STUDIES IN THE THYMELAEACEAE I. NMR SPECTRAL ASSIGNMENTS OF DAPHNORETIN

GEOFFREY A. CORDELL

Program for Collaborative Research in the Pharmaceutical Sciences. College of Pharmacy. University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, 1L 60612

ABSTRACT.—The high-field proton and 13 C-nmr spectra of daphnoretin (1) are assigned unambiguously through polarization transfer and selective decoupling experiments.

Daphnoretin (1) is a well-known bis-coumarin derivative found principally in the Thymelaeaceae, but also in the Leguminosae and Rutaceae [Table 1 (1-25)]. The structure was determined by Tschesche *et al.* (10), and confirmed by total synthesis (26). Interest in daphnoretin (1) has been rekindled recently because of the *in vivo* antineoplastic activity shown against the Ehrlich ascites carcinoma in mice (21,27), and the ability of 1 to inhibit a number of enzymes involved in DNA synthesis in Ehrlich ascites cells (28). It should be noted that daphnoretin (1) is not active in the standard NCI *in vivo* or *in vitro* assays (7, 15, 16, 21).



Table 1.	Occurrence of	Daphnoretin in	n Plants
----------	---------------	----------------	----------

Plant Source	Family	Reference
Boenninghausenia albiflora	Rutaceae	1,2
Boenninghausenia japonica	Rutaceae	3
Coronilla balansae	Leguminosae	4
Coronilla cretica	Leguminosae	4,5
Coronilla hyrcana	Leguminosae	4,5
Coronilla orientalis	Leguminosae	4,5
Coronilla repanda	Leguminosae	4,5
Coronilla scorpioides	Leguminosae	4-6
Coronilla varia	Leguminosae	4,5,7
Daphne cannabina	Thymelaeaceae	8
Daphne gnidium	Thymelaeaceae	9
Daphne mezereum	Thymelaeaceae	10-13
Daphne tangutica	Thymelaeaceae	13
Daphnopsis racemosa	Thymelaeaceae	10,11
Edgeworthia gardneri	Thymelaeaceae	14,15
Peddiea fischeri	Thymelaeaceae	16
Ruta graveolens	Rutaceae	17
Thymelaea hirsuta	Thymeleaeceae	18,19
Thymelaea tartonraira	Thymelaeaceae	20
Wikstroemia foetida var oahuensis	Thymelaeaceae	21
Wikstroemia indica	Thymelaeaceae	22-24
Wikstroemia viridiflora	Thymelaeaceae	25

Even though 1 has been isolated frequently and sometimes in high-yield, nmr spectral data are not well established. This paper reports the first definitive study of the ¹H-nmr spectrum and a complete and unambiguous assignment of the ¹³C-nmr spectrum of daphnoretin (1).¹

A preliminary study of the ¹H-nmr spectrum of **1** has been published (4, 13, 25), without discussion or measurement of coupling constants. Our initial work at 60 MHz,² using DMSO- d_6 as the solvent, failed to resolve adequately a three-proton complex in the region δ 7.03-7.20.³ At 360 MHz, each aromatic proton was distinct (Figure 1),⁴ and a number of selective decoupling experiments established the assignments. Thus, irradiation of the doublet at δ 6.363 (H-3') collapsed the doublet at δ 8.025 to a singlet (H-4'), and back irradiation, as well as reducing the multiplicity of H-3', also eliminated a long-range coupling (~0.3 Hz) in the proton at δ 7.172, indicating this doublet (J=2.3 Hz) to be H-8'. Final confirmation of the assignments on the A unit came through irradiation of the doublet (J=9.6 Hz) at δ 7.693, which reduced the doublet of doublets at δ 7.100 to a doublet (J=2.3 Hz). Three singlets, at δ 7.860, 7.196 and 6.853, were assigned to H-4, H-5, and H-8, respectively, based on the established data for coumarins (29).

More substantial problems were posed by the ¹³C-nmr spectrum.⁵ At 90.546



FIGURE 1. 360 MHz ¹H-nmr Spectrum of Daphnoretin (1) (aromatic region only).

¹The daphnoretin used in this study was obtained from the stems of *Edgeworthia gardneri* Meisn. (Thymelaeaceae) (15).

²Obtained using a Varian T-60A instrument equipped with a Nicolet TT-7 Fourier Transform attachment.

 $^{^{3}}$ The total field dispersion of the H-6, H-8 and H-5' protons at 60 MHz is 5.8 Hz, making unambiguous assignment of H-6 and H-8 impossible.

⁴Obtained using a Nicolet NT 360 spectrometer at the NSF Regional NMR Facility, University of Illinois at Urbana, Urbana-Champaign, IL.

⁵Partial assignments of the ¹³C-nmr spectrum of **1** have been reported (9) as follows: δ 160.0 (C-2), 159.7 (C-2'), 157.0 (C-7). 155.0 (C-9), 144.1 (C-4'), 130.0 (C-5') and 113.5 (C-3'). The remaining signals were not assigned.

MHz, the 19 carbon atoms were clearly resolved in the proton noise decoupled spectrum, and the INEPT spectrum (30-32) afforded a substantial amount of information concerning the coupling of the individual carbons (Figure 2).⁴



^a"ghost" from DMSO-d₆

By comparison with the established data for coumarins (33-35), a number of assignments could be made quite readily. For the purposes of discussion, the carbon atoms of daphnoretin (1) may be divided into three groups, (a) those bearing a proton, (b) those attached to oxygen, and (c) those attached only to carbon. Assignments for each of these groups of carbon atoms will be presented in turn.

(a) The INEPT spectrum clearly indicated those carbons bearing a proton (Figure 2) to be at δ 144.11, 130.95, 129.89, 113.81, 113.55, 109.39, 104.03, and 102.84. The signal at δ 113.81 displayed ${}^{1}J_{CH}$ =173.9 Hz permitting unambiguous assignment to C-3' (34), and because δ 104.03, but not δ 102.84, showed a ${}^{3}J_{CH}$ =3.9 Hz, these signals could be assigned to C-8' and C-8, respectively. The most downfield carbon bearing a proton, δ 144.11, was assigned to C-4' (33-35) and was confirmed when heteronuclear decoupling (LPSFORD) at δ 8.05 eliminated the ${}^{1}J_{CH}$ coupling. Irradiation at H-4 (δ 7.86) collapsed the doublet of doublets (J=4.9, 165.5 Hz) at δ 130.95 to a doublet and thus should be C-4, which is further coupled only to H-5. The other signal (δ 129.89) in this region was established to be H-5' also through irradiation at the frequency of the attached proton, δ 7.70.

In the course of irradiating H-8' (δ 7.17), it was apparent that a number of other resonances not associated with H-8' had also been affected, presumably because of the very close chemical shift of H-5 (δ 7.20). However, this did permit the assignment of the resonance at δ 109.39 to C-5, leaving the doublet of doublets at δ 113.55 to be assigned to C-6'.

(b) Eight of the carbon atoms are attached to oxygen, and except for C-4' at δ 144.11, are all of the signals downfield of δ 135 ppm. The most downfield carbons were anticipated to be C-2 and C-2' (33-35), and they were easily distinguished because the signal at δ 160.07 was observed to be a doublet of doublets (J=9.9, 4.1 Hz) and should be C-2', whereas δ 159.75 was a broad doublet (J=11.6 Hz) as anticipated for C-2. Selective decoupling (LPSFORD) experiments irradiating H-4 (δ 7.87) and H-4' (δ 8.05) confirmed these assignments.

١

Irradiation at δ 7.87 (H-4) removed a number of small coupling constants resulting in some simplification, thus the narrow doublet (${}^{2}J_{CH}$ =3.9 Hz) could be assigned to C-3, and the ddd at δ 147.5 to C-9, tentatively. Since this same signal was also simplified on irradiation of H-5 and H-8, the assignment was confirmed. These irradiations also affected the rather diffuse signal at δ 145.75, which, on the basis of previously published work (34,35) should be C-6, bearing the methoxy group. On the other hand, C-9', being in a 7-substituted coumarin, should resonate at about δ 155 (34,35); indeed, the signal at δ 155.06 was a ddd that simplified on irradiation of either H-4', H-5' or H-8'.

A distinction between C-7' and C-7 was initially made on the basis of their anticipated chemical shift differences (34,35). Confirmation was achieved through irradiation at δ 7.21 (H-5) and δ 6.88 (H-8), which markedly enhanced the resonance at δ 150.44, and at δ 7.71 (H-5'), which simplified the signal at δ 157.07. These signals could therefore be assigned to C-7 and C-7', respectively.

(c) Only two of the carbons in daphnoretin are attached solely to carbon, C-10 and C-10', and may be distinguished on the basis of the complexity of their signals in the coupled spectrum. In this way, the broad signal at δ 114.45 was assigned to C-10' and the broadened doublet (${}^{3}J_{\rm CH}$ =4.8 Hz) at δ 110.25 to C-10.

The observed and calculated values for daphnoretin (1) are shown in Table 2, and a number of discrepancies are immediately apparent. Thus, the observed value for C-7 is downfield of the calculated value, and the assignment of C-7 vs. C-6 may be questioned. However, it is well established (34,35) that C-7 in a 6,7-dioxygenated coumarin appears in the region 150-152 ppm and C-6 in the region 143-146 ppm.

Carbon	Observed Chemical Shift (δ, ppm)	Coupling Constant (J, Hz)	Calculated Chemical Shift (35)
C-2	159.75	11.6	158.5
C-3	135.74	3.9	137.5
C-4	130.95	165.5, 4.9	114.7
C-5	109.39	162.5, 3.8	109.5
С-6	145.75	3.3	145.9
C-7	150.44	6.8, 3.8	144.5
С-8	102.84	162.7	103.0
С-9	147.50	4.6, 5.6, 9.7	145.5
C-10	110.25	4.6	113.7
C-2'	160.07	4.0, 9.9	160.8
C-3'	113.81	173.9	112.7
C-4'	144.11	166.7, 4.5	143.3
C-5'	129.89	165.5, 3.4	128.7
C-6'	113.55	165.5, 4.6	112.1
C-7'	157.07	2.8, 7.8	162.6
C-8′	104.03	165.8, 3.9	100.6
C-9'	155.06	4.2, 5.3, 9.6	155.6
C-10'	114.45	complex	112.3
6'-OCH,	56.00	144.4	

 TABLE 2.
 Observed and Calculated ¹³C-Chemical Shifts of Daphnoretin (1)

Actually, C-4 appears 16 ppm further downfield than predicted, although inspection of the data reveals that this estimated value is based on only one prior observation (35).

A more serious concern involves the relative chemical shifts of C-10 and C-10', but as previously discussed, the coupling observed for these two signals justifies the assignments indicated. Both C-7' and C-8' have also undergone fairly substantial shifts, the

former upfield by 5.6 ppm, and the latter downfield by 3.4 ppm. In these cases, calculated values were obtained through the use of a substituent effect for a methoxy group (35). and this probably is inadequate to account for the interaction between the two nuclei.⁶

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by Grant CA 20164 from the Division of Cancer Treatment, National Cancer Treatment. High-field nuclear magnetic resonance spectra were obtained at Midwest Regional NMR Facility, University of Illinois at Urbana; this facility is funded, in part, by the National Science Foundation grant number CHE 79-16100.

LITERATURE CITED

- 1. S.K. Talapatra, S. Mukhopadhyay, and B. Talapatra, Phytochemistry, 14, 836 (1975).
- 2. Z. Rózsa, K. Szendrei, I. Novak, J. Reisch, and E. Minker, Pharmazie, 30, 753 (1975).
- 3. M. Kozawa, K. Baba, M. Minami, H. Nitta, and K. Hata, Chem. Pharm. Bull., 22, 2746 (1974).
- 4. N.F. Komissarenko, Khim. Prir. Soedin., 5, 141 (1969).
- 5. N.F. Komissarenko and I.G. Zoz, Rast. Resur., 5, 178 (1969).
- 6. Yu. N. Beletskii and N.F. Komissarenko, Khim. Prir. Soedin., 3, 277 (1967).
- 7. M. Williams and J.M. Cassady, J. Pharm. Sci., 65, 912 (1976).
- 8. P.L. Majumder and G.C. Sengupta, J. Indian Chem. Soc., 45, 1058 (1968).
- 9. E. Cabrera and A. Garcia-Granados, An. Quim., Ser. C, 77, 31 (1981).
- 10. R. Tschesche, U. Schact, and G. Legler, Liebigs Ann. Chem., 662, 113 (1963).
- 11. R. Tschesche, U. Schact, and G. Legler, Naturwissenschaften, 15, 521 (1963).
- L.I. Kosheleva and G.K. Nikonov, Tr. Vses. S'ezda. Farm. 1st., 245 (1970); Through Chem. Abstr., 75: 126577k (1971).
- 13. L.-g. Zhuang, O. Seligmann, K. Jurcic, and H. Wagner, Planta Med., 45, 172 (1982).
- 14. P.L. Majumder, G.C. Sengupta, B.N. Dinda, and A. Chatterjee, Phytochemistry, 13, 1929 (1974).
- 15. S.P. Gunasekera, G.A. Cordell, and N.R. Farnsworth, unpublished results.
- 16. S.S. Handa, A.D. Kinghorn, G.A. Cordell, and N.R. Farnsworth, J. Nat. Prod., 46, 248 (1983).
- 17. J. Reisch, I. Novak, K. Szendrei, and E. Minker, Planta Med., 16, 372 (1968).
- 18. A.M. Rizk and H. Rimpler, Phytochemistry, 11, 473 (1972).
- 19. A.M. Rizk, F.M. Hammouda, and S.I. Ismail, Acta Chim. Acad. Sci. Hung., 85, 107 (1975); through Chem. Abstr., 83: 40191h (1975).
- 20. A. Garcia-Grandos and J.M. Saenz de Buruaga, An. Quim., Ser. C, 76, 96 (1980).
- 21. S.J. Torrance, J.J. Hoffmann, and J.R. Cole, J. Pharm. Sci., 68, 664 (1979).
- 22. A. Kato, Y. Hashimoto, and M. Kidokoro, J. Nat. Prod., 42, 159 (1979).
- C.C. Chen, Y.C. Lin, Y.P. Chen, and H.Y. Hsu, *T'ai-wan Yao Hseub Tsa Chib*, 33, 28 (1981); through Chem. Abstr., 96: 139684b (1982).
- K.-H. Lee, K. Tagahara, H. Suzuki, R.-Y. Wu, M. Haruna, I.H. Hall, H.-C. Huang, K. Ito, T. Iida, and J.-S. Lai, J. Nat. Prod., 44, 530 (1981).
- 25. S. Tandon and R.P. Rastogi, Phytochemistry, 16, 1991 (1977).
- 26. B. Kirkiacharian and C. Mentzer, Bull. Soc. Chim. Fr., 770 (1966).
- 27. I.H. Hall, K. Tagahara, and K.-H. Lee, J. Pharm. Sci., 71, 741 (1982).
- 28. Y.F. Liou, I.H. Hall, and K.-H. Lee, J. Pharm. Sci., 71, 745 (1982).
- 29. W. Steck and M. Mazurek, Lloydia, 35, 418 (1972).
- 30. G.A. Morris and R. Freeman, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 101, 760 (1979).
- 31. G.A. Morris, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 102, 428 (1980).
- 32. D.M. Dodrell and D.T. Pegg, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 102, 6388 (1980).
- K.K. Chan, D.D. Giannini, A.H. Cain, J.D. Roberts, W. Porter, and W.F. Trager, *Tetrahedron*, 33, 899 (1977).
- 34. C.-j Chang, H.G. Floss, and W. Steck, J. Org. Chem., 42, 1337 (1977).
- 35. H. Duddeck and M. Kaiser, Org. Magn. Reson., 20, 55 (1982).
- G.C. Levy, R.L. Lichter, and G.L. Nelson, "Carbon-13 Nuclear Magnetic Resonance-Spectroscopy, 2nd edition," Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1980, p. 111.

Received 22 February 1983

⁶See, for example, the ¹³C-substituent effects of -OCH₃ and OPh for C_6H_6 derivatives (36).