S 2 was introduced every 15 basic stimuli. The S1S2 interval was increased in 5 ms increments until capture occurred, with the longest S1S2 interval consistently failing to produce a propagated response defining ERP. Diastolic threshold and ERP were determined in duplicate and averaged to give a single value. These values were generally within a 5 ms range. The interval between the stimulus artifact and the peak of the local electrogram was measured as an index of conduction velocity.

The stimulus voltage-heart rate relationship for vagal nerve stimulation was determined under control conditions in most experiments. The vagi were stimulated as described above with various voltages to determine the voltage, which caused asystole (defined as a sinus pause greater than 3 s ). The response to vagal nerve stimulation was confirmed under each experimental condition, and the voltage was adjusted to maintain the heart rate response to vagal nerve stimulation constant. In cases in which it was not possible to produce asystole, vagal nerve stimulation was adjusted
to a voltage that allowed two 20 min episodes of vagal-AF to be maintained under control conditions (see below).

All drugs were administered i.v. via an infusion pump, with drug solutions prepared freshly on the day of the experiment. Vagal stimulation parameters were defined under control conditions as described above, and maintenance of AF during 20 min of vagal nerve stimulation under control conditions was verified. After the termination of AF, the diastolic threshold and ERP of the atrium and ventricle were determined. Subsequently, these variables were reassessed in the atrium under vagal nerve stimulation.

Canine Sterile Pericarditis-Induced AF Model. FL or AF was induced 2-4 days after creation of sterile pericarditis in 22 adult mongrel dogs weighing $19-25 \mathrm{~kg}$. In all instances, the AF or FL lasted longer than 10 min . All studies were performed in accordance with guidelines specified by The Case Western Reserve University Animal Care and Use Committee, the American Heart Association Policy on Research Animal Use, and the Public Health Service Policy on Use of Laboratory Animals.

The canine sterile pericarditis model was created as previously described. ${ }^{20}$ At the time of surgery, a pair of stainless steel wire electrodes coated with FEP polymer except for the tip (O Flexon, Davis and Geck) were sutured on the right atrial appendage, Bachman's bundle, and the posteroinferior left atrium close to the proximal portion of the coronary sinus. The distance between each electrode of each pair was approximately 5 mm . These wire electrodes were brought out through the chest wall and exteriorized posteriorly in the interscapular region for subsequent use. At the completion of the surgery, the dogs were given antibiotics and analgesics and then were allowed to recover. Postoperative care included administration of antibiotics and analgesics.

In all dogs, beginning on postoperative day 2 , induction of stable AF/FL was attempted in the conscious, nonsedated state to confirm the inducibility and the stability of $\mathrm{AF} / \mathrm{FL}$ and to test the efficacy of the compounds. Atrial pacing was performed through the electrodes sutured during the initial surgery.

For the induction of $\mathrm{AF} / \mathrm{FL}$, one of two previously described methods was used: (1) introduction of one or two premature atrial beats after a train of eight paced atrial beats at a cycle length of $400,300,200$, or 150 ms or (2) rapid atrial pacing for periods of $1-10 \mathrm{~s}$ at rates incrementally faster by $10-50$ beats/min than the spontaneous sinus rate until FL was induced or there was a loss of 1:1 atrial capture. Atrial pacing was performed from either the right atrial appendage electrodes or the posteroinferior left atrial electrodes. All pacing was performed using stimuli of twice the threshold for each basic drive train with a modified Medtronic 5325 programmable, battery-powered stimulator with a pulse width of 1.8 ms . (1) ERPs were measured from three sites, right atrial appendage (RAA), posterior left atrium (PLA), and Bachmann's bundle (BB), at two basic cycle lengths 200 and 400 ms . (2) Pace induce A-Fib or AFL. This was attempted for 1 h . If no arrhythmia was induced, no further study was done on that day. (3) If induced, AF must have been sustained for 10 min . Then a waiting period was allowed for spontaneous termination or 20 min , whichever came first. (4) AF was then reinduced and 5 min was allowed before starting drug infusion. (5) Drug was then infused as a bolus over 5 min. (6) If AF terminated with the first dose, then a blood sample was taken and ERP measurements were repeated. (7) A period of 5 min was allowed for the drug to terminate AF . If there was no termination, then the second dose was given over 5 min . (8) After termination and ERPs were measured, a second attempt to reinduce AF was tried for a period of 10 min . (9) If reinduced and sustained for 10 min , a blood sample was taken and the study was repeated from (3) above. (10) If no reinduction could be obtained, the study was terminated.

Pharmacokinetics. The jugular vein of male Wistar rats were cannulated 2 days before drug administration. Single intravenous doses ( 12 or $17 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, bolus) and oral doses ( 24 or $34 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$, gavage) of compounds of interest were administered to fasted rats. Blood samples were taken at 5,15 , and 30 min and $1,2,4,8$, and 24 h post dose. Typically, to each plasma sample $(100 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was added the internal standard in 1 M perchloric acid $(100 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ for
protein precipitation. After centrifugation, the supernatant was transferred to another tube and 1 M aq ammonium formate (350 $\mu \mathrm{L})$ was added. The resultant solution was subjected to the on-line solid-phase extraction narrow bore HPLC-MS/MS analysis. The sample was trapped on a $20 \times 2 \mathrm{~mm}$ Superspher RP-18 trapping column and washed for 2 min with 5 mM ammonium formate pH 3.6 buffer. The analyte and the internal standard were then transferred to the analytical column (Superspher RP-18 $125 \times 2$ mm ) where separation takes place with an eluent mixed from A $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{MeOH}-\mathrm{AcOH}, 50: 50: 1\right)$ and $\mathrm{B}(5 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{NH} 4 \mathrm{OAc}$ with $1 \% \mathrm{AcOH}$ ) in a $9 / 1$ ratio. After elution, the trapping column as well as the analytical column were washed carefully. Detection was performed on an API III triple quadrupole mass spectrophotometer in selected reaction monitoring mode with collision energy of $\sim 20$ eV . Calibration graphs were constructed for all tested compounds from 5 to $100 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{mL}$, with an accuracy of approximately $15 \%$ over the entire concentration range. Pharmacokinetic parameters were determined by noncompartmental analysis using WinNonLin Pro 1.5.
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