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#### Abstract

The parent phenol of adapalene and its ( $E$ )-cinnamic acid analogue were found to induce cancer cell apoptosis but cause adverse systemic effects when administered to mice. In contrast, their respective $5-\mathrm{Cl}$ - and $3-\mathrm{Cl}$-substituted analogues had their adverse effects mitigated without a comparable loss of cancer cell inhibitory activity. As a result, pharmacologic space in this region of the cinnamic phenyl ring scaffold was explored. Various substituents were introduced, and their effects on cancer cell proliferation and viability were evaluated. Cinnamic acids having $3-\mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{CN}, \mathrm{NO}_{2}$, $\mathrm{NH}_{2}, \mathrm{OMe}$, and $\mathrm{N}_{3}$ groups had activity comparable to that of 4-[3'-(1-adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-chlorocinnamic acid. A comparative molecular field analysis study indicated that introduction of an H -bond acceptor at position 3 of the central phenyl ring would favor inhibition of leukemia cell viability, and docking suggested its hydrogen  $X=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{CF}_{3}$, $\mathrm{CN}, \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{OMe}, \mathrm{OEt}, \mathrm{OH}$, $\mathrm{NO}_{2}, \mathrm{NH}_{2}, \mathrm{~N}_{3}$ $\mathrm{X}_{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{Me}, \mathrm{OMe}$ $\mathrm{X}_{2}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{F}, \mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{Br}$ bonding with a polar group in a small heterodimer partner homology model. The 3-CN, $\mathrm{NO}_{2}, \mathrm{NH}_{2}$, and OH analogues also inhibited MMTV-Wntl murine mammary stem cell viability.


## INTRODUCTION

We discovered that 5-Cl-AHPN (3) and 3-Cl-AHPC (8) (Figure 1) are ligands of the orphan nuclear receptor (NR) small heterodimer partner (SHP) on the basis of their competitive binding with the 5,5 'tritiated analogue of SHP ligand AHPN (1). ${ }^{1}$ SHP is one of two unique orphan nuclear receptors in having only a ligandbinding domain (LBD) through which it acts to regulate cell processes such as survival, DNA methylation, and metabolism. ${ }^{2-4}$ Although a crystal structure of SHP has not been reported, a homology model was derived from the structure [Protein Data Bank (PDB) entry 1G2N] of the LBD of ultraspiracle (USP) protein, ${ }^{5}$ which is the insect homologue of the vertebrate orphan NR retinoid X receptor (RXR). ${ }^{6}$ This model, which has been partially validated by mutagenesis, ${ }^{7}$ has the canonical NR LBD structure of 12 sandwiched $\alpha$-helices, a short $\beta$-sheet between helices H 5 and H 6 , a H12 containing a ligand-dependent activation function 2 (AF-2), and a putative ligand-binding pocket (LBP) to which a USP ligand could be docked. ${ }^{6}$ This model also revealed that NR box or coactivator (CoA) motifs (LXXLL, X = unspecified) were located in helical regions corresponding to NR LBD H1, H6, and H10. The NR motifs permit a CoA protein to interact with the NR AF-2 surface generated by NR H3, H4, and H12, thereby allowing the NR-CoA complex bound to DNA to recruit the transcriptional complex. In contrast, binding by a SHP

NR box to the AF-2 surface generally represses NR transactivational activity. While a natural ligand for SHP has not been reported, our studies showed that small molecules such as $\mathbf{1}$ and 8 (Figure 1) by interacting with SHP induced SHP to interact with the mSin 3 A multiprotein repressor complex, ${ }^{1}$ thereby modifying expression of several genes, including c-Fos and c-Jun, ${ }^{8}$ leading to activation of JNK and NF- $\kappa$ B signaling pathways and resulting in apoptosis of cancer and leukemia cell lines. ${ }^{8-10}$

Without a structure of SHP available, ligand design has relied on indirect methods such as structure-activity analysis and docking of candidates to the homology model. The prototype for SHP ligands was the aromatic retinoid 6-[3'-(1-adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-2-naphthalenecarboxylic acid (AHPN/ CD437, 1), the parent phenol of the anti-acne drug adapalene. The retinoid-like adverse effects of 1 were mitigated in the 4 aryl 3-chlorocinnamic acid 8, which was unable to transcriptionally activate the retinoic acid nuclear receptors (RARs). ${ }^{11}$ Molecular dynamics of the more rigid 5-chloronaphthalenecarboxylic acid analogue (3) of 8 suggested why the chloro group on the central aryl ring ortho to the diaryl bond would interfere in the docking of 3 (Figure $1 ; \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Cl}$ in Table 1) to
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|  | X |  | $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{5}$ (3-A-AHPC) | $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{3} \mathrm{NHAc}$ | H | H |  |
| $\mathbf{6}$ (AHPC) | H | H | H |  |
| $\mathbf{7}$ (3-Me-AHPC) | Me | H | H |  |
| $\mathbf{8}$ (3-Cl-AHPC) | Cl | H | H |  |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$ | H | H |  |
| 10 | OEt | H | H |  |
| 11 | Me | Me | H |  |
| 12 | OMe | OMe | H |  |
| 13 | Cl | Cl | H |  |
| 14 | H | H | F |  |
| 15 | H | H | Cl |  |

Figure 1. Structures of the adamantyl-substituted retinoid-related AHPN series: AHPN/CD437 (1), 5-Me-AHPN (2), 5-Cl-AHPN (3), and 4. Structures of the similarly substituted AHPC series: 3-A-AHPC (5), АНРС (6), 3-Me-AHPC (7), 3-Cl-AHPC (8), and 9-15.
the agonist conformation of the $\mathrm{RAR} \gamma \operatorname{LBD}$ (PDB entry 3LBD). ${ }^{12}$ With the naphthalenecarboxylate group of 3 anchored by ionic and/or H-bonding interactions with the LBD H5 R278 side chain in the RAR ligand-binding pocket, the larger $5-\mathrm{Cl}$ group caused the torsion angle between the aryl rings of 3 to increase so that its 1 -adamantyl group (1-Ad) clashed with side chains in the agonist position of H11, thereby preventing H12 from forming the AF-2 surface. Fortunately, the new orientation of the aryl rings did not prevent $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{8}$ from inducing cancer cell apoptosis. ${ }^{11}$

To explore chemical space about the $5-\mathrm{Cl}$ group of 3 and the $3-\mathrm{Cl}$ group of analogue 8 , we had previously synthesized and evaluated a limited series of analogues. Their abilities to inhibit the proliferation and induce the apoptosis of all-trans-retinoic acid (ATRA)-resistant human HL-60R myeloid leukemia and MDA-MB-231 breast cancer cell lines at 1.0 and $5.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ are summarized in Table 1. The growth inhibitory and apoptotic activities of several compounds from these initial studies indicated that introducing particular groups at position 5 of naphthalene-2-carboxylic acid 1 and position 3 of cinnamic acid 6 negatively impacted efficacy. Their analogues, 2 and 7, respectively, with a methyl group at these positions were less active than the parent structures, whereas 3 and 8 with a chloro group, which was only $3 \AA^{3}$ smaller ( $13.5 \%$ ) in volume than the methyl group, had these activities partially restored. ${ }^{11}$ In contrast, introduction of larger groups such as hydroxymethyl and ethoxy in 4 and 10, respectively, caused the loss of both activities. Moreover, the introduction of two methyl and methoxy substituents at positions 3 and 5 of the central phenyl ring ( 11 and 12, respectively), both of which are ortho to the diaryl bond, further diminished activity against MDA-MB-231 cell proliferation, whereas introducing 3,5-dichloro groups (13) did not impact MDA-MB-231 growth inhibition but did
diminish HL-60R cell apoptosis compared to that with 8. Shifting the $3-\mathrm{Cl}$ group to position 2 of the cinnamic acid ring in $15\left(\mathrm{X}_{2}=\mathrm{Cl}\right)$ caused a loss of activity against both cell lines (Table 1), whereas the corresponding 2-F group of $14\left(\mathrm{X}_{2}=\mathrm{F}\right)$ with a volume of $10.7 \AA^{3}$ weakened only MDA-MB-231 growth inhibition but did not affect HL-60R apoptosis induction. Docking studies described below now suggest reasons for these differences.

These previous results suggested that further increasing the volume of the central ring substituent ortho to the diaryl bond would inversely correlate with levels of growth inhibition and apoptosis induction. As a corollary, those analogues with smaller substituents at position 3 would interact with SHP but those with larger volumes would not. To more thoroughly explore space in this region, these studies focused on additional analogues of 6 because of their relative ease of synthesis. Initially, evaluations employed KG-1 AML cells and then were extended to OCI-AML2 AML, K562 chronic myeloid leukemia (CML), and MOLT4 T-cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia (T-ALL) cell lines for which the analogue dose response was investigated. Several of the more potent analogues were also evaluated using the murine MMTV-Wnt1 mammary stem cell line in which the Wntl oncogene had been overexpressed.

## RESULTS

Design and Chemical Synthesis. Computational studies indicated that 8 assumed two poses when docked to the SHP model. ${ }^{13}$ Both poses suggested that the carboxylate group of 8 could have ionic interactions with the side chain of R238 in SHP helix H11, its phenolic hydroxyl could form an $\mathrm{H}-\pi$ bond with the phenyl ring of F96 in H5, and its 1-adamantyl group could have van der Waals and/or hydrophobic contacts with L97, L100, A145, and W148. In contrast, the cinnamyl ring of 8 occupied orthogonal positions so that the $3-\mathrm{Cl}$ group was directed toward LBP hydrophobic residues or toward the polar side chains of T55 and C56 in H3. This second orientation suggested a possible H -bond interaction with the threonine hydroxyl group and/or cysteine sulfhydryl group. To explore the importance of the substituent at position 3 with respect to volume and electrostatic properties and its subsequent impact on ligand orientation in the SHP LBP, analogues 46-52, 57, 59, and 61 with various substituents at position 3 were designed, synthesized (Schemes 1 and 2), and evaluated (Table 2). In addition, the effect on activity of a substituent at cinnamic acid ring position 6 , which is ortho to the cinnamic acid double bond, was explored in $63\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}=\mathrm{Br}\right)$, and that of restricting the aryl rings to a planar orientation was investigated in tricyclic carbazoles 66 and 69, in which a common nitrogen atom and the diaryl bond combined to restrict ring rotation.

The general route to the 3 -substituted analogues of $\mathbf{8}$ involved constructing a series of $(E)$-cinnamate intermediates by a Mizoroki-Heck vinyl-aryl coupling ${ }^{14}$ of 3,4-disubstituted phenyl halides with ethyl acrylate or by a Wittig reaction ${ }^{15,16}$ on 3,4-disubstituted benzaldehydes. After suitable functionalization followed by the Suzuki-Miyaura diaryl coupling, ${ }^{17}$ suitablyfunctionalized cinnamates with 3-(1-adamantyl)-4-benzyloxyphenylboronic acid (34) were used to introduce the central diaryl bond (Schemes 1 and 2). One-step procedures were used to prepare four of the five precursors required for constructing the required 3,4-disubstituted cinnamates (Scheme 1). Thus, diazotization of aniline 16 at -5 to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and treatment with potassium iodide at $22-100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ afforded 4-bromo-3-trifluoromethylphenyl iodide (17) required for intermediate 25.

Table 1. Effects of a Substituent on the Central Aryl Ring on Analogue Activity Compared to That of the 5-Chloro Group of 1 and the 3-Chloro Group of 8 in Terms of Human Leukemia and Breast Cancer Cell Growth Inhibition and Apoptosis Induction ${ }^{a}$

| AHPN series |  |  |  | growth inhibition after treatment (\%) ${ }^{b}$ |  |  |  | apoptosis (\%) after treatment time ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { KG-1 AML } \\ & \text { at } 48 \mathrm{~h} \end{aligned}$ |  | MDA-MB231 breast cancer at 96 h |  | HL-60R leukemia at 24 h |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { KG-1 AML } \\ & \text { at } 48 \mathrm{~h} \end{aligned}$ |  | MDA-MB- <br> 231 breast cancer at 96 h |  |
| compou | nd |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ \mu \mathrm{M} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.0 \\ \mu \mathrm{M} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0 \\ \mu \mathrm{M} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2.0 \\ \mu \mathrm{M} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.1 \\ \mu \mathrm{M} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ \mu \mathrm{M} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ \mu \mathrm{M} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.0 \\ \mu \mathrm{M} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0 \\ \mu \mathrm{M} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.0 \\ \mu \mathrm{M} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  | $46^{e}$ | $64^{e}$ | $73^{\text {d }}$ | $98^{\text {d }}$ |  |  | $26^{f}$ | $46^{e}$ |
| 2 |  |  |  | $91{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $94^{d}$ | $28^{f}$ | $43^{e}$ | $29^{f}$ | $70^{e}$ | $50^{e}$ | $72^{\text {d }}$ | $28^{f}$ | $43^{e}$ |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  | $41^{e}$ | $66^{e}$ | $62^{\text {e }}$ | $94^{d}$ |  |  | $21^{g}$ | $41^{e}$ |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  | $1^{g}$ | $1^{g}$ | $0^{g}$ | $74^{d}$ |  |  |  |  |
| AHPC series |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{\sim}{*}$ $X_{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| compound | $\mathrm{X}^{c}$ | $\mathrm{X}_{1}{ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\mathrm{X}_{2}{ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | H | H | H |  |  | $53^{e}$ | $57^{e}$ | $90^{d}$ | $98^{\text {d }}$ |  |  | $53^{e}$ | $58^{e}$ |
| 7 | Me | H | H |  |  | $30^{f}$ | $49^{e}$ | $10^{g}$ | $95^{d}$ | $23^{f}$ | $42^{e}$ | $5^{8}$ | $30^{\text {f }}$ |
| 8 | Cl | H | H | $44^{e}$ | $67^{e}$ | $43^{e}$ | $76^{d}$ | $51^{e}$ | $94^{d}$ | $30^{f}$ | $55^{e}$ | $31{ }^{f}$ | $43^{e}$ |
| 9 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}$ | H | H |  |  |  |  | $10^{g}$ | $90^{d}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | OEt | H | H |  |  | $1^{g}$ | $0^{g}$ | $0^{g}$ | $29^{f}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Me | Me | H |  |  | $6^{8}$ | $8^{g}$ | $4^{g}$ | $15^{8}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | OMe | OMe | H |  |  | $4^{g}$ | $11^{8}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Cl | Cl | H |  |  | $52^{e}$ | $76^{\text {d }}$ | $20^{8}$ | $62^{e}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | H | H | F |  |  | $15^{8}$ | $34^{f}$ | $82^{\text {d }}$ | $98^{d}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | H | H | Cl |  |  | $3^{8}$ | $14^{g}$ | $4^{g}$ | $2^{g}$ |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{a}$ Activities of $1-3,6-8$, and 10 in inducing HL-60R and MDA-MB-231 apoptosis and growth inhibition were previously reported. ${ }^{11}{ }^{b}$ Results represent the average of triplicates $\pm \leq 10$ (standard deviation). ${ }^{c}$ Calculated volumes (cubic angstroms) of $\mathrm{X}: \mathrm{H}, 5.77 ; \mathrm{F}, 10.7 ; \mathrm{Cl}, 19.3 ; \mathrm{Me}, 22.3$; $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH}, 30.6 ; \mathrm{OMe}, 31.3$; $\mathrm{OEt}, 48.1 .^{47}$ dtatistical analysis (probability of difference of the treatment value from that of the nontreated control): $P<0.001$. ${ }^{e}$ Statistical analysis (probability of difference of the treatment value from that of the nontreated control): $P<0.01$. ${ }^{f}$ Statistical analysis (probability of difference of the treatment value from that of the nontreated control): $P<0.05$. ${ }^{g}$ Statistical analysis (probability of difference of the treatment value from that of the nontreated control): $P>0.05$.

Benzylation of phenols 18 and 20 provided the 3-benzyloxyphenyl bromides 19 and 21 for preparing the respective intermediates 26 and 29. Palladium-catalyzed acrylation of 26 and 29, $\mathrm{BBr}_{3}$-mediated debenzylation, and treatment with triflic anhydride yielded the ethyl 3-cyano- and 3-carbomethoxy-4triflyloxycinnamates 28 and 31, respectively. Diisobutylaluminum hydride reduction of 4-bromo-3-methoxybenzonitrile (22) provided benzaldehyde 23 . Both 23 and 24 underwent a Wittig olefination to afford the respective 3-methoxy- and 3-nitro-4bromocinnamate ester intermediates 32 and 33.

Palladium-catalyzed coupling of aryl bromides 25, 32, and 33 and aryl triflates 28 and 31 with 34 produced the protected 4arylcinnamates $35,38,39,36$, and 37 , respectively, which were then debenzylated by using $\mathrm{BBr}_{3}$. Another $\mathrm{BBr}_{3}$-mediated cleavage of the 3-methoxy group of 43 gave $3-\mathrm{OH}$-substituted 44. Base hydrolysis and acidification yielded target cinnamic acids $\mathbf{4 6 - 4 8}$ and 50-52. The hindered 3 -carbomethoxy group of 48 did not hydrolyze at $0-22^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, which was routinely used for the ethyl ester hydrolysis, but did at $82{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to afford 3-carboxy-substituted 49 (71\%).

The 3-nitrocinnamate 39 was also used to prepare analogues $\mathbf{5 7}, 59,61,63,66$, and 69 (Scheme 2). Reduction of the 3 -nitro group of 39 using stannous chloride in ethanol provided 3aminocinnamate 53. Diazotization of 53 under hydrophobic conditions using tert-butyl nitrite in the presence of cupric bromide ( 2 equiv) at $0-22{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ produced the 2,5 -dibromocinnamate 55. In contrast, treatment of 53 with $n$-hexyl nitrite in bromoform (34 equiv) at $100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ afforded the 3-bromocinnamate 54 .

Debenzylation of 53-55 produced 56, 60, and 62, respectively, which were hydrolyzed to provide their respective 3 -amino-, 3 -bromo-, and 2,5 -dibromocinnamic acids 57, 61, and 63. The amino group of 56 was diazotized $\left(\mathrm{HNO}_{2}\right)$ and treated with sodium azide to produce 3 -azidocinnamate 58 , which after ester hydrolysis provided 3 -azidocinnamic acid 59. Reductive cyclization of 39 by heating ( $180{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) with triphenylphosphine in 1,2 dichlorobenzene ${ }^{18,19}$ afforded the regioisomeric carbazoles 64 and 67, which were separated and then deprotected in two steps to give 66 and 69, respectively.

Biological Evaluation. Antiproliferative and Apoptotic Activities. Analogues 46-52, 57, 59, 61, 63, 66, and 69 were compared to the 3 -chloro congener (8) for their ability to inhibit proliferation or viability of four human leukemia cell lines (KG-1 AML, OCI-AML2 AML, K562 CML, and MOLT4 T-ALL) and induce KG-1 cell apoptosis (Table 2). These cell lines were selected as representative of the acute myeloid, chronic myeloid, and T-cell acute lymphoblastic types of leukemia having varied resistances to synthetic retinoid 1 from which these analogues were originally derived ${ }^{20,21}$ and to chemotherapeutic agents and a variety of defects that facilitates their proliferation, ${ }^{22-39}$ which are described in the Supporting Information. The KG-1 AML line was also used for comparison with the activities of the first-generation analogues (see Table 1).

The viability of these leukemia lines was determined after treatment for 72 h by measuring changes in their ATP levels using assays for luciferase, for which ATP serves as a cofactor (Table 2). The dose-response curves used to determine their

## Scheme 1. Syntheses of 46-52a


${ }^{a}$ Reagents and conditions: (a) $\mathrm{NaNO}_{2}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}, 0$ to $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, KI , room temperature to $100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; (b) $\mathrm{PhCH}_{2} \mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$, acetone, reflux; (c) ethyl acrylate, $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}, \mathrm{Et}_{3} \mathrm{~N}$, tri( $o$-tolyl) phosphine, reflux; (d) DIBAL, MePh, $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to room temperature; $\mathrm{MeOH}, 10 \% \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$; (e) (carbethoxymethylene)$\mathrm{Ph}_{3} \mathrm{P}$, MePh, reflux; (f) $\mathrm{BBr}_{3}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2},-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$; (g) $\mathrm{Tf}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, pyridine, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to room temperature; ( h ) for compounds 35,38 , and 39 , 3-(1-adamantyl)-4-benzyloxyphenylboronic acid (34), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}, \mathrm{DME}, 2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$, reflux; for compounds 36 and 37, compound 34, $\operatorname{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}$, $\mathrm{LiCl}, \mathrm{DME}, 2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$, reflux; (i) $\mathrm{BBr}_{3}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2},-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to room temperature; $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$; (j) for compounds 46, 48, and 51, aqueous $\mathrm{NaOH}, \mathrm{MeOH}$, reflux; $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{O}^{+}$; for compounds 47, 50, and $\mathbf{5 2}, \mathrm{LiOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{THF} / \mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, room temperature; $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{O}^{+}$; (k) LiOH $\cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaOH}, \mathrm{THF} /$ $\mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, room temperature to $82^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{O}^{+}$.
$\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values are shown in Figure S 1 of the Supporting Information. Analysis of the effects of the analogues on these leukemia lines indicated that both the volume and electron density of the substituent at position 3 on the cinnamic ring impacted antiproliferative activities. In analogues that induced the highest levels of KG-1 cell growth inhibition and apoptosis, a variety of polar substituents were tolerated, including $3-\mathrm{Cl}$, $\mathrm{CN}, \mathrm{OMe}, \mathrm{NO}_{2}, \mathrm{NH}_{2}, \mathrm{~N}_{3}$, and Br . Of these, the 3-OMe and Br groups of $\mathbf{5 0}$ and $\mathbf{6 1}$, respectively, provided the most potent KG-1 growth inhibitory activity at 1.0 and $5.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$, which approximated that of 8 having a $3-\mathrm{Cl}$ group, whereas all six groups exhibited similar potencies in inducing KG-1 apoptosis. In contrast, 48 and 51 with $3-\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}$ and $3-\mathrm{OH}$ groups, respectively, were approximately half as potent at $5.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ in inducing apoptosis. Analogues 46 and 49 with $3-\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ and $3-\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{H}$ groups, respectively, were essentially inactive. These substituent effects were observed to track with analogue potencies in inhibiting K562, OCI-AML2, and MOLT4 cell viability. In terms of $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values, OCI-AML2 AML and MOLT4 T-ALL cells were more sensitive (approximately 3-4fold) to the analogues than K562 CML cells. Analogues that inhibited viability could be sorted into two groups on the basis of their $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values with those having $3-\mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{CN}, \mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{NO}_{2}$, and $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ groups being approximately twice as potent as those with
the $3-\mathrm{OMe}, \mathrm{N}_{3}$, and Br groups. An anomaly to these trends was the $3-\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ group of 46 . At $5.0 \mu \mathrm{M}, 46$ was unable to induce KG 1 cell apoptosis after 48 h but did inhibit OCI-AML2 and MOLT4 viability by $50 \%$ at 3.8 and $3.9 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively, at 72 h , whereas at $5.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$, K562 cell viability was inhibited by only $25 \%$. The second anomaly was the lack of activity of 49 having the $3-\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{H}$ group. The deprotonation of this group at physiologic pH may have impeded the cellular uptake of 49.

Introducing a second group at position 5 of the cinnamic ring led to a further decrease in apoptotic activity in the 3,5-dimethyl, dimethoxy, and dichloro analogues (11-13, respectively) compared to their respective monosubstituted analogues $(7,50$, 8, and 61). In contrast to the growth inhibitory and apoptotic activities provided by the 3 -amino analogue 57 , its planar analogues 66 and 69 having their diaryl rings linked through an $o-\mathrm{NH}$ group had very low or no activity against the four leukemia cell lines.

Introducing a second bromo group at position 6 of the cinnamic ring of the 3-bromocinnamic acid $\mathbf{6 1}$ produced 63 with substantially lower KG-1 apoptosis-inducing activity. At $1.0 \mu \mathrm{M}, 63$ was inactive and its $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values for inhibiting leukemia cell viability ranged from 1.4 to $4.2 \mu \mathrm{M}$. This result is in agreement with the observation that shifting the chloro group to position 2 of the cinnamyl ring in 15 led to a loss of

## Scheme 2. Syntheses of 57, 59, 61, 63, 66, and $69^{a}$


${ }^{a}$ Reagents and conditions: (a) $\mathrm{SnCl}_{2} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{EtOH}, 80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; (b) $\mathrm{CuBr}_{2}$, tert-butyl nitrite, $\mathrm{MeCN}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to room temperature; (c) $n$-hexyl nitrite, CHBr 3 , $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; (d) $\mathrm{BBr}_{3}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2},-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$; (e) $\mathrm{LiOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, THF/ $\mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, room temperature; $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{O}^{+}$; (f) $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, NaNO , dioxane, $-10{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; $\mathrm{NaN}_{3}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O},-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ;(\mathrm{g}) 25 \% \mathrm{NaOH}, \mathrm{EtOH} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2: 1)(59)$ or $\mathrm{EtOH}(69)$, room temperature; $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{O}^{+}$; (h) $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$, 1,2-dichlorobenzene, $180{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

MDA-MB-231 growth inhibition and HL-60R AML cell apoptosis-inducing activities, whereas its replacement with the smaller fluorine in 14 retained HL-60R apoptotic activity but reduced the level of MDA-MB-231 growth inhibition compared to that of 6 , which had a hydrogen at position 3 . In summary, of the new analogues, those having $3-\mathrm{CN}, \mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{NO}_{2}$, and $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ groups (47,51,52, and 57, respectively) most potently inhibited leukemia cell viability with $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values comparable to those of $3-\mathrm{Cl}-$ substituted 8. These four groups have unpaired electrons that could function as H -bond acceptors. Of these, the hydroxyl and amino groups could also function as H -bond donors. The 3 - Cl group of $\mathbf{8}$ could interact with electron-donating atoms (O of T55 and S of C56) ${ }^{40}$ or perhaps have van der Waals interactions with the methyl group of T55. ${ }^{41}$

SAR Analysis. The impact of the size of the substituent at position 3 on apoptotic activity was demonstrated previously by the inability of the 3-(3-acetamidopropyloxy) analogue (3-AAHPC, 5) to induce apoptosis; on the other hand, the $3-\mathrm{Cl}$ analogue (8) was active. ${ }^{11}$ A component SAR analysis (Table S2 and Figure S2 of the Supporting Information) using 11 analogues was undertaken to investigate the impact of the volume of the substituent at position 3 on K562, OCI-AML2, and MOLT-4 leukemia cell viability as determined by the decrease in ATP levels (Table 2). This analysis excluded inactive $49\left(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{H}\right)$, inactive planar 66 and 69 , and 63 with a 3,6 -dibrominated cinnamyl ring to provide a series of active and similar compounds. Despite the fact that a downstream event (loss of the mitochondrial generation of ATP) was measured in cells that also were required to take up the analogues through the cell membrane, correlations were obtained in the $\log -\log$ plots of the volume of the substituent at position 3 versus $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values for the three leukemia cell lines. The less active compounds had substituents at position 3 with larger volumes (Figure S2B of the Supporting Information). Thus, 46 with a $3-\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ group ( $37 \AA^{3}$ ) and 48 with a $3-\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}$
group ( $50.3 \AA^{3}$ ) were the least active, whereas 52 with a $3-\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ group ( $29 \AA^{3}$ ) and 59 with a $3-\mathrm{N}_{3}$ group ( $31 \AA^{3}$ ) were active. This trend was evident upon comparison of similar substituents. For example, 8 with a smaller $3-\mathrm{Cl}$ group (19 $\AA^{3}$ ) was 1.9-3.0-fold more active than 61 with a $3-\mathrm{Br}$ group ( 24 $\AA^{3}$ ), and 47 with a $3-\mathrm{CN}$ group ( $23 \AA^{3}$ ) was $2.4-4.5$-fold more active than 59 with a $3-\mathrm{N}_{3}$ group ( $30.7 \AA^{3}$ ).

Next, the combined impact of the volume of the substituent at position 3 and H -bond acceptor and donor capacity on the inhibition of MOLT4 cell viability was examined using comparative molecular field analysis (CoMFA) (Figure 2). The resulting partial contour map shows that the favored steric and positively charged fields were asymmetric and that the favored negatively charged field was symmetric (Figure 2A). The large red contour map suggests that an H -bond acceptor would have a wider role in interacting with a SHP pocket residue to support the higher activities observed for analogues 47, 51, 52, and 57. Similar partial contour maps were obtained from analyses of the results from the treatment of K562 and OCI-AML2 cells. In Figure 2B are shown plots of the actual and predicted logarithms of the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values for viability inhibition of the three cell lines obtained from the CoMFA studies that suggest robust correlations. The data used to construct the three maps are summarized in Tables S2 and S3 of the Supporting Information. These trends continued when comparing the physical properties of the substitutents at position 3 of the 11 analogues with their KG-1 apoptosisinducing activities.

The most active analogues ( $8,47,51,52$, and 57 ) together with much less active analogue 46 were also evaluated for their effects on MMTV-Wntl murine mammary cancer stem cell proliferation. Their dose-response curves are shown in Figure 3. On the basis of the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values (Table 2) obtained from these curves, analogues with $3-\mathrm{Cl}$ and $\mathrm{NH}_{2}$ groups ( 8 and 57 , respectively) had comparable activity and were more potent

Table 2. Effects of a Substituent at Position 3 of the AHPC Scaffold on KG-1 AML Cell Growth Inhibition and Apoptosis Induction and Inhibition of Leukemia Cell (K562, OCI-AML2, and MOLT4) and Mammary Cancer Stem Cell Viability

${ }^{a}$ Results represent the means of triplicates $\pm \leq 10$ [standard deviation (SD)]. ${ }^{b}$ Leukemia cell lines treated with $0,0.1,0.25,0.5,1.0,2.5$, and $5.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ compound. $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values were determined from the dose-response curves shown in Figure S1 of the Supporting Information using data representing means of quadruplicate trials $\pm$ SD (K562, $\leq 10$; OCI-AML2, $\leq 11$; MOLT4, $\leq 10$ ), as was the determination of viability (percent at $5 \mu \mathrm{M})$. ${ }^{c} \mathrm{Cells}$ treated with $0,0.01,0.03,0.1,0.3,1.0$, and $3.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ compound. $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values determined graphically from each of triplicate dose-response curves are represented as means of triplicates $\pm \mathrm{SD}$. ${ }^{d}$ Calculated volume (cubic angstroms) of $\mathrm{X}: \mathrm{Cl}, 19.3 ; \mathrm{CF}_{3}, 37.1 ; \mathrm{CN}, 22.6 ; \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}, 50.3 ; \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{H}, 32.8$; $\mathrm{OMe}, 31.3$; $\mathrm{OH}, 13.8 ; \mathrm{NO}_{2}, 29.1 ; \mathrm{NH}_{2}, 17.1 ; \mathrm{N}_{3}, 30.7 ; \mathrm{Br}, 23.7 .{ }^{47}{ }^{e}$ Statistical analysis (probability of difference of the treatment value from that of the nontreated control): $P<0.01 .{ }^{f}$ Statistical analysis (probability of difference of the treatment value from that of the nontreated control): $P>0.05$.
 analysis (probability of difference of the analogue $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value from that of 8 ): $P<0.001$. ${ }^{j}$ Statistical analysis (probability of difference of the analogue $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value from that of $\mathbf{8}$ ): $P<0.01 .{ }^{k}$ Statistical analysis (probability of difference of the analogue $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value from that of 8 ): $P<0.005$. ${ }^{l}$ Statistical analysis (probability of difference of the analogue $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value from that of 8 ): $P>0.1 .{ }^{m}$ nd, not determined.
than analogues with $3-\mathrm{CN}, \mathrm{OH}$, and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ groups (47, 51, and 52, respectively). Compound 46 inhibited MMTV-Wnt1 proliferation with an $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value of $2.37 \mu \mathrm{M}$, which was more than 50 -fold higher than that determined for 8 . The $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values of analogues in the MMTV-Wntl murine mammary stem cell assay were much lower than those obtained using the leukemia cell lines as would be expected for cells growing in media without serum.

Binding to SHP. As one of the active analogues listed in Table 2, $47(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{CN})$ was selected to illustrate how interaction with SHP protein could have roles in leukemia cell apoptosis induction and inhibition of cell viability. SHP has thus far defied
crystallization and structure determination. In our hands, the recombinant wild-type human protein proved to be too labile for determining binding using isothermal titration calorimetry, and therefore, we resorted to low-temperature, high-field NMR spectrometry. Binding of 47 to SHP (Figure 4A) was demonstrated in comparison with $8(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Cl})$ (Figure 4B) as a positive SHP-binding control. Compound 8 was previously shown to bind to SHP in a competitive binding assay with $\left[5,5^{\prime}{ }^{3}{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{2}\right]$ AHPN. ${ }^{1}$ The $6.3-7.9 \mathrm{ppm}$ region of the NMR spectra of the compounds was selected for comparison because ligand proton signals in that region were not obscured by extraneous proton signals from water, tris(hydroxymethyl)aminomethane in


Figure 2. CoMFA of replacement of the 3-chloro group of 8 on leukemia cell viability. (A) Partial CoMFA contour maps (StDev*Coeff) for steric and electrostatic fields about the substituent at position 3 based on MOLT4 $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ viability data with analogue 47 displayed as a visual reference. Favored steric contributions are colored green and disfavored steric contributions yellow; the blue contour indicates regions where positive charges are favored and red regions where negative charge is favored. (B) Plot of predicted vs actual $\mathrm{pIC}_{50}$ values of inhibition of leukemia cell viability by 8 , 46-48, 50-52,57,59, 61, and 62 for K562 (green diamonds), OCI-AML2 (blue triangles), and MOLT4 (red dots) leukemia cell lines determined by CoMFA.


Figure 3. Effects of $\mathbf{8}, \mathbf{4 6}, \mathbf{4 7}, \mathbf{5 1}, 52$, and 57 on MMTV-Wntl mammary cancer stem cell viability as measured by DAPI staining and cell counting. Cells were treated with each analogue at the indicated concentrations or with vehicle alone $\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right.$ control) for 72 h before the viability of treated cells relative to vehicle-treated control was determined. Results represent the means of triplicates $\pm$ the standard deviation.

Tris buffer, reduced glutathione, and DMSO, which were present at higher concentrations. The lower scans in panels A and B of Figure 4 show that the peak heights of the six aromatic and two olefinic protons in this region of the spectra of both 47 and 8 were decreased and broadened in the presence of SHP, thereby indicating their interaction with the protein. In contrast, proton signals for inactive analogue $46\left(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right)$ were not depressed by the addition of SHP (Figure 4C), thereby indicating the absence or only a very weak interaction of 46 with the protein.

Computational Studies. Docking to the SHP Model.
To discern how the substituent at position 3 impacted SHP in its inhibition of cell viability, docking studies (Figure 5) were conducted using the three-dimensional model of SHP derived
from the structure of the homologous USP LBD by the Pelliccaria group. ${ }^{6}$ In the model, SHP helix H12 assumed the canonical agonist position to form an AF-2 surface with H3 and H4. This model also has a putative ligand-binding pocket (LBP) to which the USP phospholipid ligand and analogues 1,3 , and 8 had been successfully docked. ${ }^{6,13}$ The docking poses for 1,3 , and 8 were highly similar and suggested potential stabilizing interactions with the following LBP residues: T55 and C56 (H3), F96, L97, and L100 (H5), P139, A145, and W148 (H7), L231 and L235 (H11), and R238 and I240 (H11-H12 loop). ${ }^{13}$ Formation of ionic and/or H-bonding interactions between an analogue carboxylate group and the R238 guanidinium group and a nonconventional $\mathrm{H}-\pi$ bond between an analogue phenolic hydroxyl group and the F97 phenyl ring were regarded as the most important polar interactions for stabilization.

The docked poses of the current analogues substituted at position 3 were compared with that of $\mathbf{8}$ (Figure $5 A$ ). Active analogues such as $47(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{CN})$ and $52\left(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{NO}_{2}\right)$ assumed docking poses similar to that of 8 . The respective distances between their carboxylate carbon atoms and the H11 R238 guanidinium carbon were measured as 4.3 and $4.1 \AA$, respectively, compared to a value of $3.8 \AA$ for 8 . These distances suggest that their carboxylate groups would contribute H-bond and/or ionic interactions with the R238 guanidinium group to stabilize binding. On the basis of position and distance, the $4^{\prime}-\mathrm{OH}$ groups of 47 and 52, like that of 8 , could form $\mathrm{H}-\pi$ bonds with the $\pi$-electron cloud of the H5 F96 phenyl ring to enhance analogue-LBP interaction. ${ }^{13,42}$ The respective distances between their OH oxygens and the F96 phenyl ring centerx were 3.0 and $2.8 \AA$ compared to $3.0 \AA$ for 8 . van der Waals interactions between their 3'-(1-Ad) groups and the surrounding LBP W148, L97, and L100 side chains could also occur to further stabilize binding. The shortest distances measured between the $3^{\prime}-(1-\mathrm{Ad})$ group carbons of 47 and 52 and the W148 indole ring carbons were 3.6 and $3.3 \AA$, respectively, compared to 3.9 Å for 8 . Similarly, the shortest distances measured from their $3^{\prime}-(1-\mathrm{Ad})$ group carbons to one of the L97 methyl carbons were 3.7 and $4.1 \AA$, respectively, compared to $3.9 \AA$ for 8 , and those to one of the L100 methyl carbons were 3.8 and $4.2 \AA$, respectively, compared to $3.6 \AA$ for 8.


Figure 4. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra indicate that apoptosis-inducing 3cyanocinnamic acid 47 binds to SHP, whereas inactive 3(trifluoromethyl)cinnamic acid 46 does not. The low-field regions of one-dimensional ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra of 47,46 , and 8 alone and in the presence of recombinant human SHP are shown. Spectra were recorded at $11^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ on (A) $47(100 \mu \mathrm{M})$, (B) $8(100 \mu \mathrm{M})$, and (C) 46 $(200 \mu \mathrm{M})$ in the absence (top spectra) and presence (bottom spectra) of 0.5 (A and B) and $1.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ SHP protein (C). Note that small peaks at 7.3 and 7.75 ppm in panels $A$ and $B$ represent an impurity in the $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (see Figure S 4 of the Supporting Information). The spectrum in panel $C$ was that of a sample containing $D_{2} \mathrm{O}$ from another source.

Prior docking using 8 suggested a potential stabilizing interaction could occur between its 3-Cl group and the H3 C56 side chain because of formation of a $\mathrm{Cl} \cdots \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{S}$ bond ( $4.2 \AA \mathrm{Cl}-\mathrm{S}$ distance). ${ }^{13}$ The measured distances of $3.7 \AA$ from the $3-\mathrm{CN}$ nitrogen of 47 to the C 56 sulfur and $4.3 \AA$ from a $3-\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ oxygen of 52 to the C56 sulfur suggest that the $3-\mathrm{CN}$ and $3-\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ groups could form similar $\mathrm{N} \cdots \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{O} \cdots \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{S}$ H-bonding interactions. ${ }^{43}$ The docked poses of $\mathbf{4 7}$ and $\mathbf{5 2}$ also suggest that their 3CN and $3-\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ groups, respectively, could contribute to ligand stabilization by forming hydrogen bonds with the T 55 OH group,


Figure 5. Poses assumed by $8,14,15,46,47,49$, and 52 upon docking to the ultraspiracle ligand-binding domain-derived model of small heterodimer partner (SHP). (A) Overlap of docking poses for 8, 47, and 52 in stick format with LBP residues in line format. C atoms of 8,47 , and 52 and those of their corresponding pocket residues are colored cyan, orange, and magenta, respectively, with other atoms colored as follows: Cl , green; F, light blue; N, blue; O, red; S, yellow. (B) Overlap of docking poses for 8,46 , and 49 shown in stick format with LBP residues in line format. C atoms of 8, 46, and 49 and those of their corresponding pocket residues are colored cyan, magenta, and orange, respectively, with other atoms colored as in panel A. (C) Overlap of docking poses for 8, 14, and 15 shown in stick format with conformations of SHP ligand-binding pocket (LBP) residues shown in line format. C atoms of 8,14 , and 15 and those of their corresponding pocket residues are colored cyan, magenta, and orange, respectively, with other atoms colored as in panel A. The residue numbering is that for the human SHP protein sequence. Docking studies were performed using BioMed Cache version 6.2 with flexible ligands and protein side chains. 8, 14, 47, and 52 were classified as active compounds, whereas analogues 15,46 , and 49 were inactive or less active in terms of growth inhibition, loss of viability, or apoptosis induction.
just as that of 8 suggests its $3-\mathrm{Cl}$ could form a similar bond with the OH group, while the two aromatic rings of these analogues could make hydrophobic contacts with the side chains of L231, L235, and I240.

Analogues without or with very weak activity such as 46 ( $\mathrm{X}=$ $\left.\mathrm{CF}_{3}\right)$ and $49\left(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{H}\right)$ assumed docking poses that differed from that of 3-Cl-AHPC (Figure 5B). Their carboxylates were farther from the R238 guanidinium group than that of 8, and their substituents at position 3 were oriented toward hydrophobic LBP residues rather than T55 and C56, which is shown in the overlap of their docking poses in the SHP LBP. The measured distances from the carboxylate carbons of 46 and 49 to the R238 guanidinium carbon of 5.8 and $5.1 \AA$, respectively, suggest only weak or no H -bond or salt bridge interactions would occur in contrast to those possible for the carboxylate of 8. Their $3-\mathrm{CF}_{3}$ and $3-\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{H}$ groups would occupy a side pocket between the H7 P141 and H11 L235 side chains, where their respective fluorine and oxygen atoms would be unable to function as H -bond acceptors. These poses also suggest that their 4'-OH groups, which are farther from the F96 phenyl ring (OH O-phenyl center distances of 4.0 and $4.1 \AA$, respectively) than that of 8 (3.0 Å), would contribute weaker or no stabilizing $\mathrm{H}-\pi$ bond interactions. Although the poses do suggest that the $3^{\prime}-(1-\mathrm{Ad})$ groups of 46 and 49 could interact with the hydrophobic side chains of L97, L100, A145, and W148 (e.g., the shortest distance to the W148 indole ring was $3.4 \AA$ compared to $3.9 \AA$ for 8 ), their contributions by being weaker would contribute far less to binding stabilization, thereby limiting the residence time of the analogue in the LBP in agreement with their lack of activity.

Analogues with substituents at position 2 such as 14 (2-F) and $15(2-\mathrm{Cl})$ were also docked and compared with $8(2-\mathrm{H})$ (Figure 5C). Active $\mathbf{1 4}$ with the smaller F group at position 2 had a pose similar to that of 8 . In contrast, inactive 15 with the larger $2-\mathrm{Cl}$ group had a pose in which its cinnamic moiety was farther from H11 and closer to H12 than that of 8. As a result, the distance ( $4.7 \AA$ ) between the carboxylate carbon of 15 and the R238 guanidinium carbon, by being longer, suggests that any H-bond or ionic interactions with the R238 guanidinium group would be weaker. The short distance ( $2.46 \AA$ ) between the $2-\mathrm{Cl}$ atom and I240 side chain methyl carbon suggests a potential clash that would prevent robust interaction with the pocket. Thus, while the inactive analogues could be docked into the SHP LBP, their poses suggest that any polar interactions between the analogue and LBP residues required for stabilizing binding would be absent or weak.

## - DISCUSSION

Our results indicate that the leukemia cell apoptosis-inducing and viability-inhibiting activities of 3 -substituted analogues of 8 would be retained if the substituents had some electrondonating (H-bond-accepting) capacity and restricted volumes.

Recently, Pelliccaria, Wang, and co-workers conducted an elegant series of computational and mutagenesis studies to examine the SHP LBP. Several models of the SHP protein were constructed on the basis of its homology to the phospholipidcomplexed USP LBD, docosahexaenoic acid and oleic acidcomplexed $\operatorname{RXR} \alpha$ LBD, and DAX-1 using their reported crystal structures. ${ }^{7}$ These models displayed either the canonical NR LBP such as those found in the ligand-bound PPARs, RARs, RXRs, TRs, and VDR or another pocket that they termed "allosteric" such as that found in NRs bound to charged phospholipids such as USP, SF-1, and LRH-1. Both allosteric and canonical models featured an L-shaped LBP; however, docking studies revealed that $\mathbf{8}$ occupied different arms of the L with its adamantyl group residing at the arm juncture so that its carboxylate could interact with either Gln 140 (allosteric USP-
derived model) or R34 (canonical DAX-1-derived model), whereas the antagonist $5^{11}$ assumed a pose in which its carboxylate interacted with R238 (USP-derived model). Molecular dynamics using the USP-derived model suggested that H -bond and/or ionic stabilizing interactions were favored between the 8 carboxylate and SHP R238 ( $80 \%$ ) followed by Q140 (18\%) and R138 (17\%) and that SHP NR boxes 1 and 3 were stabilized by 8 , whereas NR box 2 and the H12 agonist position were destabilized.

Mutational analysis indicated that unlike wild-type SHP, the double mutant L5-6 R138D/H11 R238D, in which reversal of side chain charge would not support interaction with a ligand carboxyl group, and the H3 F96A point mutant, which by lacking the phenyl ring was incapable of stabilizing the ligand hydoxyl group, were unable to block HNF $4 \alpha$ transactivation of its site on the ApoCIII promoter-Luc reporter construct, thereby suggesting that R138, R238, and F96 played roles in mediating SHP repressor activity. Moreover, F96A and R138D/R238D mutants prevented SHP from inhibiting basal HNF $4 \alpha$ activation by $44 \%$, whereas the W148A, R238A, R138A, W92A, R34A, and R34Q/Q134R mutants did not have a similar effect. Although SHP antagonist $5[\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{O}$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{3} \mathrm{NHAc}$ ] did dock into the LBP "canonical" arm of the DAX-1-derived model to suggest that its pharmacophoric elements (carboxylate and hydroxyl) could interact with other LBP residues, their mutation to alanine did not affect the ability of SHP to repress HNF4 $\alpha$ transactivation and so did not support this canonical model. These mutational studies support our use of the USP LBD-derived "allosteric model" for ligand design. In this model, docking places the carboxylate of 8 at the pocket entrance, as do the charged termini of phospholipids bound to USP, SF-1, and LRH-1. Much remains to be learned about SHP, including the impact of ligands on NR box motif stabilization and the actual geometry of the LBP in the presence of a ligand, which highlight the necessity of determining the actual structure of SHP.

Conclusion. The results indicate that leukemia cell apoptotic activity and inhibition of cell viability are retained in analogues of 8 as long as their substituents at position 3 had some electron donor ( H -bond-accepting) capacity and restricted volume.

## EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Chemistry. General Methods. Chemicals and solvents from commercial sources were used without further purification. 3-(1-Adamantyl)-4-benzyloxyphenylboronic acid (34) was synthesized using our reported procedure. ${ }^{44}$ Abbreviations for solvents and reagents are as follows: BnBr , benzyl bromide; DIBAL, diisobutylaluminum hydride; DME, 1,2dimethoxyethane; $\mathrm{Tf}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, trifluoromethanesulfonic anhydride. Experimental procedures were not optimized. Anhydrous and/or oxygen-sensitive reactions were conducted under argon gas. Reactions were monitored by thin-layer chromatography on silica gel (mesh size $60, \mathrm{~F}_{254}$ ) with visualization under UV light. Unless specified, the standard workup involved washing the organic extract with water and brine and drying over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ followed by concentration at reduced pressure. Chromatography refers to flash column chromatography on silica gel (Merck 60, 230-400 mesh). Melting points of samples were determined in capillaries using a Mel-Temp II apparatus and are uncorrected. Infrared spectra were obtained on powdered or liquid samples using an FT-IR Mason satellite spectrophotometer. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded on a 300 MHz Varian Unity Inova spectrometer or an ECS 400 MHz Jeol spectrometer, and shift values are expressed in parts per million ( $\delta$ ) relative to $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ as the internal standard. Unless mentioned, NMR samples were dissolved in ${ }^{2} \mathrm{HCCl}_{3}$. High-resolution mass spectra were recorded on an Agilent ESITOF mass spectrometer at The Scripps Research Institute (La Jolla, CA). A Shimadzu HPLC system was used to analyze the purity of target
molecules (Table S4 of the Supporting Information). General synthetic methods are described first and designated by letters. Then compound syntheses and characterizations are listed numerically. The purity of compounds used in the biological assays was $>95 \%$ as determined by reversed-phase HPLC (Table S4 of the Supporting Information lists actual purities). The purity of 8 was $98 \%$ as determined by reversed-phase HPLC analysis. The SHP residue numbering used in the model and protein followed that given for human SHP protein (identifier Q15466) in the UniProtKB protein database; thus, SHP model residue numbers ${ }^{6}$ were increased by 13.

General Method A: Protection of Phenols 18 and 20 as Benzyl Ethers 19 and 21, Respectively. To a solution of the phenol $(1 \mathrm{mmol})$ in acetone $(3 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(1.13 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{BnBr}(1.05 \mathrm{mmol})$. This mixture was stirred at reflux temperature under argon. After removal of acetone at reduced pressure, 1 N HCl was added. This mixture was extracted (EtOAc). The residue obtained upon concentration of the extract was chromatographed to give the benzyl ether.

General Method B: Coupling of Ethyl Acrylate with Aryl Halides 17, 19, and 21 To Afford Ethyl Cinnamates 25, 26, and 29, Respectively. A solution of the aryl halide $(1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$, ethyl acrylate ( 1.3 mmol ), palladium(II) acetate ( 0.015 mmol ), and tri(o-tolyl)phosphine ( 0.04 mmol ) in triethylamine $(1.1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was stirred while being heated and then cooled to room temperature, and the reaction was quenched with 1 N HCl . The resulting suspension was extracted (EtOAc). The extract was washed (brine) and dried. After solvent removal at reduced pressure, the residue was purified on silica gel to give the cinnamate ester.

General Method C: Ethyl Cinnamates 32 and 33 by Wittig Reaction of (Carbethoxymethylene)triphenylphosphorane with Aryl Aldehydes 23 and 24, Respectively. A solution of aryl aldehyde ( 1.0 mmol ) and (carbethoxymethylene)triphenylphosphorane $(1.15 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{PhMe}(2.9 \mathrm{~mL})$ was heated at reflux and then cooled to room temperature. After solvent removal at reduced pressure, the residue was chromatographed to give the cinnamate.

General Method D: Debenzylation of 26, 29, 35-39, 53-55, 64, and 67 Using Boron Tribromide. To a stirred solution of the benzyl ether ( 1.0 mmol ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under argon was slowly added 1.0 M boron tribromide $(3.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 3.0 $\mathrm{mL})$. The mixture was stirred at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h , the reaction quenched with water $(15 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the mixture extracted ( EtOAc ). The extract was washed (brine) and dried. After solvent removal at reduced pressure, flash chromatography of the residue yielded the phenol.

General Method E: Conversion of Phenols 27 and 30 to Triflates 28 and 31, Respectively. To a stirred solution of the phenol $(1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ and pyridine (redistilled from $\mathrm{KOH}, 2.25 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ under argon at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was slowly added $\mathrm{Tf}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1.35$ $\mathrm{mmol})$. The resulting solution was allowed to warm to room temperature while being stirred, the reaction quenched with 1 N HCl , and the mixture extracted $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$. The extract was washed (brine), dried, and concentrated at reduced pressure. The residue was purified by chromatography to afford the triflate.

General Method F: Diaryl Coupling of 3-(1-Adamantyl)-4benzyloxyphenylboronic Acid (34) with Aryl Halides 25, 32, and 33. To a solution of $34(1.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ and aryl halide $(1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in degassed DME ( 6.7 mL ) were added tetrakis(triphenylphosphine) palladium ( 0.12 mmol ) and $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ (degassed, 1.3 mL ). The reaction mixture was heated at reflux, cooled to room temperature, diluted with EtOAc, washed $\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ and brine), and dried. After solvent removal at reduced pressure, flash chromatography on silica gel yielded the coupling product.

General Method G: Coupling of Aryl Boronic Acid 34 to Aryl Triflates 28 and 31. To a stirred solution of $34(1.17 \mathrm{mmol})$ and the aryl triflate $(1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ in degassed DME $(8 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added LiCl $(2.6 \mathrm{mmol})$, tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)palladium $(0.12 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ (degassed, 1.2 mL ). The reaction mixture was heated at reflux, cooled to room temperature, then diluted with EtOAc, washed ( $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and brine), and dried. After concentration of the organic layer at reduced pressure, flash chromatography on silica gel yielded the diaryl coupling product.

General Method H: Hydrolysis of Ethyl Cinnamates 40, 42, and 44 to Cinnamic Acids 46, 48, and 51, Respectively, Using Aqueous Sodium Hydroxide. To a stirred solution of the cinnamate ( 1 mmol ) in $\mathrm{MeOH}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added 5 M aqueous $\mathrm{NaOH}(5 \mathrm{mmol})$. This mixture was heated at reflux under argon, cooled to room temperature, acidified with 2 N HCl , and extracted (EtOAc). The extract was washed (brine) and dried. The yellow solid residue obtained by concentration was chromatographed or washed (hexane and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ or $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ) to afford the cinnamic acid.

General Method I: Hydrolysis of Cinnamates 41, 43, 45, and 65 to Cinnamic Acids 47, 50, 52, and 66, Respectively, Using Aqueous Lithium Hydroxide. To a stirred solution of the ethyl cinnamate ( 1 mmol ) in a $50: 33: 17 \mathrm{THF} / \mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ mixture $(16 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added $\mathrm{LiOH} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{mmol})$. This mixture was stirred under argon, the reaction quenched with 2 N HCl to pH 1 , and the mixture extracted (EtOAc). The extract was washed (brine) and dried. The residue obtained by concentration was chromatographed or washed (hexane and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) to afford the cinnamic acid.

4-lodo-2-trifluoromethylphenyl Bromide (17). A reported procedure ${ }^{45}$ was modified with respect to workup. To a cold solution prepared by adding 4-bromo-3-(trifluoromethyl)aniline ( $5.0 \mathrm{~g}, 20.8$ mmol) to prewarmed concentrated sulfuric acid ( 5 mL ) and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(18.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added with vigorous stirring and cooling (ice-salt bath) a solution of $\mathrm{NaNO}_{2}(1.56 \mathrm{~g}, 21.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ over a 30 min period. The mixture was stirred for 28 min before a solution of $\mathrm{KI}(4.74 \mathrm{~g}, 28 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(3.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and copper powder (approximately 3 mg ) were added. The reaction mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature via removal of the ice bath, stirred for 1.3 h , and then heated at $101^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h , cooled, and extracted with EtOAc ( 280 mL ). Extracts were washed (water and brine) and dried. After solvent removal at reduced pressure, the residue was chromatographed (hexane) to give $4.8 \mathrm{~g}(66 \%)$ of 17 as a white solid: $\mathrm{mp} 72-$ $73{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (lit. $\left.{ }^{45} 78-80{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 7.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 3-\mathrm{ArH})$, 7.73 (dd, $J=8.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 4-\mathrm{ArH}), 8.0(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH})$.

2-Benzyloxy-5-bromobenzonitrile (19) (method A). Compound 18 ( $1.31 \mathrm{~g}, 6.60 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) on reaction for 23 h , workup, and chromatography ( 10 to $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave 1.99 g ( $100 \%$ ) of 19 as an off-white solid: mp 72-74 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2907, 2229, 1486, 1282 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 5.23\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{PhCH}_{2}\right), 6.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 3-$ ArH), 7.33-7.50 (m, 5H, C6H5), 7.61 (dd, $J=9.0,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 4-$ ArH), $7.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{BrNO}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 309.9838$, found 309.8840.

Methyl 2-Benzyloxy-5-bromobenzoate (21) (method A). Methyl 5-bromo-2-hydroxybenzoate (20) $(1.50 \mathrm{~g}, 6.17 \mathrm{mmol})$ on reaction for 19 h , workup, and chromatography ( 5 to $9 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave $1.98 \mathrm{~g}(100 \%)$ of 21 as a light yellow liquid: IR 2909, 1731, 1486, 1242 $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 3.94$ ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 5.20 ( $\mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ArCH}_{2}$ ), 6.93 (d, $\mathrm{J}=$ $9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 3-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.31-7.52\left(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right), 7.55(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.0,2.7$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 4-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.97 (d, $J=2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{BrO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 342.9940$, found 342.9945 .

4-Bromo-3-methoxybenzaldehyde (23). A method different from that reported in ref 46 was used. To a solution of benzonitrile 22 (1.04 g, 4.90 mmol ) in anhydrous $\mathrm{PhMe}(14 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added 1 M DIBAL ( 7.35 mmol ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(7.40 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 0.5 h , warmed to room temperature, stirred for an additional 4.25 h , the reaction quenched with $\mathrm{MeOH}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the mixture stirred for 0.5 h . After addition of $10 \% \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}(45 \mathrm{~mL})$, the resulting solution was stirred for 1.75 h and then extracted with EtOAc ( $100 \mathrm{~mL}, 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). After solvent removal at reduced pressure, the residue was chromatographed ( 10 to $16 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) to give $876 \mathrm{mg}(83 \%)$ of 23 as a white solid: $\mathrm{mp} 70-72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (lit. ${ }^{46} 74-76{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ); IR 2960, 1701, 1582, $1042 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 4.01\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 7.36$ (dd, $J=1.8,7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.77$ (d, $J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 9.98 ( $\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CHO}$ ).

Ethyl (E)-4-Bromo-3-(trifluoromethyl)cinnamate (25) (method B). 4-Iodo-2-trifluoromethylphenyl bromide (17) ( $1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 2.85 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after coupling at $115{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 h , workup, and chromatography $(10 \%$ EtOAc/hexane) produced $738 \mathrm{mg}(80 \%)$ of 25 as a yellow solid: mp 92-94 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2917, 1704, 1362, $1174 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.38(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $\left.7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.32\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 6.53(\mathrm{~d}$,
$J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.67$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH})$, $7.85(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{BrF}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ 322.9889, found 322.9897 .

Ethyl (E)-4-Benzyloxy-3-cyanocinnamate (26) (method B). 2-Benzyl-oxy-5-bromobenzonitrile (19) ( $1.97 \mathrm{~g}, 6.84 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) on coupling at $94{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 18 h , workup, and chromatography ( 5 to $33 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ / hexane) produced $2.00 \mathrm{~g}(95 \%)$ of 26 as an off-white solid: mp 115$117^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2924, 2230, 1707, 1501, $1268 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.38(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $\left.6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.32\left(\mathrm{q}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.29(\mathrm{~s}$, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 6.36(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.33-7.51\left(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right), 7.59(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.77(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$308.1281, found 308.1285.

Ethyl (E)-3-Cyano-4-hydroxycinnamate (27) (method D). Ethyl (E)-4-benzyloxy-3-cyanocinnamate (26) ( $1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 3.25 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after reaction for 2 h , workup, and chromatography ( 33 to $50 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave $0.7 \mathrm{~g}(99 \%)$ of 27 as an off-white solid: mp 198-200 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3302, 2903, 2228, 1711, $1510 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.37(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.30\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 6.34(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{OH}), 6.37(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, 5-ArH), $7.59(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.69 (s, 1H, 2-ArH); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{H}]^{+}$218.0812, found 218.0811 .

Ethyl (E)-3-Cyano-4-(trifluoromethylsulfonyloxy)cinnamate (28) (method E). Cinnamate $27(685 \mathrm{mg}, 3.15 \mathrm{mmol})$ after reaction for 24 h , workup, and chromatography ( $16.7 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) yielded $1.04 \mathrm{~g}(94 \%)$ of 28 as a white solid: $\mathrm{mp} 80-82^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2903, 2226, $1705,1236 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.37\left(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.31$ $\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 6.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO), $7.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}$ ), 7.85 (dd, $J=8.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.90(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{NO}_{5} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$350.0305, found 350.0308 .

Ethyl (E)-4-Benzyloxy-3-carbomethoxycinnamate (29) (method B). 4-Bromobenzoate $21(1.10 \mathrm{~g}, 3.43 \mathrm{mmol})$ on coupling at $105^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 17 h , workup, and chromatography ( 5 to $22 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) produced $1.15 \mathrm{~g}(98 \%)$ of 29 as a pale yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 84-85^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2902, 1729, 1689, 1501, $1269 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.36(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 3.95\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.29(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), $5.26\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ArCH}_{2}\right), 6.39(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ $\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.31-7.52\left(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$, 7.60 (dd, $J=8.4,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO), 8.05 ( $\mathrm{d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}$ ); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$341.1383, found 341.1383.

Ethyl (E)-3-Carbomethoxy-4-hydroxycinnamate (30) (method D). Cinnamate 29 ( $623 \mathrm{mg}, 1.83 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after reaction for 2 h , workup, and chromatography ( 10 to $33 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave 456 $\mathrm{mg}(99 \%)$ of 30 as a pale yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 62-64{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3247, 2941, $1707,1677 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.36\left(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.01$ $\left(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.29\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 6.36(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.03(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 8.04(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 11.0(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{O}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ 251.0914, found 251.0918.

Ethyl (E)-3-Carbomethoxy-4-trifluoromethylsulfonyloxycinnamate (31) (method E). Cinnamate $30(434 \mathrm{mg}, 1.74 \mathrm{mmol})$ after reaction for 23 h , workup, and chromatography ( 10 to $16 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ / hexane) yielded $641 \mathrm{mg}(96 \%)$ of 31 as a white solid: $\mathrm{mp} 51-52^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2913, 1731, 1431, $1213 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.03\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.33\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$, $6.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.36(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.69(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.67(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.4,2.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 8.27 (d, $J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}$ ); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{7} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$383.0407, found 383.0417.

Ethyl (E)-4-Bromo-3-methoxycinnamate (32) (method C). Benzaldehyde 23 ( $876 \mathrm{mg}, 4.07 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after reaction for 19 h , workup, and chromatography ( 10 to $16 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) produced 1.09 g (94\%) of a cream solid ( $90 \% E$ isomer), which after crystallization (hexane) yielded $712 \mathrm{mg}(61 \%)$ of the pure $E$ isomer of 32 as a white solid:
$\mathrm{mp} 58-60{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2988, 1709, 1484, $1177 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.36(\mathrm{t}$, $\left.J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 3.94\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{3}\right), 4.30(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 6.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.01(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=$ $8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.03(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.56(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.64(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{BrO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$285.0121, found 285.0128.

Ethyl (E)-4-Bromo-3-nitrocinnamate (33) (method C). Benzaldehyde $24(3.00 \mathrm{~g}, 13.03 \mathrm{mmol})$ after reaction for 18.5 h , workup, and chromatography ( 14 to $33 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) followed by crystallization (hexane) produced $3.36 \mathrm{~g}(86 \%)$ of 33 as a pale yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 132-134{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2981, 1714, 1530, $1181 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR} \delta 1.38(\mathrm{t}$, $\left.J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.31\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 6.54$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.58(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.1,8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-$ $\mathrm{ArH}), 7.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 8.0(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{BrNO}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$299.9866, found 299.9865.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-benzyloxyphenyl]-3-(trifluoromethyl)cinnamate (35) (method F). Aryl halide 25 (194 mg, 0.6 mmol ) on coupling for 18 h , workup, and chromatography (6 to $11 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) produced 319 mg ( $94 \%$ ) of 35 as an offwhite solid: mp $107-109{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2903, 1713, $1124,1176 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39\left(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 1.75\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right)$, 2.06 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.18 (bs, 6H, $\mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 4.32 ( $\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.19\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ArCH}_{2}\right), 6.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO), $7.01\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.17(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.25\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.33-7.49(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ from $\left.\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.54-7.57(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ArH}), 7.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.90(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$561.2611, found 561.2635.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-benzyloxyphenyl]-3-cyanocinnamate (36) (method G). Aryl triflate 28 ( $349 \mathrm{mg}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) on coupling for 45 h , workup, and chromatography ( $9 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) produced $310 \mathrm{mg}(60 \%)$ of 36 as an off-white solid: $\mathrm{mp} 65-67^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2904, 2230, 1711, 1483, $1230 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 1.77 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.08 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.23 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), $4.33\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.22(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 6.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.08(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.35-7.58\left(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right), 7.47(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, 6'-ArH), $7.52\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-$ $\mathrm{ArH}), 7.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.78(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.90(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{H}]^{+}$518.2690, found 518.2686.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-benzyloxyphenyl]-3-carbomethoxycinnamate (37) (method G). Aryl triflate 31 (382 g, 1.0 mmol ) on coupling for 22 h , workup, and chromatography ( 10 to $23 \%$ $\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) produced $546 \mathrm{mg}(99 \%)$ of 37 as a white solid: mp $55-57{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2905, 1712, $1479 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.38(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 1.75 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.08 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.18 (bs, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 3.71\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.31(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.21\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ArCH}_{2}\right), 6.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO), $7.02\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.20\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\right.$ ArH), 7.22 (s, 1H, 2'-ArH), 7.46 (d, $J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.34-$ $7.57\left(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right), 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.74(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.93$ (s, 1H, 2-ArH); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{38} \mathrm{O}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$551.2792, found 551.2789.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-benzyloxyphenyl]-3-methoxycinnamate (38) (method F). Aryl halide 32 ( $119 \mathrm{mg}, 0.41 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) on coupling for 22.6 h , workup, and chromatography ( 11 to $12 \%$ EtOAc/hexane) produced $192 \mathrm{mg}(88 \%)$ of 38 as a cream solid: mp $62-64{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2903, 1706, 1487, $1163 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 1.76 (bs, 6H, $\mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.08 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), $2.21\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 3.89\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{3}\right), 4.31(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.19\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ArCH}_{2}\right), 6.49(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ $\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.01\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.14\left(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.22$ (dd, $\left.J=8.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.31-7.58\left(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}, 2,5,6-\right.$ ArH), $7.74(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{38} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$523.2843, found 523.2842.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-benzyloxyphenyl]-3-nitrocinnamate (39) (method F). Aryl halide 33 ( $1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 3.33 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) on coupling for 16 h , workup, and chromatography ( 9 to $33 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane)
produced $1.66 \mathrm{~g}(93 \%)$ of 39 as a yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 170-171^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2902, $1719,1532,1179 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39\left(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$, 1.75 (bs, 6H, $\mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.07 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.17 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 4.33 $\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.19\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ArCH}_{2}\right), 6.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}$ ), 7.03 (d, $J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.19 (dd, $J=$ $8.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.24\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.31-7.57(\mathrm{~m}$, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.72 (d, $\left.J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}\right), 7.74$ (dd, $J=$ $7.5,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{NO}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 538.2588$, found 538.2584.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-(trifluoromethyl)cinnamate (40) (method D). Cinnamate 35 ( 306 mg , 0.54 mmol ) after reaction for 2 h , workup, and chromatography ( 9 to $14 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave 240 mg ( $93 \%$ ) of 40 as a pale yellow solid: mp 186-187 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3408, 2899, 1695, 1324, $1175 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39\left(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 1.81\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right)$, 2.11 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.16 (bs, 6H, AdCH2), 4.32 (q, $J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.99(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 6.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO), 6.72 (d, $J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.06 (dd, $J=8.1,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.20\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.40(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.76(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}$ ), 7.89 (s, 1H, 2-ArH); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}$ $+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$471.2141, found 471.2151.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-cyanocinnamate (41) (method D). Cinnamate 36 ( $147 \mathrm{mg}, 0.28 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after treatment for 2 h , workup, and chromatography ( 8 to $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave 102 mg ( $84 \%$ ) of 41 as a cream solid: $\mathrm{mp} 220-222^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3373, 2902, 2233, 1693, $1256 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (acetone- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 1.33$ $\left(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 1.84\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 2.09(\mathrm{bs}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{AdCH}), 2.27\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 4.27\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$, 6.75 (d, $J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.0\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\right.$ ArH), 7.38 (dd, $\left.J=8.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.69(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.76(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 8.06(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 8.20(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 8.83(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{H}]^{+} 428.2220$, found 428.2214 .

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-carbomethoxycinnamate (42) (method D). Cinnamate 37 (325 mg, 0.59 mmol ) after reaction for 2 h , workup, and chromatography ( 10 to $33 \%$ $\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave $271 \mathrm{mg}(100 \%)$ of 42 as a pale yellow solid: mp $71-73{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3340, 2904, 1709, $1255 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 1.81 (bs, 6H, AdCH 2 ), 2.12 (bs, 3H, AdCH), $2.16\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 3.72\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.31(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 4.97(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 6.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO), $6.72\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.10(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.18\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.45(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.67(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.8,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.74(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{29} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{O}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$461.2328, found 461.2321.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-methoxycinnamate (43) (method D). Cinnamate 38 ( $80 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after reaction for 2 h , workup, and chromatography ( 16 to $33 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ / hexane) gave 66 mg ( $100 \%$ ) of 43 as a cream solid: mp $197-199^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3332, 2902, 1686, 1493, $1183 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 1.81 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.11 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 2.19 (bs, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 3.87\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{3}\right), 4.32(\mathrm{q}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), $5.37(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 6.49(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO), $6.74\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.12\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\right.$ ArH), 7.21 (dd, $\left.J=1.5,7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.31(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.1,8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.35(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.42(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, 2-ArH), $7.74(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$433.2373, found 433.2370 .

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-hydroxycinnamate (44) (method D). Cinnamate 38 ( $85 \mathrm{mg}, 0.16 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after reaction at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 0.33 h and at room temperature for 2.5 h , workup, and chromatography ( 16 to $25 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave 43 mg (63\%) of 44 as a yellow solid: mp 193-194 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3295, 2838, 1693, $1463,1216 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39\left(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 1.81$ (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.12 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 2.18 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 4.30 (q, $\left.J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.49(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 6.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.83\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.12-7.22$
(m, 3H, 2', $\left.6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.27(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.1,8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.32$ (d, $J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$419.2217, found 419.2216 .

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-nitrocinnamate (45) (method D). Cinnamate 39 ( $52 \mathrm{mg}, 0.097 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after treatment for 2 h , workup, and chromatography ( 16 to $20 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave 43 mg ( $100 \%$ ) of 45 as a yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 236-238^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3271, 2903, 1688, 1533, $1203 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 1.81 (bs, 6H, AdCH 2 ), 2.12 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.15 (bs, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 4.32\left(\mathrm{q}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.10(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{OH}), 6.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.73(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.07 (dd, $\left.J=1.8,8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.2(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.73(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.73(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.8,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}$ ); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$448.2118, found 448.2117 .
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-(trifluoromethyl)cinnamic Acid (46) (method H). Cinnamate 40 ( $207 \mathrm{mg}, 0.44 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after hydrolysis for 35 min , workup, and chromatography (1:5:0 to 5:5:2 EtOAc/hexane $/ \mathrm{MeOH}$ ) afforded $164 \mathrm{mg}(84 \%)$ of 46 as a pale yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 180-182^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3239, 2900, 1686, 1317, $1140 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 1.84$ (bs, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 2.07$ (bs, $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}\right)$, $2.20\left(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 6.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.79$ (d, $\left.J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 6.99$ (dd, $J=8.1,1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.12\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.76$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH})$, 7.96 (s, 1H, 2-ArH); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ 443.1828, found 443.1840.
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-cyanocinnamic Acid (47) (method I). Cinnamate 41 ( $98 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after hydrolysis for 5 h , workup, and washing (hexane and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) afforded $79 \mathrm{mg}(86 \%)$ of 47 as a white solid: $\mathrm{mp} 294-296{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3362, 2904, 2230, 1694, 1417, $1253 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 1.86$ (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.09 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 2.25 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 6.64 $(\mathrm{d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.88\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right)$, $7.30\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.46$ ( $\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.72(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.94(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $8.06(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{3}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$400.1907, found 400.1903 .
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-(methoxycarbonyl)cinnamic Acid (48) (method H). Cinnamate 42 ( $231 \mathrm{mg}, 0.48 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after hydrolysis for 1.5 h , workup, and washing (hexane and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) afforded $190 \mathrm{mg}(91 \%)$ of 48 as a white solid: $\mathrm{mp} 259-262{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3347, 2906, 1712, 1695, $1253 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 1.84$ (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.08 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.19 (bs, 6H, AdCH 2 ), 3.69 ( s , $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 6.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.04 (dd, $J=8.1,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.08 (d, $J=$ $2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.48 (d, $J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.74(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.80(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.86$ (d, $J=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ 433.2009, found 433.2011.
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-carboxycinnamic Acid (49). To a solution of $48(61 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol})$ in a THF/ $\mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ mixture ( $3: 2: 1,1.8 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) was added lithium hydroxide monohydrate ( $30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.71 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). This mixture was stirred under argon for 21 h at which time TLC indicated some starting material 48. Therefore, the mixture was treated with $\mathrm{MeOH}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and 5 N aqueous $\mathrm{NaOH}(0.4 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $82{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h , the reaction quenched with $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(6 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the mixture extracted with EtOAc (40 and 20 mL ). The extract was washed (brine), dried, and concentrated at reduced pressure. The residue was washed with hexane, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (three times), and pentane and dried to give 42 mg ( $71 \%$ ) of 49 as a cream solid: mp 274-277 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3281, 2895, 1712, 1691, $1250 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta 1.83$ (bs, 6H, AdCH 2 ), 2.07 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.20 (bs, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 6.56(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.78(\mathrm{~d}$, $\left.J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.10\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.20(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, 2'-ArH), 7.45 (d, $J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.73(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.86(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$419.1853, found 419.1855.
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-methoxycinnamic Acid (50) (method I). Cinnamate $43(66 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol})$ on hydrolysis for 6.3 h , workup, and washing (hexane and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) afforded $43 \mathrm{mg}(70 \%)$ of $\mathbf{5 0}$ as a cream solid: mp $218-220{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3281, 2905, 1686, 1421, $1252 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 1.79$ (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.03 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 2.16 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 3.82 ( s , $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{O}\right), 6.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.13 (dd, $\left.J=8.5,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.20$ (dd, $J=$ 8.7, $2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.22 (d, $J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.25 (d, $J=$ $8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.27(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.66(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ 405.2060, found 405.2056.
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-hydroxycinnamic Acid (51) (method H). Cinnamate $44(35 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$ after hydrolysis for 1.5 h , workup, and washing (hexane and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) afforded 28 mg ( $85 \%$ ) of $\mathbf{5 1}$ as a light yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp}>260^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec; IR 3276, 2907, 1689, 1429, $1177 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3} / \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta$ 1.54 (bs, 6H, AdCH $)$, 1.82 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 1.94 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), $6.14(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.83\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\right.$ ArH), 6.84 (dd, $\left.J=7.5,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 6.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.03(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.5,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.13 (d, $J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.38(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 391.1904$, found 391.1906.
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-nitrocinnamic Acid (52) (method I). Cinnamate $45(36 \mathrm{mg}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$ after hydrolysis for 3.5 h , workup, and washing (hexane and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) afforded 32 mg (95\%) of 52 as a yellow solid: mp 285-287 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3278, 2904, 1696, $1529,1254 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 1.84$ (bs, 6H, $\mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.08 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}), 2.18\left(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 6.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.80\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.04(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,2.1$ $\left.\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.10\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.74(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.88(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $7.8,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 8.01 (d, $J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}$ ); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 420.1805$, found 420.1800 .

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-benzyloxyphenyl]-3-aminocinnamate (53). A suspension of $39(538 \mathrm{mg}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol})$ and stannous chloride dihydrate $(1.13 \mathrm{~g}, 5.00 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{EtOH}(4.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was heated at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (oil bath) for 2 h . Next, most of the solvent was removed at reduced pressure; the mixture was cooled to room temperature, and its pH was adjusted to $7-8$ by addition of $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $5 \%$ $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting mixture was stirred for 10 min and then extracted with EtOAc ( 80 mL and $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The residue obtained after workup was purified by chromatography on silica gel (14 to $50 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) to give 506 mg (99\%) of 53 as a pale yellow solid: mp $150-151{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3370, 2905, 1703, $1177 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.38\left(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 1.76\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right)$, 2.08 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.20 (bs, 6H, AdCH 2 ), 3.89 (bs, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NH}_{2}$ ), 4.30 ( $\left.\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.20\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 6.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.18\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\right.$ ArH), 7.27 (dd, $\left.J=8.1,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.36(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.32-7.58(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ArH}), 7.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ $\mathrm{CHCO})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{37} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 508.2846$, found 508.2847.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-benzyloxyphenyl]-3-bromocinnamate (54). To a solution of $n$-hexyl nitrite ( $32 \mathrm{mg}, 0.24 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CHBr}_{3}(0.6 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $95{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added $53(1.408 \mathrm{~g}, 4.64 \mathrm{~mL})$ in $\mathrm{CHBr}_{3}(4.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ over a period of 5 min . The mixture was stirred at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 h and cooled to room temperature. After most of the CHBr 3 had been removed under high vacuum, the residue was purified on silica gel ( 3 to $5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) to give 67 mg ( $58 \%$ ) of 54 as a white solid: mp $159-161{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2903, 1712, $1230 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.39\left(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 1.76\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right)$, 2.08 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.21 (bs, 6H, AdCH2), 4.31 (q, $J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.20\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ArCH}_{2}\right), 6.48(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO), 7.03 (d, $J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.28 (dd, $J=8.4,2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.38 (d, $\left.J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.39(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $5-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.51(\mathrm{dd}, J=7.8,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.32-7.57(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}$, ArH, 5-ArH), 7.67 (d, $J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.5$
$\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{BrO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$571.1842, found 571.1838.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-benzyloxyphenyl]-3,6-dibromocinnamate (55). To a solution of $53(228 \mathrm{mg}, 0.45 \mathrm{mmol})$ in anhydrous $\mathrm{MeCN}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ were added, under argon, tert-butyl nitrite $(107 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{CuBr}_{2}(201 \mathrm{mg}, 0.9 \mathrm{mmol})$. The mixture was stirred at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 45 min , warmed to room temperature, stirred for 4 h , the reaction quenched with $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and the mixture extracted with $\mathrm{EtOAc}(60$ and 40 mL ). The residue obtained on workup was chromatographed ( 3 to $5 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) to give $135 \mathrm{mg}(46 \%)$ of 55 as a pale yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 74-77{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 2907, 1718, 1457, $1183 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.38(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), $1.76\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 2.08(\mathrm{bs}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}), 2.20$ (bs, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 4.32\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.20\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$, $6.45(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.02\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\right.$ ArH), 7.24 (dd, $J=8.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.34 (d, $J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.32-7.58(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ArH}), 7.62(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.92(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-$ ArH), $8.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$649.0947, found 649.0943.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-aminocinnamate (56) (method D). A solution of $53(45 \mathrm{mg}, 0.089 \mathrm{mmol})$ after reaction for 2.5 h , workup, and chromatography ( 16 to $20 \%$ $\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave 30 mg (81\%) of 56 as a light yellow solid: mp $214-216^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3356, 2905, 1692, $1178 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.38(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 1.81 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.12 (bs, $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}\right)$, $2.17\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 3.80\left(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NH}_{2}\right), 4.29(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.03(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 6.43(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO), $6.76\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 6.94\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\right.$ ArH), 7.01 (dd, $\left.J=8.1,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.19(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.1,7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.32(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, 2-ArH), $7.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$418.2377, found 418.2372.
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-aminocinnamic Acid (57) (method I). Cinnamate 56 ( $27 \mathrm{mg}, 0.065 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after hydrolysis for 4 h , workup, and washing (hexane, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, and pentane) afforded 25 mg (100\%) of 57 as a yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 240-242{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3360, 2902, 1687, $1253 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 1.84$ (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.08 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 2.21 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 6.43 (d, $J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.82\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.01$ (dd, $\left.J=8.4,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.06\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.08$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.10(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH})$, $7.21(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 390.2064$, found 390.2065.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-azidocinnamate (58). To a suspension of $56(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.197 \mathrm{mmol})$ in 1,4 dioxane $(1.2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}(2.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ at -10 to $-5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under argon was added a solution of $\mathrm{NaNO}_{2}(30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.43 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(140 \mu \mathrm{~L})$. The mixture was stirred at -10 to $-5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 20 min before a solution of $\mathrm{NaN}_{3}(43 \mathrm{mg}, 0.65 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(220 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was added, and stirring was continued for 30 min . The mixture was warmed to room temperature and diluted with $\mathrm{EtOAc}(70 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was washed (saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ and brine), dried, and concentrated at reduced pressure. The residue was chromatographed ( 10 to $14 \%$ $\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane $)$ to give 76 mg ( $87 \%$, two steps from 53 ) of 58 as a light yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 88-91^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $3416,2901,2111,1691,1180$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 1.35\left(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 1.78$ (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.09 (bs, $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}\right), 2.15\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 3.80$ (bs, $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NH}_{2}$ ), $4.28\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.14$ (bs, 1 H , $\mathrm{OH}), 6.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.76(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.18 (dd, $\left.J=8.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.28(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), 7.33 (bs, 3H, 2,5,6-ArH), $7.66(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=$ CHCO); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 444.2282$, found 444.2281.
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-azidocinnamic Acid (59). To a suspension of $58(53 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(0.1 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{EtOH}(0.2 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added $25 \%$ aqueous $\mathrm{NaOH}(50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, $0.42 \mathrm{mmol})$. The mixture was stirred for 6 h , acidified with 1 N HCl $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and extracted with EtOAc ( 50 and 30 mL ). The extract was washed (brine), dried, and concentrated at reduced pressure. The
residue was chromatographed (0:50:50 to 14:43:43 $\mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) to give 33 mg ( $66 \%$ ) of 59 as a tan solid: $\mathrm{mp}>260^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3374, 2904, 2113, 1685, $1251 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (DMSO- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 1.76$ (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.07 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 2.13 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 6.65 (d, $J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.85\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.19$ $\left(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.38(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.66(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.67(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 9.58(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 12.43(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{COOH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$416.1974, found 416.1988 .

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-bromocinnamate (60) (method D). Cinnamate $54(67 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol})$ after reaction for 2 h , workup, and chromatography ( 9 to $11 \% \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) gave 51 mg ( $90 \%$ ) of 60 as a cream solid: $\mathrm{mp} 213-215^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3351, 2903, 1691, $1197 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 1.82 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.13 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 2.19 (bs, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 4.31\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.01(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH})$, $6.48(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.74\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\right.$ ArH), 7.18 (dd, $J=8.1,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}$ ), $7.38(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.51(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $6-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}$ ); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{BrO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 481.1373$, found 481.1374.
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-bromocinnamic Acid (61) (method I). Cinnamate $60(30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.06 \mathrm{mmol})$ after hydrolysis for 5 h , workup, and washing (hexane and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ) afforded $25 \mathrm{mg}(89 \%)$ of $\mathbf{6 1}$ as a cream solid: $\mathrm{mp} 244-247{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3313, 2915, 1702, $1166 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 1.84(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.08 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 2.21 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 6.54 (d, $J=$ $16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.79\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.08$ (dd, $\left.J=8.1,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.22\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right)$, $7.38(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.62(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.1,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6-\mathrm{ArH})$, $7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-$ ArH); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{BrO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$453.1060, found 453.1062.

Ethyl (E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3,6-dibromocinnamate (62) (method D). Cinnamate 55 ( $128 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after reaction for 2 h , workup, and chromatography ( 4 to $12 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ / hexane) gave 97 mg ( $88 \%$ ) of $\mathbf{6 2}$ as a pale yellow solid: mp 211-213 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3382, 2905, 1694, $1194 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 1.82 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.13 (bs, $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}\right), 2.18$ (bs, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 4.33\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.03(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{OH}), 6.45(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.74(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.15$ (dd, $\left.J=8.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.30(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.61(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.91(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH}), 8.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ 559.0478, found 559.0468.
(E)-4-[3'-(1-Adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3,6-dibromocinnamic Acid (63) (method I). Cinnamate 62 ( $58 \mathrm{mg}, 0.104 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) upon hydrolysis for 3.5 h , workup, and washing (hexane, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, and $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ ) afforded $53 \mathrm{mg}(96 \%)$ of $\mathbf{6 3}$ as a yellow solid: mp 262-264 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3299, 2904, 1701, $1249 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 1.84$ (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.08 (bs, 3H, AdCH), 2.21 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 6.55 (d, $J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.80\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.08$ (dd, $\left.J=8.4,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right), 7.21\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 2^{\prime}-\mathrm{ArH}\right)$, $7.61(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5-\mathrm{ArH}), 7.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 8.07(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 2-\mathrm{ArH})$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 531.0165$, found 531.0171.

Ethyl (E)-3-[6-(1-Adamantyl)-7-benzyloxy-9H-carbazol-2-yl]propenoate (64) and Ethyl (E)-3-[8-(1-Adamantyl)-7-benzyloxy-9H-carbazol-2-yl]propenoate (67). A reported method was used to synthesize carbazoles 64 and $67 .{ }^{18,19}$ To a solution of $39(0.80 \mathrm{~g}, 1.49$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ in 1,2-dichlorobenzene was added $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}(0.97 \mathrm{~g}, 3.72 \mathrm{mmol})$. The mixture was heated at $180^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ while being stirred under argon for 19 h . After cooling, the mixture was chromatographed (9 to $25 \%$ $\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) to give fractions containing 64 or 67, as the major isomer, each of which was separately crystallized ( $\mathrm{EtOH}, 6 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) to afford 390 mg ( $52 \%$ ) of 64 as a yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 203-205^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and $330 \mathrm{mg}(44 \%)$ of 67 as a yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 144-145^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .64$ : IR 3334, 2905, 1704, $1291 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.38(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), 1.79 (bs, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.12 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 2.28 (bs,
$\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 4.31\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.25(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{ArCH}_{2}\right), 6.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.99(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 8 \mathrm{H}-$ carbazole), $7.36-7.60\left(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 3 H\right.$-carbazole), 7.86 (d, $J=$ $16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}$ ), 7.94 (s, 1H, 5 H -carbazole), 7.97 (bs, 1 H , $9 H$-carbazole), 7.99 (d, $J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 4 H$-carbazole); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$506.2690, found 506.2683. 67: IR 3407, 2911, 1702, $1272 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), $1.80\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 2.12(\mathrm{bs}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}), 2.61$ (bs, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 4.32\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.24(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{ArCH}_{2}\right), 6.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.03(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 6 \mathrm{H}$-carbazole), $7.35-7.59\left(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 3 \mathrm{H}\right.$-carbazole), 7.85 $(\mathrm{d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5 H-$ carbazole), 7.95 (d, $J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}$-carbazole), 8.91 (bs, $1 \mathrm{H}, 9 \mathrm{H}$ carbazole); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 506.2690$, found 506.2688.

Ethyl (E)-3-[6-(1-Adamantyl)-7-hydroxy-9H-carbazol-2-yl]propenoate (65) (method D). Ester $64(100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol})$ after reaction for 2.3 h , workup, and chromatography ( 16 to $28 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ / hexane) gave $60 \mathrm{mg}(73 \%)$ of $\mathbf{6 5}$ as a yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} \mathrm{244-246}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3311, 2915, 1670, $1249 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ), $1.86\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 2.17$ (bs, $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}\right), 2.27$ (bs, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 4.32\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 5.25(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH})$, $6.50(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.73(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 8 H$-carbazole), 7.43 (dd, $J=8.1,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 3 H$-carbazole), 7.46 (s, $1 \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}-$ carbazole), $7.84(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.86(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 9 \mathrm{H}-$ carbazole), $7.91(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5 \mathrm{H}$-carbazole), $7.97(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}$ carbazole); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 416.2226$, found 416.2224.
(E)-3-[8-(1-Adamantyl)-7-hydroxy-9H-carbazol-2-yl]propenoic Acid (66) (method I). Ester 65 ( $42 \mathrm{mg}, 0.10 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) upon hydrolysis for 23 h , workup, and chromatography ( $0: 67: 33$ to 6.5:93.5:0 MeOH/ $\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane) afforded 15 mg (38\%) of 66 as a yellow solid: mp $256-258{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3334, 2905, 1685, $1280 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (acetone- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 1.87\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 2.13(\mathrm{bs}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}), 2.33\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right)$, $6.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.00(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 8 \mathrm{H}$-carbazole $)$, 7.48 (dd, $J=8.1,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 3 H$-carbazole), 7.71 (d, $J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $1 H$-carbazole), $7.84(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.93(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $5 H$-carbazole), 8.07 (d, $J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}$-carbazole), 10.15 (bs, 1 H , 9 H -carbazole); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$388.1913, found 388.1912 .

Ethyl (E)-3-[8-(1-Adamantyl)-7-hydroxy-9H-carbazol-2-yl]propenoate (68) (method D). Ester 67 ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.20 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) after reaction for 2 h , workup, and chromatography ( 16 to $28 \% \mathrm{EtOAc}$ / hexane) gave $32 \mathrm{mg}(39 \%)$ of 68 as a yellow solid: $\mathrm{mp} 163-166{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3392, 2920, 1680, $1242 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (acetone- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 1.39(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $\left.7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 1.80-2.00\left(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 2.13(\mathrm{bs}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{AdCH}), 2.68\left(\mathrm{bs}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 4.25\left(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$, 5.17 (bs, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OH}), 6.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.86$ (d, $J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 6 \mathrm{H}$-carbazole), 7.47 (dd, $J=8.1,1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ carbazole), 7.55 (d, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 1 H$-carbazole), $7.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 5 H$-carbazole), $7.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=15.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.92$ (d, $J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}$-carbazole), 8.86 (bs, $1 \mathrm{H}, 9 \mathrm{H}$-carbazole); HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 416.2220$, found 416.2220 .
(E)-3-[6-(1-Adamantyl)-7-hydroxy-9H-carbazol-2-yl]propenoic Acid (69). To a suspension of $68(30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.07 \mathrm{mmol})$ in EtOH ( 0.2 $\mathrm{mL})$ and THF ( 0.1 mL ) was added $25 \%$ aqueous $\mathrm{NaOH}(50 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.42$ mmol ). This mixture was stirred for 24 h , acidified to pH 1 with 1 N $\mathrm{HCl}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and extracted with EtOAc ( $40 \mathrm{~mL}, 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The extract was washed (brine), dried, and concentrated at reduced pressure. The residue was chromatographed (0:50:50 to 9:91:0 $\mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexane and then $9: 91$ to $17: 83 \mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ). The product was washed (pentane) to give $20 \mathrm{mg}(74 \%)$ of 69 as a yellow solid: mp $184-187{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR 3342, 2907, 1679, $1270 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta$ 1.82-2.02 (m, 6H, $\mathrm{AdCH}_{2}$ ), 2.15 (bs, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{AdCH}$ ), 2.65 (bs, 6H, $\left.\mathrm{AdCH}_{2}\right), 6.56(\mathrm{~d}, J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 6.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}, 6 H$-carbazole ), $7.31(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 3 H$-carbazole), 7.65 (d, $J=16.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}=\mathrm{CHCO}), 7.70(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}$-carbazole), 7.71 (d, $J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 5 H$-carbazole), $7.85(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, 4 H$-carbazole $)$; HRMS calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$388.1907, found 388.1908.

Computational Studies. Docking Experiments. Docking of analogues to the SHP homology model ${ }^{6}$ derived from the USP LBDphospholipid complex structure (PDB entry 1G2N) using BioMed Cache version 6.2 (Fuiitsu Ltd., Beaverton, OR) was assessed as we previously described. ${ }^{15}$ The binding pocket site was derived by selecting all neighboring residues within $4 \AA$ (radius) of the USP ligand 1-stearoyl-2-palmitoylglycero-3-phosphoethanolamine, which had been docked to the SHP model. ${ }^{6}$ Both the ligand and side chains of pocket residues were allowed to be flexible during the docking process. Final docking poses in Figure 5 were analyzed by measuring interatom distances after overlaying the docked structures by superposing the backbone of the SHP model structure.

CoMFA Experiments. Comparative molecular field analysis (CoMFA) of analogues of 8 substituted at position 3 was performed using SYBYL version 8.0 (Tripos Inc., St. Louis, MO). Three partial CoMFA models were derived from 11 analogues and their $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values for inhibiting the viability of three leukemia cell lines (K562, OCIAML2, and MOLT4). Each initial structure was minimized by the conjugate gradient method and convergence criterion of $0.005 \mathrm{kcal} /$ mol using the Tripos force field with Gasteiger-Huckel charges added. The asterisk-labeled atoms of analogue 47 , which had the lowest $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values for inhibiting OCI-AML2 and MOLT4 cell viability, comprised the common substructure (Figure S3A of the Supporting Information) used for the alignment. The other 10 analogues were aligned to this template using the database alignment method in SYBYL version 8.0 as shown in Figure S3B of the Supporting Information and placed in a three-dimensional lattice. The steric and electrostatic CoMFA fields were calculated at each lattice intersection of a 2.0 Å spaced grid. An sp ${ }^{3}$ carbon atom with a formal charge of +1 and a van der Waals radius of $1.52 \AA$ was used as a probe atom to generate Lennard-Jones (steric energies) and Coulombic (electrostatic energies) potential. The van der Waals and Coulombic potentials representing the steric and electrostatic fields, respectively, were calculated using standard Tripos force fields with a distance-dependent dielectric constant of 1.00 . Cutoff default values of 30.0 $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for both steric and electrostatic fields were used.

Biologic Studies. NMR Protein Binding Studies. GST-bound SHP was expressed and purified as described previously. ${ }^{15}$ Onedimensional ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded with 128 transients and a sweep width of 12376 Hz using a Bruker Avance 600 MHz NMR spectrometer equipped with a TCI cryoprobe so that the sample temperature was maintained at $11{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The repetition time was 3 s . Spectra were recorded for solutions of each compound ( $100 \mu \mathrm{M} 8$ and 47 and $200 \mu \mathrm{M} 46$ ) in the bead elution buffer [ 50 mM Tris ( pH 7.2 ) containing 20 mM reduced glutathione] prepared using $92.5 \% \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $2 \%$ DMSO- $d_{6}$ alone or with GST-bound SHP ( $0.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ for 8 and 47 and $1.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ for 46 ).

Cell Culture. KG-1 AML cells from H. P. Koeffler (UCLA, CedarsSinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA) were grown in RPMI 1640 medium supplemented with $5 \%$ heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum (FBS) and gentamycin ( $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ). ATRA-resistant HL-60R myeloid leukemia cells from S. Collins (University of Washington, Seattle, WA) were grown under the same conditions. MDA-MB-231 breast cancer cells (ATCC, Manassas, VA) were seeded in DMEM/F12 medium supplemented with $10 \%$ FBS and gentamycin ( $25 \mu \mathrm{~g} /$ mL ). Cells were incubated for 24 h before being treated with compound (final $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}$ concentration of $0.1 \%$ ) for 48 or 72 h . K562 AML (ATCC), MOLT4 T-ALL (ATCC), and OCI-AML2 (from S. Kitada, Sanford-Burnham Medical Research Institute) leukemia cell lines were cultured in RPMI 1640 medium (CellGro, Mediatech, Manassas, VA) supplemented with $10 \%$ heat-inactivated FBS and a $1 \%$ penicillin/streptomycin solution (Omega Scientific, Tarzana, CA) at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a $5 \% \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ atmosphere.

Inhibition of Proliferation. KG-1 leukemia cells were seeded in sixwell plates containing 3 mL of medium and $5 \%$ FBS per well and incubated overnight. After compounds dissolved in $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}$ were added to provide the designated concentrations, cells were incubated for 48 h and harvested. Cell numbers were determined by counting using a hemocytometer as described previously. ${ }^{11}$ Results shown are averages of triplicate determinations $\pm$ standard deviations (SDs), which were $<10 \%$.

Cell Apoptosis. KG-1 leukemia cells were seeded and incubated for 48 h as described for the cell growth inhibition experiments. Apoptotic cells were identified using acridine orange staining for DNA fragmentation as described previously. ${ }^{11}$ Results shown are the averages of triplicate determinations $\pm$ SDs, which were $<10 \%$.
Cancer Stem Cell Assay. The effects of compounds on proliferation of MMTV-Wntl murine mammary cancer stem cells derived from mammospheres were determined as previously described. ${ }^{15}$ Briefly, dissociated cells were plated in MSC medium without serum into gelatin-coated 384 -well plates, incubated for 24 h , and then treated with the indicated concentrations of compound in vehicle (final $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}$ concentration of $0.1 \%$ ) or vehicle ( $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}$ ) alone for 72 h . Cells were fixed and stained with DAPI. Cell numbers were determined by analyzing nine images acquired by the IC100 automatic focusing imaging system and Cyteseer (Vala Sciences, San Diego, CA). Results are expressed as means $\pm$ SD from triplicate determinations.

Cell Viability Assay. This assay was conducted as previously reported with several modifications. ${ }^{15}$ Briefly, K562, MOLT4, and OCI-AML2 leukemia cell suspensions in medium containing $10 \%$ fetal bovine serum (FBS) ( 1800 cells in $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of medium/well) were added to 384 -well white-bottomed Greiner plates and incubated with compounds at the specified concentrations. Compounds were dissolved in $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}$ (maximal final concentration of $0.1 \%$, which had no effect on cell growth) and then diluted into medium containing $10 \%$ FBS. After 72 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, plates were cooled to room temperature for 15 min before luciferase assays were conducted to determine ATP levels using CellTiter Glo Luminescent Cell Viability Reagent ( $20 \mu \mathrm{~L} /$ well; Promega, Madison, WI) and light emission was measured after 10 min according to the manufacturer's instructions. Experiments were performed in quadruplicate (mean $\pm$ SD). Cell viability was calculated on the basis of maximal luminescence intensity observed for each cell line in the presence of the $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}$ vehicle alone ( $100 \%$ value). Assay results are displayed graphically in Figure S1 of the Supporting Information.

Statistical Analysis. For the data obtained at analogue concentrations of 1.0 and $5.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ compared to those of the nontreated control groups, which are given in Tables 1 and 2, the statistical significance between treated and nontreated control groups ( $n=3$ each) was determined by the two-sample $t$ test with a degree of freedom $(k)$ of 4 on the mean $\pm$ standard deviation (SD) data. $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values for effects of analogues on the K562, OCI-AML2, and MOLT4 leukemia cell lines were determined from dose-response curves of the means of quadruplicate determinations $\pm \mathrm{SD}$, which are shown in Figure S1 of the Supporting Information. The means of the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values $\pm$ SD of the effects of compounds on the mammary stem cells that are listed in Table 2 were determined by a one-tailed $t$ test on the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values determined from dose-response curves in triplicate experiments. Statistical comparisons between the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value of 8 and those of five other analogues were made using the two-sample $t$ test with a degree of freedom ( $k$ ) of 4 on the means $\pm$ standard deviation (SD) of their $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values. The dose-response curves shown in Figure 3 represent the means of triplicate determinations $\pm$ SDs of the effects of analogues on these stem cells.
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## - ABBREVIATIONS

1-Ad, 1-adamantyl; 3-Cl-AHPC, (E)-4-[3'-(1-adamantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-3-chlorocinnamic acid; AHPN, 6-[3'-(1-ada-mantyl)-4'-hydroxyphenyl]-2-naphthalenecarboxylic acid; AML, acute myelocytic leukemia; ATRA, all-trans-retinoic acid; CML, chronic myeloid leukemia; CoMFA, comparative molecular field analysis; DAPI, 4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole dihydrochloride; RAR, retinoic acid receptor; RXR, retinoid X receptor; SHP, small heterodimer partner; T-ALL, T-cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia
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