Pentacyclic Triterpenoid Esters from the Fruits of *Bruguiera cylindrica*

Surat Laphookhieo,[†] Chatchanok Karalai,^{*,†} Chanita Ponglimanont,[†] and Kan Chantrapromma[‡]

Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science, Prince of Songkla University, Hat-Yai, Songkhla 90112, Thailand, and Institute of Science, Walailak University, Thasala, Nakhon Si Thammarat 80160, Thailand

Received November 26, 2003

Six new pentacyclic triterpenoid esters (1-6) together with 3α - and 3β -taraxerol were isolated from the fruits of *Bruguiera cylindrica*. The structures of the new compounds were characterized as 3α -Eferuloyltaraxerol (1), 3α -Z-feruloyltaraxerol (2), 3β -E-feruloyltaraxerol (3), 3β -Z-feruloyltaraxerol (4), 3α -*E*-coumaroyltaraxerol (5), and 3α -*Z*-coumaroyltaraxerol (6), respectively. Compounds 2 and 6 exhibited weak cytotoxicity against the NCI-H187 cell line.

Bruguiera cylindrica Blume (Rhizophoraceae), a mangrove plant, is distributed in Southeast Asia. This plant has been used by the local Thai people in folk medicine for the treatment of diarrhea and the healing of wounds.¹ An ethanolic extract of the leaves has shown antiviral activity.² In a previous report, Kato et al. isolated several sulfurcontaining compounds from the CHCl₃ extract of the stem bark.³ As part of our continuing chemical studies on Thai medicinal mangrove plants,⁴⁻⁶ we report herein the isolation and structural elucidation of six new triterpene esters along with two known compounds, 3α - and 3β -taraxerol,⁷ from the hexane extract as well as the evaluation of the cytotoxicity of the new compounds.

Compound 1 was obtained as a white solid with a molecular formula of $C_{40}H_{58}O_4$, on the basis of the [M -H]⁻ ion at m/z 601.4242 in the ESITOFMS (calcd m/z601.4256). The IR spectrum exhibited absorption bands at 3438 (hydroxy), 1705, 1684 (carbonyl), and 1635, 1605 (aromatic ring) cm⁻¹, which together with the UV spectrum $(\lambda_{max}$ 228, 300, and 326 nm) was consistent with the presence of a substituted cinnamoyl chromophore. The ¹³C NMR spectrum of 1 (Table 2) showed 40 signals, attributable to eight methyls, one methoxy group, 10 methylenes, 10 methines, and 11 quaternary carbons, as determined by a DEPT experiment. It was deduced to be a triterpenoid through a purple vanillin-sulfuric acid test and the appearance of seven three-proton singlets of eight methyl groups at δ 0.83, 0.89, 0.91, 0.95, 0.95, 0.96, 0.98, and 1.12 in the ¹H NMR spectrum (Table 1). The signal of one olefinic proton at δ 5.57 (dd, J = 3, 8 Hz) together with ¹³C NMR signals of C-14 (δ 158.5) and C-15 (δ 116.2) suggested a taraxerane moiety.^{7,8} The ¹H NMR spectrum also exhibited two olefinic signals that were characteristic of a trans double bond at δ 6.32 (1H, d, J = 16 Hz, H-2') and 7.59 (1H, d, J = 16 Hz, H-3') and three aromatic protons (a typical pattern of 1,2,4-trisubstituted benzene) at δ 7.08 (1H, dd, J = 1.5, 8 Hz, H-9'), 7.06 (1H, d, J = 1.5 Hz, H-5'),and 6.91 (1H, d, J = 8 Hz, H-8'). ¹³C NMR signals from the HMQC spectrum confirmed the assignments at δ 116.8

(C-2'), 144.4 (C-3'), 123.2 (C-9'), 109.1 (C-5'), and 114.6 (C-8'). This ester substituent, characterized as a feruloyloxy group,^{9,10} was placed at C-3 in the axial position because of the downfield effect observed on H-3 with a small coupling constant at δ 4.76 (t, $J = 2.5 \text{ Hz})^7$ and an observed HMBC cross-peak between H-3 and C-1' at δ 167.0. Thus, compound **1** was identified as 3α -*E*-feruloyltaraxerol. Additional HMBC spectral data are summarized in Table S1 (Supporting Information).

Compound **2**, a white solid, showed a molecular ion peak at m/z 601.4247 [M - H]⁻ in the ESITOFMS (calcd m/z601.4256), corresponding to a molecular formula of $C_{40}H_{58}O_4$. The UV and IR spectra of **2** exhibited the same patterns as those of **1**. The ¹H NMR spectrum of **2** (Table 1) was similar to that of 1, but differed in the downfield shift of H-5', which was at δ 7.76 instead of δ 7.06 because of an anisotropic effect of the carbonyl group. The presence of two olefinic protons at δ 5.86 (H-2') and 6.76 (H-3') with a mutual coupling (J = 13 Hz) was consistent with a *cis* configuration of the ester group.¹¹⁻¹⁴ Thus, compound **2**, a geometric isomer of **1**, was assigned as 3α -*Z*-feruloyltaraxerol. Its absolute configuration has been confirmed by X-ray crystallography.15

Compound **3** was obtained as a white solid, for which the molecular formula of C40H58O4 was inferred by ES-ITOFMS (m/z 601.4269 [M – H]⁻, calcd 601.4256). The ¹H and ¹³C NMR spectra of 3 (Tables 1 and 2) were similar to those of 1, except that the splitting pattern of H-3 at δ 4.60 was a doublet of doublets (J = 5.5, 11 Hz) instead of a triplet at δ 4.76 (J = 2.5 Hz).⁷ The difference in the multiplicity with a larger coupling constant of H-3 in 3 was in agreement with the respective coupling pattern (axialequatorial and axial-axial) of H-3 and H₂-2, indicating that H-3 is situated in an axial position. The HMBC spectrum of 3 (Table S1, Supporting Information) showed a longrange correlation between C-1' at δ 167.1 and H-3 (δ 4.60) and both vinyl protons, H-2' (δ 6.28) and H-3' (δ 7.58). Thus, **3** was determined as 3β -*E*-feruloyltaraxerol, an epimer of 1.

Compound **4**, detected as a minor component in the ¹H NMR spectrum of **3**, was postulated as 3β -*Z*-feruloyltaraxerol by comparison of the multiplicity and coupling con-

© 2004 American Chemical Society and American Society of Pharmacognosy 10.1021/np0305122 CCC: \$27.50 Published on Web 04/07/2004

^{*} To whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel: +6674288444. Fax: +6674212918. E-mail: kchatcha@ratree.psu.ac.th. [†] Prince of Songkla University.

[‡] Walailak University.

position	1	2	3	4 ^a	5	6
1	0.98 m, 1.30 m	0.98 m, 1.32 m	0.94 m, 1.30 m		0.98 m, 1.32 m	0.98 m, 1.32 m
2	1.62 m, 1.90 m	1.60 m, 1.88 m	1.68 m		1.60 m, 1.86 m	1.64 m, 1.92 m
3	4.76 t (2.5)	4.70 t (2.5)	4.60 dd (5.5, 11)	4.53 dd (5.5, 11)	4.75 t (3)	4.71 dd (2.5, 5.5)
5	1.36 m	1.28 m	0.92 m		1.20 m	1.36 m
6	1.42 m, 1.54 m	1.42 m, 1.50 m	1.48 m, 1.62 m		1.48 m, 1.68 m	1.66 m
7	1.50 m, 1.62 m	1.54 m, 1.62 m	1.50 m, 1.62 m		1.62 m	1.62 m
9	0.98 m	0.96 m	0.94 m		0.94 m	0.96 m
11	1.48 m, 1.64 m	1.46 m, 1.62 m	1.42 m, 1.62 m		1.34 m	1.48 m
12	1.02 m, 1.38 m	1.00 m, 1.38 m	1.03 m, 1.34 m		1.02 m, 1.34 m	1.03 m, 1.34 m
15	5.57 dd (3, 8)	5.55 dd (3.5, 8)	5.54 dd (2, 9)	5.53 dd (2, 9)	5.56 dd (3, 8)	5.56 dd (3, 8)
16	1.64 m, 1.92 m	1.64 m,1.92 m	1.62 m, 1.90 m		1.68 m, 1.92 m	1.64 m, 1.94 m
18	1.58 m	1.50 m	1.46 m		1.46 m	1.55 m
19	1.44 m, 2.04 m	1.38 m, 2.02 m	1.34 m, 2.02 m		1.40 m, 2.00 m	1.44 m, 2.04 m
21	1.24 m	1.24 m	1.24 m		1.24 m	1.22 m
22	1.36 m	1.34 m	1.34 m		1.36 m	1.38 m
23	0.89 s	0.85 s	0.91 s		0.88 s	0.83 s
24	0.95 s	0.94 s	0.96 s		0.96 s	0.96 s
25	0.98 s	0.94 s	0.98 s		0.97 s	0.94 s
26	1.12 s	1.09 s	1.10 s		1.11 s	1.09 s
27	0.95 s	0.95 s	0.91 s		0.94 s	0.91 s
28	0.83 s	0.82 s	0.82 s		0.83 s	0.83 s
29	0.96 s	0.92 s	0.95 s		0.96 s	0.96 s
30	0.91 s	0.91 s	0.91 s		0.91 s	0.91 s
2'	6.32 d (16)	5.86 d (13)	6.28 d (16)	5.82 d (13)	6.35 d (16)	5.81 d (13)
3′	7.59 d (16)	6.76 d (13)	7.58 d (16)	6.77 d (13)	7.60 d (16)	6.85 d (13)
5'	7.06 d (1.5)	7.76 d (1.5)	7.03 d (2)	7.78 d (2)	7.45 d (8.5)	7.60 d (8.5)
6'					6.83 d (8.5)	6.79 d (8.5)
8′	6.91 d (8)	6.86 d (8)	6.91 d (8.5)	6.87 d (8)	6.83 d (8.5)	6.79 d (8.5)
9′	7.08 dd (1.5, 8)	7.10 dd (1.5, 8)	7.07 dd (2, 8.5)	7.11 dd (8, 2)	7.45 d (8.5)	7.60 d (8.5)
-OMe	3.95 s	3.91 s	3.93 s	3.92 s		

Table 1. ¹H NMR Data of Compounds 1-6

^a Only partial ¹H NMR data of compound **4** are reported.

stants to those of 1-3. Efforts to separate compounds 3 and 4 were unsuccessful.



Compounds ${\bf 5}$ and ${\bf 6}$ were both obtained as viscous colorless oils. Their 1H NMR spectra (Table 1) showed

Table 2.	¹³ C NMR	Spectral Data	of Compo	ounds 1–3	5 , and 6
----------	---------------------	---------------	----------	-----------	-------------------------

position	1	2	3	5	6	DEPT ^a
1	36.6	36.6	37.4	36.6	36.7	CH_2
2	22.7	22.6	23.6	22.7	22.6	CH_2
3	78.2	78.0	80.8	78.3	78.3	CH
4	36.7	36.6	37.5	36.7	36.6	С
5	50.5	50.3	55.6	50.6	50.2	CH
6	18.6	18.5	18.7	18.6	18.5	CH_2
7	33.6	33.7	36.6	33.7	33.7	CH_2
8	39.2	39.1	39.0	39.2	39.1	С
9	48.6	48.7	48.7	48.7	48.7	CH
10	37.6	37.6	37.9	37.6	37.6	С
11	17.4	17.4	17.5	17.4	17.4	CH_2
12	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	35.1	CH_2
13	38.0	37.9	37.9	38.0	37.9	С
14	158.5	158.2	158.0	158.3	158.5	С
15	116.2	116.8	116.9	116.8	116.8	CH
16	37.7	37.7	37.7	37.7	37.7	CH_2
17	35.8	35.8	35.8	35.8	35.8	С
18	49.2	48.9	49.2	49.1	48.9	CH
19	41.2	41.0	41.2	41.2	41.0	CH_2
20	28.8	28.8	28.8	28.8	28.8	С
21	33.0	33.1	33.7	33.1	33.1	CH_2
22	33.0	32.9	33.1	33.0	32.9	CH_2
23	27.9	27.8	28.0	27.9	27.8	CH_3
24	21.4	21.3	16.8	21.4	21.4	CH_3
25	15.2	15.2	15.5	15.2	15.2	CH_3
26	26.0	26.0	25.9	26.0	26.0	CH_3
27	29.8	29.8	29.8	29.8	29.8	CH_3
28	29.9	29.9	29.9	29.9	29.9	CH_3
29	33.3	33.4	33.3	33.4	33.4	CH_3
30	21.8	21.8	21.3	21.8	21.8	CH_3
1′	167.0	166.2	167.1	167.2	166.3	C
2′	116.8	117.7	116.2	116.2	118.3	CH
3′	144.4	143.1	144.3	144.1	142.8	CH
4′	127.1	127.4	127.1	127.3	127.8	С
5'	109.1	112.7	109.2	129.9	132.1	CH
6′	146.7	145.9	146.7	115.8	115.0	С
7′	147.8	146.8	147.8	157.6	156.4	С
8′	114.6	113.8	114.6	115.8	115.0	CH
9′	123.2	125.4	123.0	129.9	132.1	CH
-OMe	56.0	56.0	55.9			CH_3

^a The data were analyzed by DEPT 90° and 135°.

characteristics similar to those of 1-3, except for the disappearance of a methoxy signal at ca. δ 3.9. Therefore, compounds **5** and **6** were determined as 3α -*E*-coumaroyl-taraxerol and 3α -*Z*-coumaroyltaraxerol, respectively. Their

HMBC spectral data are summarized in Table S1 (Supporting Information).

The other two known compounds were identified as 3α taraxerol⁷ and 3β -taraxerol⁷ by analysis of 1D and 2D NMR information and comparison of their physical and spectral data with reported values.

Compounds 2 and 6 exhibited weak cytotoxicity against the NCI-H187 (human small cell lung cancer) cell line with IC_{50} values of 12.2 and 20.0 μ g/mL, respectively. No activity was observed in both the BC (human breast cancer cells) and KB (oral human epidermoid carcinoma) cell lines, while compounds 1, 3, and 5 showed no cytotoxicity. It is interesting to note that the 3α -cis-taraxeryl esters (2, 6) were somewhat active, while their trans isomers were inactive.

Experimental Section

General Experimental Procedures. Melting points were determined on an Electrothermal melting point apparatus and are uncorrected. Optical rotation values were determined with an Autopol II automatic polarimeter. UV spectra were measured with a UV 160A spectrophotometer (Shimadzu). The IR spectra were measured with a Perkin-Elmer FTS FT-IR spectrophotometer. The ¹H and ¹³C spectral data were recorded using a 500 MHz Varian UNITY INOVA spectrometer in CDCl₃. Chemical shifts are recorded in parts per million (δ) in CDCl₃. The ESITOFMS were obtained from a Micromass LCT mass spectrometer. Quick column chromatography and column chromatography were carried out on silica gel 60 F₂₅₄ (Merck) and silica gel 100, respectively. Precoated thin-layer plates of silica gel 60 GF₂₅₄ were used for analytical purposes.

Plant Material. The fruits of Bruguiera cylindrica were collected in March 2002 at the Mangrove Research Station in Nakhon Si Thammarat Province, Thailand. The plant was identified by Prof. Puangpen Sirirugsa, and a voucher specimen (No. 0012531) has been deposited at the Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand.

Extraction and Isolation. Air-dried fruits of B. cylindrica (6 kg) were extracted with hexane, methylene chloride, and methanol, successively. The hexane extract (35 g) was subjected to quick column chromatography (QCC) over silica gel and eluted with a gradient of hexane-acetone to afford 15 fractions (A1-A15). Fraction A6 (2.50 g) was crystallized from acetone-hexane to give 3α-taraxerol (1.50 g). Fraction A8 (1.25 g), upon washing with hexane, gave a white solid (121 mg), which was further subjected to column chromatography using acetone-hexane (1:9) as eluent to give two subfractions (A8/1 and A8/2). Of these, subfraction A8/2 (20 mg) was further purified by preparative TLC (acetone-hexane, 1:9) to afford 3β -taraxerol (5.2 mg). Fraction A9 (2.80 g) was crystallized from acetone-hexane to give compound 2 (1.50 g). Fraction A12 (4 g) was crystallized from acetone-hexane to give a mixture of compounds **3** and **4** (10 mg, detected from the ¹H NMR spectrum to be in the ratio 8:2). The mixture was further purified by preparative TLC (acetone-hexane, 1:9) to yield compound 3 (5.2 mg). The mother liquor of fraction A12 (3.70 g) was recrystallized from acetone-hexane to give compound 1 (2.50 g). Fraction A13 (100 mg) was subjected to column chromatography using 100% methylene chloride as eluent to give two subfractions (A13/1and A13/2). Subfraction A13/2 (30 mg) was further purified by preparative TLC (diethyl etherhexane, 2.5:7.5) to afford compounds 5 (10 mg) and 6 (7 mg), respectively.

3α-E-Feruloyltaraxerol (1): white solid, mp 125–126 °C; $[\alpha]^{27}_{\rm D} - 37.5^{\circ}$ (*c* 0.08, CHCl₃); UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\rm max}$ (log ϵ) 326 (4.31), 300 (4.24), 228 (4.08); IR (KBr) v_{max} 3438, 1705, 1684, 1635, 1605, 1515 cm $^{-1}$; $^1\!H$ NMR (CDCl_3, 500 MHz), see Table 1; $^{13}\!C$ NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz), see Table 2; EIMS *m*/*z* 602 (3) [M]⁺, 408 (18), 194 (24), 177 (100); ESITOFMS (negative mode) m/z $[M - H]^-$ 601.4242 (calcd for C₄₀H₅₇O₄, 601.4256).

3α-Z-Feruloyltaraxerol (2): white solid, mp 185–186 °C; $[\alpha]^{27}_{D}$ –104.4° (c 0.067 CHCl₃); UV (MeOH) λ_{max} (log ϵ) 323 (4.29), 300 (4.17) 237 (4.16); IR (KBr) ν_{max} 3463, 1708, 1697, 1623, 1594, 1513 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz), see Table 1; ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz), see Table 2; EIMS *m*/*z* 602 (3) [M]+, 408 (12), 194 (28), 177 (100); ESITOFMS (negative mode) $m/z [M - H]^-$ 601.4247 (calcd for C₄₀H₅₇O₄, 601.4256).

3β-E-Feruloyltaraxerol (3): white solid, mp 132–133 °C; $[\alpha]^{27}_{D}$ -62.5° (c 0.016, CHCl₃); UV (MeOH) λ_{max} (log ϵ) 327 (4.25), 300 (4.08), 237 (4.03); IR (KBr) ν_{max} 3449, 1704, 1682, 1635, 1509 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz), see Table 1; ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz), see Table 2; EIMS *m*/*z* 602 (2) [M]⁺, 408 (8), 194 (48), 177 (100); ESITOFMS (negative mode) m/z $[M - H]^-$ 601.4269 (calcd for C₄₀H₅₇O₄, 601.4256).

 3α -*E*-Coumaroyltaraxerol (5): colorless, viscous oil, $[\alpha]^{27}$ _D +136.36° (*c* 0.022, CHCl₃); UV (MeOH) λ_{max} (log ϵ) 311 (4.23), 300 (4.18), 237 (4.10); IR (neat) $\nu_{\rm max}$ 3449, 1767, 1712, 1638, 1603, 1505 cm⁻¹; ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz), see Table 1; ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz), see Table 2; ESITOFMS (negative mode) $m/z [M - H]^- 571.4144$ (calcd for C₃₉H₅₅O₃, 571.4151).

3 α -**Z**-Coumaroyltaraxerol (6): colorless, viscous oil, $[\alpha]^{27}$ _D +26.31° (c 0.038, CHCl₃); UV (MeOH) λ_{max} (log ϵ) 311 (4.27), 300 (4.22); IR (neat) ν_{max} 3372, 1704, 1675, 1635, 1600, 1509 cm $^{-1};\ ^1H$ NMR (CDCl_3, 500 MHz), see Table 1; ^{13}C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz), see Table 2; ESITOFMS (negative mode) $m/z [M - H]^-$ 571.4131 (calcd for C₃₉H₅₅O₃, 571.4151).

Cytotoxicity Assay. The cytotoxicity assay employed the colorimetric method.¹⁶ Ellipticine, the reference substance, exhibited activity toward BC, KB, and NCI-H187 cell lines, with the IC₅₀ range of 0.3–0.6 μ g/mL.

Acknowledgment. We are grateful to the Thailand Research Fund through the Royal Golden Jubilee Ph.D. Program (Grant No. PHD/0007/2546), the Higher Education Development Project: Postgraduate Education and Research Program in Chemistry, Biodiversity Research and Training Program (BRT), Taiyo Group of Japan, and the Graduate School, Prince of Songkla University, for financial support. The Bioassay Research Facility of BIOTEC is also gratefully acknowledged for bioactivity tests.

Supporting Information Available: Table S1, summarizing the HMBC correlation of compounds 1-3, 5, and 6. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

References and Notes

- Boonyapraphat, N.; Chockchaicharaenphorn, C. *Thai Medicinal Plants*; Prachachon Publisher: Bangkok, 1998; Vol. 2, p 151.
 Premanthan, M.; Kathiresan, K.; Chandra, K. *Int. J. Pharmacog.* 1995, 33, 75-77.
- (3) Kato, A.; Takahashi, J. Phytochemistry 1976, 15, 220-221.
- (4) Chumkaew, P.; Karalai, C.; Ponglimanont, C.; Chantrapromma, K. J. Nat. Prod. 2003, 66, 540-543.
- (5) Laphookhieo, S.; Karalai, C.; Chantrapromma, S.; Fun, H. K.; Usman, A.; Rat-a-pa, Y.; Chantrapromma, K. Acta Crystallogr. 2001, C57, 1352-1353.
- (6) Chantrapromma, S.; Usman, A.; Fun, H. K.; Laphookhieo, S.; Karalai, C.; Rat-a-pa, Y.; Chantrapromma, K. Acta Crystallogr. 2003, C59, o68-o70
- (7) Corbett, R. E.; Cumming, S. D. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1 1972, 2827 - 2829.
- (8) Mahato, S. B.; Kundu, A. P. *Phytochemistry* **1994**, *37*, 1517–1575.
 (9) Siddiqui, B. S.; Kardar, M. N. *Phytochemistry* **2001**, *58*, 1195–1198.
- (10) Wang, H.; Fujimoto, Y. *Phytochemistry* **1993**, *33*, 151–153.
 (11) Begum, S.; Hassan, S. I.; Siddiqui, B. S.; Shaheen, F.; Ghayur, M.
- N.; Gilani, A. H. *Phytochemistry* **2002**, *61*, 399–403.
 Ali, M.; Heaton, A.; Leach, D. *J. Nat. Prod.* **1997**, *60*, 1150–1151.
 Hwang, B. Y.; Chai, H. B.; Kardono, L. B. S.; Riswan, S.; Farnsworth, (13)N. R.; Cordell, G. A.; Pezzuto, J. M.; Kinghorn, A. D. Phytochemistry 2003, 62, 197-201.
- (14) Gu, J. Q.; Park, E. J.; Luyengi, L.; Hawthorne, M. E.; Mehta, R. G.; Fransworth, N. R.; Pezzuto, J. M.; Kinghorn, A. D. Phytochemistry 2001. 58. 121-127.
- (15)
- Chantrapromma, S.; Fun, H. K.; Razak, I, A.; Laphookhieo, S.; Karalai, C. *Acta Crystallogr.* **2003**, *E59*, 01864–01866. Skehan, P.; Storaeng, R.; Scudiero, D.; Monks, A.; McMahon, J.; Vistica, D.; Warren, J. T.; Bokesch, H.; Kenney, S.; Boyd, M. R. J. (16)Natl. Cancer Inst. 1990, 82, 1107-1112.

NP0305122