Synthesis of C‑Glycosyl Pyrrolo[3,4‑c]carbazole-1,3(2H,6H)‑diones as a Scaffold for Check Point Kinase 1 Inhibitors

Satoshi Ichikawa,* Nana Tatebayashi, and Akira Matsuda*

Faculty of Pharmace[uti](#page-9-0)cal Sciences, Hokkaido University, Kita-12, Nishi[-6](#page-9-0), Kita-ku, Sapporo 060-0812, Japan

S Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: Indolocarbazole natural products are known to possess a variety of biological activities that hold promise as cancer chemotherapeutic agents. We newly designed C-glycosyl pyrrolo[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3(2H,6H)-dione derivatives 7 and 8, which are natural-product-like scaffolds. Compounds 7 and 8 were stereoselectively and efficiently synthesized using β-selective Callylation, Heck reaction, and thermal 6π-electron cyclization/oxidative aromatization. Their potential as Chk1 inhibitors was investigated, and 7 and 8 exhibited an inhibitory activity with IC₅₀ values of 0.5–9.5 μ M, which is good activity for scaffolds. The key intermediate 23 was obtained by five steps from D-ribose in 33% overall yield by this synthetic route, which would enable us to prepare a range of analogues in order to investigate further structure−activity relationship studies in the optimization process.

INTRODUCTION

Indolocarbazole natural products are known to possess a variety of biological activities that hold promise as cancer chemotherapeutic agents. For examples, staurosporine¹⁻³(Figure 1, 1), UCN-01^{4 $\frac{1}{2}$} (2) and K252a^{8−10} (3) are potent inhibitors of protein kinases including PKC,¹¹ and rebeccamy[cin](#page-9-0)^{[12](#page-9-0)−14} (4) is

Figure 1. Structures of indolocarbazole natural product.
Published: October 15, 2013

a topoisomerase inhibitor, and all of them exhibited antitumor activity. Among them, UCN-01 (Figure $1, 2$) is a potent inhibitor of check point kinase 1 (Chk1), which plays a crucial role in the G2/M checkpoint in cell cycle. The activation of cell cycle checkpoints provides an opportunity for cancer cells to repair DNA damage by reducing the antitumor effect of DNAdamaging agents.¹⁵ Premature mitotic entry of cells with unrepaired DNA leads to mitotic catastrophe and/or apoptosis. Therefore drugs t[ha](#page-9-0)t abrogate the DNA damage-induced G2/ M checkpoints should selectively sensitize p53-deficient cancer cells to anticancer therapies.^{15−18} UCN-01 has been shown to enhance the therapeutic activity of DNA-damaging agents in animal models¹⁹ and is curr[en](#page-9-0)t[ly](#page-9-0) in phase II clinical trials²⁰ in the United States. Several other derivatives of this class of natural produ[cts](#page-10-0) shown in Figure 1 have entered clinical [tri](#page-10-0)als as anticancer drugs. Therefore, this class of natural products is a good lead to pursue in the development of anticancer agents in many aspects. In an effort to develop new Chk1 inhibitors, we designed a pyrrolo $[3,4-c]$ carbazole-1,3 $(2H,6H)$ -dione scaffold 5 $(IC_{50} = 9.0 \mu M)$ through a structural simplification of UCN-01 (Figure 2).²¹ The further structure−activity relationship (SAR) of the scaffold has been investigated with guidance from structur[e-](#page-1-0)b[ase](#page-10-0)d drug design (SBDD), and the compound 6 $(IC_{50} = 31 \text{ nM})$ was found to have an inhibitory activity similar to that of UNC-01 (IC₅₀ = 5.6 nM). However, a shortcoming

Received: September 23, 2013

Figure 2. Design of Chk1 inhibitors.

of 5 and 6 was poor aqueous solubility, and precipitation occurred during the biological evaluation. The chemical structure of natural products shown in Figure 1 surrogates a sugar moiety, introduction of which to hydrophobic molecules improves an aqueous solubilty in many case. [T](#page-0-0)herefore, we newly designed C-glycosyl pyrrolo[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3(2H,6H) dione derivatives 7 and 8, which are more natural-product-like scaffolds. Different from natural products, the sugar moiety was attached to the pyrrolo[3,4-c]carbazole chromophore by a chemically and biologically stable C−C bond. Here we describe a stereoselective and efficient synthesis of C-glycosyl pyrrolo- $[3,4-c]$ carbazole-1,3(2H,6H)-dione derivatives as potential Chk1 inhibitors.

■ RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The synthetic strategy to the analogues is outlined in Scheme 1. Suitably protected bromoindolylmaleimide A was first coupled

to C-allyl-D-glycoside derivatives B by Heck reaction to give C. Either photochemical or thermal 6π -electron cyclization of C followed by oxidative aromatization would afford the pyrrolo- $[3,4-c]$ carbazole-1,3(2H,6H)-dione linking to the glycoside 7 or 8. As for the synthesis of 7, it is quite difficult to synthesize β -Cribosides by a Lewis acid-promoted direct alkylation of ribosyl donors^{23−25} since a neighboring group participation²⁶ is not usually effective in C-ribosylation reactions.^{27,28} We recently develo[pe](#page-10-0)d [t](#page-10-0)he highly β-selective O- and C-ribosyl[ati](#page-10-0)on via unusual outside attack of the nucleophile wi[th th](#page-10-0)e use of a 3pentylidene protecting group at the 2,3-hydroxyl groups.^{28–30} In these studies, only the ribosyl fluoride was examined to use as a glycosyl donor. In this study, the C-allylation with [1-](#page-10-0)[O](#page-10-0)acetates 10 and 11, which are more stable and more easily prepared than the corresponding fluorides, was first investigated. The 1-O-acetates 10 and 11 were prepared by acetylation of the known 5-azide-2,3-(3-pentylidene)-D-ribofuranose and $2,3-(3-pentylinder)$ -D-ribofuranose, respectively.²⁹ The results of C-allylation are summarized in Table 1. First, 10

Table 1. C-Allylation of 1-O-Acetyl-3-pentylidene Ribofuranose

	R	OAc 10: $R = N3$ 11: $R = OAC$	TMS (5 equiv.) promoter MS4A	R٠	12. $R = N_3$ 13: $R = OAC$	
entry	donor	promoter (equiv)	solvent	temp $({}^{\circ}C)$	yield $(\%)^a$	ratio $(\beta/\alpha)^b$
1	10	$BF_3 \cdot OEt_2$ (3.5)	CH ₂ CI ₂	Ω	20	20/1
$\overline{2}$	10	SnCI ₄ (0.5)	CH_2Cl_2	Ω	60	>25/1
3	11	BF_3 ·OEt ₂ (3.5)	CH_2Cl_2	Ω	g	1.5/1
4	11	SnCI ₄ (0.5)	CH_2Cl_2	Ω	70	5/1
5	11	TMSOTf (0.5)	MeCN	Ω	59	>25/1
6	11	TMSOTf (0.5)	EtCN	-50	75	>25/1

^aCombined isolated yields after column chromatography. ^bAnomeric ratio determined from ${}^{1}{\rm H}$ NMR integration values of selected protons.

was treated with allyltrimethysilane (5.0 equiv) and BF_3 ·OEt₂ (3.5 equiv) and molecular sieves 4 Å (MS4 Å) in CH_2Cl_2 at 0 °C. The reaction proceeded slowly compared to that with the ribosyl fluoride, and the desired 12 was obtained only in 20% yield with a large amount of unreacted 10 remaining in the reaction mixture (entry 1). ¹H NMR analysis of the product revealed a $β/α$ ratio of 20/1, and good $β$ -selectivity was achieved as expected. The use of $SnCI₄$, a stronger promoter than $BF_3 \cdot OEt_2$, improved the yield of 12 with increased stereoselectivity (60%, $\beta/\alpha > 25/1$). On the other hand, the Callylation of 11, which possesses the acetoxy substituent at the 5-position, resulted in reduced stereoselectivity (entries 3 and 4). A neighboring group participation of the acetoxy group to the oxocarbenium intermediate at the $β$ -face would decrease the stereoselectivity, as was indicated by our previous study.²⁹ The β -selectivity was improved with the conditions where TMSOTf was used as a promoter in MeCN to give the desir[ed](#page-10-0) $β$ -C-allyl riboside 13 as a major product (>25/1, entry 5). Lowering the reaction temperature (−50 °C) in EtCN suppressed the undesired hydrolysis of the 3-pentylidene group and gave 13 in 75% yield (entry 6).

With the β -selective ribosylation with acetate donors established, the synthesis of 7 was conducted (Scheme 2). Staudinger reduction of the azide group of 12 followed by Bocprotection of the liberated amine afforded 14 in 99% yield o[ve](#page-2-0)r two steps. Next, the Heck reaction linking 14 to bromo-5 methoxyindolylmaleimide 31 (15) was investigated (Table 2). The C-allylriboside 14 was treated with 15 under the conditions used in the [syn](#page-10-0)thesis of 5 in our previous st[ud](#page-2-0)y $(Pd(OAc)₂, Bu₃P, DMF, 80 °C, 2 h).²¹ However, the desired$

Scheme 2

Table 2. Optimization of Heck Reaction^a

^aReaction was carried out with 10 mol % catalyst, 40 mol % ligands, 1.1 equiv of Bu_3N in DMF at 80 °C for 2 h.

16 was not obtained at all (entry 1). Optimization of the reaction conditions was then pursued to find the conditions to give 16 by changing a ligand. The use of tri(2-furyl)phosphine gave a small amount of 16 (entry 2). Use of a bidentate phosphine ligand, bis(diphenylphosphino)propane, gave no improvement (entry 3).

When the catalyst was changed to $Pd_2(dba)_3$ in the presence of tri(2-furyl)phosphine, much improvement of the yield of 16 was achieved (68%, entry 4). The use of the bidentate phosphine ligand gave no product in this case, either (entry 5), and $(Ph_3P)_2PdCl_2$ was not effective at all (entries 6 and 7). Photochemical 6π-electron cyclization followed by oxidative aromatization using a medium-pressure mercury lamp (400 W) in THF under oxygen atmosphere gave a trace amount of the desired pyrrolo[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3(2H,6H)-dione 17 with extensive decomposition of 16. The yield of 17 was improved by thermal 6π -electron cyclization conditions. Namely, heating of 16 in 1,3-dichlorobenzene under reflux in the presence of Pd/C gave 17 in 68% yield. Thermal 6π-electron cyclization was much more scalable than that of the photochemical reaction. Deprotection of the 3-pentylidene, the methyl, and the Boc groups of 17 (BBr₃, CH₂Cl₂, –78 °C) followed by Boc protection of the liberated amine gave 18 in 48% yield over two

steps. Finally deprotection of the Boc group successfully afforded the target compound 7a as a hydrochloride salt. O-Methyl derivative 19 was obtained by treatment of 17 with aq TFA in 57% yield.

With the synthetic strategy established, other analogues were prepared as shown in Scheme 3. In this synthetic scheme, the

methyl group used as protection of the phenol was changed to a TBS group. A magnesium salt of the resulting 20 was then reacted with the dibromomaleimide to afford 21 in 78% yield. In a manner similar to the synthesis of 17, 23 was prepared by the Heck reaction of 13 with 21 $(Pd_2(dba)_3$, tri(2-furyl)phosphine, Bu₃N, DMF, 80 °C, 2 h, 83%) and thermal 6π electron cyclization followed by oxidative aromatization (Pd/C, 1,3-dichlorobenzene, 170 °C, 3 h, 73%). Removal of the acetyl group of 23 gave 24 (K_2CO_3 , MeOH, 95%), which was treated with aq TFA to give 7b in 53% yield. Deoxy analogue 26 was obtained by conversion of the hydroxyl group of 24 to the iodo group $(I_2, PPh_3, \text{imidazole}, \text{DMF}, 88\%)$, deprotection (aq TFA) and hydrogenolysis $(H₂, Pd/C, MeOH, 98%$ over two steps).

Glucopyranose-type analogues 8a and 8b were also prepared as shown in Scheme 4. Basically the synthetic strategy was the same as in Scheme 3 except for the use of known β -Callylglucoside $27³²$ f[ro](#page-3-0)m which the key intermediate 30 was obtained over three steps. Deprotection of the TBS group of 30 provided 8b. On [th](#page-10-0)e other hand, after the primary hydroxyl group of 30 was converted to the azide group to give 31 (TsCl, pyridine, then NaN_3 , DMF , 73% over two steps), the last target compound 8a was obtained by reduction of the azide group

Scheme 4

 (Ph_3P, H_2O, THF) , protection of the liberated amine $(Boc_2O,$ NaHCO₃) and deprotection of 31 (HCl, AcOEt, 99% over three steps).

The Chk1 inhibitory activity of the C-glycosyl pyrrolo[3,4 c]carbazole-1,3(2H,6H)-dione derivatives was then evaluated (Table 3). All the analogues have greater aqueous solubility

Table 3. Chk1 Inhibitory Activity of C-Glycosylpyrrolo[3,4 c]carbazole-1,3-(2H,6H)-diones

		compound								
	7a	7 _b	19	26	8a	8b				
IC ₅₀ $(\mu M)^a$	0.9	0.5	9.5	6.0	2.3					

 ${}^a{\rm IC}_{50}$: concentration of drug $(\mu {\rm M})$ to inhibit the phosphorylation of a Cdc25 substrate peptide by Chkl. Values are an average of three separate determinations; variation was generally +15%.

compared to 5 and 6, and no precipitation was observed at all in the assay. All analogues exhibited a moderate Chk1 inhibitory activity with IC_{50} values of 0.5−9.5 μ M. The ribofuranose-type analogues are better inhibitors than the glucopyranose-type analogues $(7a,b \text{ vs } 8a,b)$, and the analogues possessing the hydroxyl group at the methylene carbon show 2 fold better activity than those with the amino group (7b vs 7a and 8b vs 8a). Decreased inhibitory activity found in the deoxy analogue 26 (7b vs 26) indicates that these polar functional groups of the sugar moiety are contributory to the activity. The phenolic hydroxyl group at the pyrrolo[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3- (2H,6H)-dione is also important for the activity, and its methylation decreased the inhibitory activity by a factor of 10 (7a vs 19). In order to predict the mode of binding to Chk1,

analogues 7b and 8b were docked to the active site of the public domain crystal structure published for Chk1 (PDB accession code 1nvq^{33} using the Glide program,^{34–36} and the results were compared to that of 5 (Figure 3). This model suggested that 5, 7b, [an](#page-10-0)d 8b share a very similar [bindin](#page-10-0)g mode with matching occupancy of the binding [po](#page-4-0)cket and key hydrogen bonds to the hinge domain (Glu85 and the hydrogen atom at the NH of maleimide moiety, and Cys87 and the carbonyl oxygen of the maleimide). The sugar moieties of 7b and 8b are superimposable onto the benzyl group of 5 with additional contact between the primary hydroxyl group and the Glu91 residue. The prediction is in accordance with the decreased activity of deoxy analogue 26 compared to those of 7b and 8b. These docking models with Chk1 indicated that there is a space, where additional functional groups can be introduced around the introduced sugar moiety of 7b or 8b. This allows us to conduct structure-based drug design based on 7b or 8b to optimize the Chk1 inhibitory activity as in the discovery of 6, and further optimization would lead to development of a novel Chk1 inhibitor.

■ CONCLUSION

Here C-glycosyl pyrrolo[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3(2H,6H)-dione scaffolds 7 and 8 were stereoselectively and efficiently synthesized using β -selective C-allylation, followed by Heck reaction and thermal 6π-electron cyclization/oxidative aromatization. Their potential as Chk1 inhibitors was investigated to find that 7 and 8 exhibited an inhibitory activity with IC_{50} values of 0.5−9.5 μ M, which were good activity as scaffolds. The key intermediate 23 was obtained by five steps from Dribose in 33% overall yield. This synthetic strategy makes it easier to prepare a range of analogues in order to investigate further SAR study in optimization process.

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

General Experimental Methods. ${}^{1}H$ and ${}^{13}C$ NMR chemical shifts were reported in parts per million (δ) relative to tetramethylsilane (0.00 ppm) as internal standard otherwise noted. Coupling constant (J) was reported in herz (Hz). Abbreviations of multiplicity were as follows; s: singlet, d: doublet, t: triplet, q: quartet, m: multiplet, br: broad. Data were presented as follows; chemical shift (multiplicity, integration, coupling constant). Assignment was based on ¹H⁻¹H COSY, HMBC and HMQC NMR spectra. The mass analyzer type used for the HRMS measurements was TOF. Analytical thin layer chromatography (TLC) was performed on Merck silica gel 60F254 plates. Normal-phase column chromatography was performed on Merck silica gel 5715 or Kanto Chemical silica gel 60N (neutral). Flash column chromatography was performed on Merck silica gel 60.

1-O-Acetyl-5-azido-5-deoxy-2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-β-D-ribofuranose (10). A mixture of 5-azido-5-deoxy-2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-

 β -D-ribofuranose (832 mg, 3.4 mmol), Et₃N (0.52 mL, 3.7 mmol), DMAP (42 mg, 0.34 mmol), and Ac_2O (0.35 mL, 3.7 mmol) in MeCN (34 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 40 min. The reaction was quenched with MeOH, and the mixture was concentrated. The residue was partitioned between AcOEt (100 mL) and $H₂O$ (50 mL). The organic layer was washed with 0.2 M aqueous HCl (50 mL), saturated aqueous NaHCO_{3} (50 mL), and brine (50 mL); then it was dried over Na_2SO_4 , filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column

Figure 3. Predicted binding mode of C-glycoside Chk1 inhibitors.

chromatography (φ 7.5 cm \times 17 cm, CHCl₃) to give 10 (867 mg, 89%) as a colorless syrup. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 6.28 (s, 1H, H-1), 4.75 (d, 1H, H-2, J = 6.0 Hz), 4.67 (d, 1H, H-3, J = 5.9 Hz), 4.44 (dd, 1H, H-4, $J = 6.6$, 6.6 Hz), 3.46 (dd, 1H, H-5, $J = 7.6$, 13.3 Hz), 3.26 (dd, 1H, H-5, $J = 6.2$, 13.3 Hz), 1.72 (q, 2H, CH₂CH₃, $J = 7.8$ Hz), 1.59 (q, 2H, CH₂CH₃, J = 7.8 Hz), 0.93 (t, 3H, CH₂CH_{3,} J = 7.8 Hz), 0.88 (t, 3H, CH_2CH_3 , J = 7.8 Hz); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl3): δ 169.3, 117.8, 102.6, 86.9, 85.6, 82.1, 53.3, 29.6, 29.0, 21.3, 8.43, 7.48; FABMS-LR $m/z = 308$ (MNa⁺); FABMS-HR calcd for $C_{12}H_{19}N_3O_5N$ a 308.1222, found 308.1211 (MNa⁺).

1,5-O-Diacetyl-2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-β-D-ribofuranose (11). A mixture of 2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-β-D-ribofuranose (2.84 g, 13

mmol), Et₃N (4 mL, 28.6 mmol), DMAP (0.16 g, 1.3 mmol), Ac₂O (2.7 mL, 28.6 mmol) in MeCN (130 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 3.5 h. The reaction was quenched with MeOH, and the mixture was concentrated. The residue was partitioned between AcOEt (150 mL) and $H₂O$ (50 mL). The organic layer was washed with 0.2 M aqueous HCl (50 mL), saturated aqueous $NAHCO₃$ (50 mL), and brine (50 mL), dried over Na_2SO_4 , filtered, and concentrated to give 11 $(3.59$ g, $92%)$ as a yellow oil. ^{1}H NMR $(500 \text{ MHz}, \text{CDCI}_3)$ δ 6.23 (d, 1H, H-1, J = 1.7 Hz), 4.73 (m, 2H, H-2, H-3), 4.49 (dt, 1H, H-4, J = 1.7, 6.8 Hz), 4.15 (ddd, 1H, H-5a, J = 2.3, 6.9, 11.5 Hz), 4.10 (ddd, 1H, H-5b, J = 1.7, 6.9, 11.5 Hz), 2.10 (s, 3H, OAc), 2.06 (s, 3H, OAc), 1.72 (dq, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, J = 1.7, 7.4 Hz), 1.59 (dq, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, J = 1.7, 7.4 Hz), 0.92 (dt, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 1.7, 7.4 Hz), 0.88 (dt, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 1.7, 7.5 Hz); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 170.6, 169.5, 117.7, 102.3, 85.7, 85.6, 82.0, 64.3, 29.6, 29.1, 21.3, 21.0, 8.5, 7.5; FABMS-LR $m/z = 325$ (MNa⁺); FABMS-HR calcd for C₁₄H₂₂O₇Na 325.1267, found 325.1247 (MNa⁺).

3-[5-Azido-5-deoxy-2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-β-D-ribofuranosyl]-1-propene (12). A mixture of 10 $(4.2 \text{ g}, 14.7 \text{ mmol})$,

allyltrimethylsilane (11.7 mL, 73.5 mmol) and molecular sieve 4 A (17 g) in CH_2Cl_2 (170 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 20 min. Then, the mixture was cooled to 0 $^{\circ}$ C and SnCl₄ (0.86 mL, 7.4 mmol) was added. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min and quenched with Et₃N. The insolubles were filtered off through Celite pad, the filtrate was partitioned between AcOEt (150 mL) and H_2O (150 mL). The organic layer was washed with brine (150 mL), dried over Na2SO4, filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 7.5 cm \times 17 cm, hexane/AcOEt = 19/1−9/1) to give 12 (2.4 g, 60%) as a yellow syrup. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 5.84 (m, 1H, H-2), 5.17 (ddd, 1H, H-1a, J = 1.8, 3.5, 17.2 Hz), 5.13 (dd, 1H, H-1b, J = 1.8, 10.8 Hz), 4.53 (dd, 1H, H-3', J $= 4.6, 6.9$ Hz), 4.40 (dd, 1H, H-2', $J = 4.6, 6.9$ Hz), 4.05 (dd, 1H, H-4', $J = 4.6, 8.6$ Hz), 3.98 (dd, 1H, H-1', $J = 6.3$, 11.5 Hz), 3.56 (dd, 1H, H- $5′a, J = 3.5, 13.2 Hz$), 3.33 (dd, 1H, H-5[′]b, J = 4.6, 13.2 Hz), 2.42 (m, 2H, H-3), 1.74 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, J = 7.5 Hz,), 1.60 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 0.95 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 0.87 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 7.5 Hz); $[\alpha]_{\text{D}}^{25}$ +54.8 (c 0.87, CHCl₃); ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 133.5, 119.6, 118.0, 84.5, 83.9, 82.9, 82.3, 52.4, 37.9, 29.8, 29.4, 8.56, 8.01; FABMS-LR m/z = 268 (MH⁺); FABMS-HR calcd for $C_{13}H_{22}N_3O_3$ 268.1661, found 268.1653 (MH⁺).

3-[5-O-Acetyl-2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-β-D-ribofuranosyl]-1 propene (13). A mixture of 11 (61.2 mg, 0.2 mmol),

allyltrimethylsilane (160 μ L, 1.0 mmol) and molecular sieve 4 A (200 mg) in EtCN (2 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 20 min then cooled down to −50 °C. Trimethylsilyl trifluoromethanesulfonate (18 μ L, 0.1 mmol) was added to the solution, which was stirred for 2 h. The reaction was quenched with Et_3N , and molecular sieves were filtered to remove. The filtrate was partitioned between AcOEt (30 mL) and $H₂O$ (20 mL). The organic layer was washed with brine (20 mL), dried over $\mathrm{Na_{2}SO_{4}}$, filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 1.5 cm \times 10.5 cm, hexane/AcOEt = $10/1$) to give 13 (43 mg, 75%) as a syrup. ¹H NMR $(500 \text{ MHz}, \text{CDCl}_3)$ δ 5.80 (m, 1H, H-2), 5.12 (m, 2H, H-1), 4.47 (dd, 1H, H-3', $J = 4.0$, 6.9 Hz), 4.38 (dd, 1H, H-2', $J = 4.6$, 7.5 Hz), 4.26 (dt, 1H, H-5'a, $J = 6.3$, 13.8 Hz), 4.08 (m, 2H, H-4' and H-5'b), 4.08 $(m, 1H, H-1', J = 4.6, 6.3 Hz)$, 2.36 (dt, 2H, H-3, J = 1.8, 6.3 Hz), 2.07 (s, 3H, OAc), 1.72 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, J = 7.5 Hz), 1.58 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 0.94 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 0.85 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 7.5 Hz); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 170.9, 133.4, 119.3, 118.0, 84.3, 83.9, 82.2, 81.8, 64.6, 37.9, 29.8, 29.4, 21.0, 8.5, 8.0; FABMS-LR $m/z = 285$ (MH⁺); FABMS-HR calcd for $C_{15}H_{25}O_5$ 285.1697, found 285.1695 (MH⁺).

3-[5-tert-Butoxycarbonylamino-5-deoxy-2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)- β -D-ribofuranosyl]-1-propene (14). A mixture of 12 (2.2 g,

8.2 mmol), triphenylphosphine (6.45 g, 24.6 mmol) and $H₂O$ (7.1) mL, 400 mmol) in THF (82 mL) was stirred at 50 °C for 30 min. Then the solution was treated with NaHCO₃ (1.38 g, 16.4 mmol) and Boc₂O (3.8 mL, 16.4 mmol) at room temperature for 1 h. The reaction mixture was concentrated, and the residue was partitioned between AcOEt (200 mL) and H₂O (100 mL \times 2). The organic layer was washed with brine (100 mL), dried over $Na₂SO₄$, filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 3.5 cm × 14 cm, hexane/AcOEt = 10/1-5/1) to give 14 (2.78 g, 99%) as a yellow syrup. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 5.82 (m, 1H, H-2), 5.16 (dd, 1H, H-1a, J = 1.8, 17.2 Hz), 5.13 (dd, 1H, H-1b, $J = 1.1$, 10.3 Hz), 4.76 (s, 1H, NH), 4.44 (dd, 1H, H-3′, J = 4.6, 7.4 Hz), 4.35 (dd, 1H, H-2′, J = 4.5, 7.4 Hz), 3.94 (m, 2H, H-1′, H-4′), 3.45 (m, 1H, H-5′a), 3.28 (m, 1H, H-5′b), 2.37 (m, 2H, H-3), 1.73 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, J = 7.4 Hz), 1.58 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 1.45 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.95 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 0.86 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, $J = 7.5$ Hz); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 156.1, 133.6, 119.2, 118.0, 84.5, 83.6, 83.0, 82.7, 42.7, 37.9, 29.8, 29.4, 28.5, 8.5, 8.0; ESIMS-LR $m/z =$ 364 (MNa⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{18}H_{31}NO_5N$ a 364.2100, found 364.2091 (MNa⁺).

4-{1E-3-[5-tert-Butoxycarbonylamino-5-deoxy-2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-β-D-ribofuranosyl]-1-propenyl}-3,4-dihydro-3-(5-me-

thoxy-1H-indol-3-yl)-1H-pyrrole-2,5-dione (16). A mixture of 15 $(284 \text{ mg}, 0.88 \text{ mmol})$, 14 $(300 \text{ mg}, 0.88 \text{ mmol})$, $Pd_2(dba)$ ₃ $(91 \text{ mg},$ 0.088 mmol), Bu_3N (240 μL , 0.99 mmol) and tri(2-furyl)phosphine (80 mg, 0.35 mmol) in DMF (9 mL) was stirred at 80 °C for 2 h. The mixture was partitioned between AcOEt (100 mL) and H_2O (100 mL) \times 2). The organic layer was washed with brine (100 mL), dried over Na₂SO₄, filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 2.5 cm \times 11.5 cm, hexane/AcOEt = 2/ 1) to give 16 (350 mg, 68%) as a red foam. 1 H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.98 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 7.67 (s, 1H, H-2), 7.53 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.32 (d, 1H, H-7, J = 9.1 Hz), 7.11 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 7.00 (dt, 1H, H-2", $J = 7.2$, 15.8 Hz), 6.92 (dd, 1H, H-6, $J = 2.2$, 9.0 Hz), 6.59 (d, 1H, H-3", $J = 16.3$ Hz), 4.87 (s, 1H, Boc-NH), 4.42 (d, 1H, H-3', $J = 3.6$ Hz), 4.33 (dd, 1H, H-2', $J = 5.0$, 6.8 Hz), 3.97 (m, 1H, H-1′), 3.92 (m, 1H, H-4′), 3.82 (s, 3H, OMe), 3.41 (dd, 1H, H-5′a, J = 4.6, 13.6 Hz), 3.29 (dd, 1H, H-5′b, J = 5.4, 13.1 Hz), 2.65 (m, 1H, H-1"a), 2.48 (dd, 1H, H-1"b, J = 6.8, 14.1 Hz), 1.70 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, J = 7.7 Hz), 1.56 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, J = 7.7 Hz), 1.24 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.92 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 7.3 Hz), 0.84 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 7.7 Hz); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 171.2, 156.3, 155.2, 137.1, 131.4, 129.4, 126.2, 123.0, 119.6, 113.6, 112.6, 105.9, 103.3, 84.3, 83.2, 83.1, 82.8, 79.8, 75.2, 55.9, 42.8, 37.9, 29.9, 29.7, 29.4, 28.5, 25.0, 8.6, 8.1; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 604$ (MNa⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{31}H_{39}N_3O_8N$ a 604.2635, found 604.2637 (MNa⁺).

5-{[5-tert-Butoxycarbonylamino-5-deoxy-2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-β-D-ribofuranosyl]methyl}-9-methoxypyrrolo-[3,4-c] carbazole-1,3-dione(17). A mixture of 16 (10 mg, 0.017 mmol) and 10%Pd/C (1.2 mg) in 1,3-dichlorobenzene (5 mL) was heated under reflux for 5.5 h. The insolubles were filtered off through Celite pad, and the filtrate was concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel

column chromatography (φ 0.7 cm \times 8 cm, hexane/AcOEt = 2/1) to give 17 (4.7 mg, 48%) as a red foam. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 10.22 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 8.50 (s, 1H, H-10), 7.72 (d, 1H, H-7, $J = 8.6$ Hz), 7.67 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.40 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 7.20 (dd, 1H, H-8, J = 2.3, 9.1 Hz), 4.80 (s, 1H, Boc-NH), 4.43 (m, 2H, H-2′, H-3′), 4.10 (m, 1H, H-1′), 3.99 (s, 4H, OMe, H-4′), 3.68 (m, 1H, H-5′a), 3.42 (d, 1H, H-1″a, J = 14.3 Hz), 3.21 (m, 1H, H-5′b), 3.16 (d, 1H, H- $1''$ b, J = 14.3 Hz), 1.74 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, J = 7.5 Hz), 1.61 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, J = 7.4 Hz), 1.47 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.93 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 0.73 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, $J = 7.4$ Hz); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 170.6, 169.9, 156.8, 154.5, 144.4, 136.8, 126.4, 125.6, 123.8, 121.5, 120.8, 120.1, 118.4, 112.7, 106.8, 84.9, 84.3, 83.7, 81.9, 80.2, 55.9, 55.8, 42.3, 37.2, 29.7, 29.3, 28.5, 8.5, 8.0; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 602$ (MNa⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{31}H_{37}N_3O_8N$ a 602.2473, found 602.2490 (MNa⁺).

 $5 -$ {[5-tert-Butoxycarbonylamino-5-deoxy- β -p-ribofuranosyl]methyl}-9-hydroxypyrrolo-[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3-dione (18). A

solution of 17 (92 mg, 0.16 mmol) in CH_2Cl_2 (1.6 mL) was treated with BBr_3 (1.0 M solution in CH₂Cl₂, 0.64 mL, 0.64 mmol) at 0 °C for 2 h. The reaction mixture was concentrated, and the residue was dissolved in dioxane (2.1 mL). The solution was treated with NaHCO₃ (36 mg, 0.43 mmol) and Boc₂O (0.096 mL, 0.42 mmol) at room temperature for 3 h. The reaction mixture was partitioned between AcOEt and $H₂O$. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over Na_2SO_4 , filtered, and concentrated to give 18 (38 mg, 0.076) mmol, 48%) as a red solid. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 11.42 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 10.97 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 9.22 (s, 1H, phenol-OH), 8.22 (d, 1H, H-10, J = 2.3 Hz), 7.62 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.46 (d, 1H, H-7, $J = 8.6$ Hz), 7.04 (dd, 1H, H-8, $J = 2.3$, 8.6 Hz), 6.88 (t, 1H, Boc-NH, J = 6.3 Hz), 4.85 (m, 2H, 2′-OH, 3′-OH), 3.97 (m, 1H, H-1′), 3.73 (m, 1H, H-3′), 3.64 (m, 2H, H-2′, H-4′), 3.29 (dd, 1H, H- $1''a$, $J = 4.0$, 14.3 Hz), 3.10 (dd, 1H, H-1″b, $J = 8.0$, 14.3 Hz), 3.01 (m, 1H, H-5′a), 2.91 (m, 1H, H-5′b), 1.37 (s, 9H, t-butyl); 13C NMR (125 MHz, DMSO-d₆) δ 170.6, 169.9, 156.8, 154.5, 144.4, 136.8, 126.4, 125.6, 123.8, 121.5, 120.8, 120.1, 118.4, 112.7, 106.8, 84.9, 84.3, 83.7, 81.94, 80.2, 55.9, 55.8, 42.3, 37.2, 29.7, 29.3, 28.5, 8.5, 8.0; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 520$ (MNa⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{25}H_{27}N_3O_8N$ a 520.16900, found 520.1686 (MNa⁺).

5-[(5-Amino-5-deoxy-β-D-ribofuranosyl)methyl]-9-hydroxypyrrolo-[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3-dione Hydrochloride Salt (7a). Compound 18 (25 mg, 0.050 mmol) was treated with 4 M HCl/ AcOEt (1 mL) at room temperature for 45 min. The reaction was concentrated, and the resulting residue was triturated from diethylether to give 7a (16 mg, 0.040 mmol, 80%) as an yellow solid. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 11.80 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 10.99 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 9.24 (s, 1H, phenol-OH), 8.22 (d, 1H, H-10, $J = 2.3$ Hz), 7.99 (s, 2H, NH₂), 7.67 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.46 (d, 1H, H-7, $J = 8.6$ Hz), 7.05 (dd, 1H, H-8, $J = 2.3$, 8.6 Hz), 5.09 (s, 2H, 2'-OH, 3′-OH), 4.17 (m, 1H, H-1′), 3.80 (m, 3H, H-2′, H-3′, H-4′), 3.28

(m, 2H, H-1″), 3.01 (m, 1H, H-5′a), 2.81 (m, 1H, H-5′b); 13C NMR (125 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 170.6, 170.6, 151.4, 143.7, 135.6, 127.0, 124.9, 123.4, 121.0, 119.4, 118.0, 117.8, 112.3, 108.9, 83.2, 79.1, 74.0, 71.9, 41.4, 35.1; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 398$ (M⁺-HCl); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{20}H_{20}N_3O_6$ 398.1347, found 398.1352 (M⁺-HCl).

5-[(5-Amino-5-deoxy-β-D-ribofuranosyl)methyl]-9-methoxypyrrolo-[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3-dione Trifluoroacetic Acid Salt

(19). Compound 17 (450 mg, 0.78 mmol) was treated with 80% aqueous TFA (10 mL) at room temperature for 3 h. The reaction was concentrated and the residue was triturated with diethylether to give **18** as an yellow solid (199 mg, 57%). ¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 11.90 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 11.05 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 8.37 (d, 1H, H-10, $J = 2.3$ Hz), 7.91 (s, 2H, NH₂), 7.71 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.56 (d, 1H, H-7, $J = 8.6$ Hz), 7.21 (dd, 1H, H-8, $J = 2.3$, 8.6 Hz), 5.13 (s, 1H, OH), 5.02 (d, 1H, OH, J = 4.5 Hz), 4.18 (m, 1H, H-1′), 3.86 (s, 3H, OMe), 3.80 (m, 3H, H-2', H-3', H-4'), 3.25 (m, 2H, H-1"), 3.01 (dd, 1H, H-5'a, J = 2.8, 12.7 Hz), 2.81 (dd, 1H, H-5'b, J = 7.7, 13.2 Hz); $13C$ NMR (125 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 170.6, 153.7, 143.6, 136.4, 127.3, 125.0, 123.8, 120.8, 119.7, 118.1, 117.5, 112.7, 106.6, 83.1, 79.2, 74.0, 72.0, 55.5, 41.6, 35.1; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 412$ (MH⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{21}H_{22}N_3O_6$ 412.1503, found 412.1512 (MH⁺).

4-Bromo-2,5-dihydro-3-(5-tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy-1H- indol-3-yl)-1H-pyrrole-2,5-dione (21). A solution of ²⁰ (495 mg,

2.0 mmol) in THF (25 mL) was treated with EtMgBr (1.0 M solution in THF, 2.0 mL, 2.0 mmol) at 0 °C for 1 h. The solution was added dropwise to a solution of dibromomaleimide (127 mg, 0.5 mmol) in THF (5 mL) at 0 °C, which was stirred for 22 h. The reaction was quenched with saturated aqueous $NH₄Cl$, and the whole mixture was concentrated in vacuo. The residue was partitioned between AcOEt (50 mL) and $H₂O$ (30 mL) . The organic layer was washed with brine (30 mL), dried over Na_2SO_4 , filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 1.5 cm \times 17.5 cm, hexane/AcOEt = $6/1-3/1$) to give 21 (164 mg, 78%) as a red solid. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 11.97 (br s, 1H, indole-NH), 11.29 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 8.00 (d, 1H, H-2, J = 2.3 Hz), 7.37 (d, 1H, H-4, J = 2.3 Hz), 7.35 (d, 1H, H-7, J = 8.6 Hz), 6.75 (dd, 1H, H-6, $J = 2.3$, 8.6 Hz), 0.96 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.18 (s, 6H, methyl \times 2); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, DMSO-d₆) δ 170.3, 167.5, 149.3, 138.1, 132.0, 125.4, 116.5, 113.6, 112.8, 111.8, 103.5, 25.7, 18.0; ESIMS-LR $m/z =$ 419 (MH⁻); ESIMS-HR calcd for C₁₈H₂₀ Br N₂O₃Si 419.0432, found 419.0440 (MH[−]).

4-{1E-3-[5-O-Acetyl-2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-β-D-ribofuranosyl]-1-propenyl}-3-(5-tert-butyldimethylsilyloxy-1H-indol-3 y [)-2,5-dihydro-1H -pyrrole-2,5-dione (22). A mixture of 21 (1.7) g, 4.0 mmol), 13 (2.3 g, 8.1 mmol), $Pd_2(dba)_3$ (414 mg, 0.4 mmol), Bu3N (2.1 mL, 8.8 mmol) and tri(2-furyl)phosphine (371 mg, 1.6 mmol) in DMF (40 mL) was stirred at 80 °C for 3.5 h. The reaction mixture was concentrated, and the residue was partitioned between AcOEt (300 mL) and H_2O (200 mL). The organic layer was washed with brine (200 mL), dried over $Na₂SO₄$, filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 3.5 cm \times 18 cm, hexane/AcOEt = 3/1-2/1) to give 22 (2.03 g, 83%) as a red foam. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 9.15 (br s, 1H, indole-NH), 7.56 (d, 1H, H-2, $J = 2.3$ Hz), 7.23 (d, 1H, H-7, $J = 8.6$ Hz), 7.07 (d, 1H, H-4, $J = 1.8$ Hz), 7.03 (m, 1H, H-2"), 6.79 (dd, 1H, H-6, $J = 2.3$, 8.6 Hz), 6.55 (d, 1H, H-3", $J = 16.0$ Hz), 4.48 (dd, 1H, H-3', $J = 4.0$, 6.9 Hz), 4.39 (dd, 1H, H-2', $J = 4.0$, 6.9 Hz), 4.27 (dd, 1H, H-5'a, $J =$ 5.8, 13.8 Hz), 4.10 (m, 3H, H-1′, H-4′, H-5′b), 2.60 (m, 1H, H-1″a), 2.49 (m, 1H, H-1″b), 2.05 (s, 3H, OAc), 1.71 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 1.57 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 0.98 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.93 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 7.5 Hz), 0.84 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 7.5 Hz), 0.18 (s, 6H, methyl \times 2); ¹³C NMR $(125 \text{ MHz}, \text{CDCl}_3)$ δ 171.6, 171.5, 171.1, 150.5, 136.7, 131.9, 131.8, 129.6, 128.4, 126.4, 123.2, 119.5, 117.4, 112.3, 110.9, 105.4, 84.3, 83.6, 82.1, 81.9, 64.5, 38.4, 29.7, 29.4, 25.9, 21.0, 18.3, 8.5, 8.0, −4.2; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 647$ (MNa⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{33}H_{44}N_2O_8N_4Si$ 647.2759, found 647.2766 (MNa⁺).

5-{[5-O-Acetyl-2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-β-D-ribofuranosyl] methyl}-9-tert-butyldimethylsilyloxypyrrolo-[3,4-c]carbazole-

1,3-dione (23). A mixture of 22 (2.0 g, 3.3 mmol) and 10%Pd/C (150 mg) in 1,3-dichlorobenzene (100 mL) was heated under reflux for 10 h. The insolubles were filtered off through Celite pad, and the filtrate was concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 3.5 cm \times 18 cm, hexane/AcOEt = 3/1) to give 23 $(1.47 \text{ g}, 73\%)$ as a red foam. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 9.56 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 8.48 (d, 1H, H-10, J = 2.3 Hz), 7.84 (br s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 7.67 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.50 (d, 1H, H-7, J = 8.6 Hz), 7.12 $(dd, 1H, H-8, J = 2.3, 8.6 Hz$, 4.51 $(dd, 1H, H-2', J = 2.3, 12.0 Hz$, 4.47 (dd, 1H, H-4', $J = 4.6, 7.5$ Hz), 4.43 (dd, 1H, H-3', $J = 5.8, 7.5$ Hz), 4.21 (m, 2H, H-1′ and H-5′a), 4.11 (m, 1H, H-5′b), 3.48 (dd, 1H, H-1″a, J = 2.3, 14.9 Hz,), 3.22 (dd, 1H, H-1″b, J = 8.0, 14.9 Hz), 1.93 (s, 3H, OAc), 1.75 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 1.60 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH2, J = 7.5 Hz), 1.04 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.95 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 7.5 Hz), 0.87 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 7.5 Hz), 0.30 (s, 6H, methyl \times 2); ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 171.2, 170.1, 169.6, 150.2, 144.9, 136.8, 126.0, 125.9, 124.1, 122.4, 121.9, 121.4, 120.4, 120.2, 114.9, 112.2, 85.1, 83.5, 82.6, 81.1, 63.5, 36.9, 29.7, 29.3, 16.0, 20.8, 18.5, 8.5, 8.0, -4.3; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 645$ (MNa⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{33}H_{42}N_2O_8N_4S_1$ 645.2603, found 645.2594 (MNa⁺).

9-tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-5-{[2,3-O-(3-pentylidene)-β-D- ribofuranosyl]methyl}-pyrrolo-[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3-dione (24). A mixture of 23 (26.3 mg, 0.042 mmol) and K_2CO_3 (7 mg, 0.051 mmol) in MeOH (1 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 1 h. The reaction mixture was neutralized with AcOH and partitioned between AcOEt (20 mL) and $H₂O$ (20 mL). The organic layer was washed with brine (20 mL), dried over $\mathrm{Na_2SO_4}$, filtered, and concentrated to give 24 (23.2 mg, 95%) as a red form. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO d_6) δ 11.85 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 10.20 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 8.35 (d, 1H, H-10, $J = 2.3$ Hz), 7.70 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.48 (d, 1H, H-7, $J = 8.6$ Hz), 7.09 (dd, 1H, H-8, J = 2.3, 8.6 Hz), 5.08 (t, 1H, OH), 4.68 (dd, 1H, H-3′, J = 3.5, 6.9 Hz), 4.59 (dd, 1H, H-2′, J = 4.1, 6.9 Hz), 4.27 (ddd, 1H, H-1', $J = 4.0, 6.3, 8.1$ Hz), 3.91 (dt, 1H, H-4', $J = 4.6, 8.0$ Hz), 3.53 (t, 2H, H-5′, J = 5.2 Hz), 3.28 (m, 2H, H-1″), 1.58 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 1.50 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 0.98 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.78 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 7.5 Hz), 0.75 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, J = 7.5 Hz), 0.24 (s, 6H, methyl $\times 2$); 13 C NMR (100 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 170.5, 170.5, 148.8, 143.6, 136.7, 126.6, 125.1, 123.7, 121.5, 121.0, 120.0, 118.0, 117.0, 113.8, 112.3, 85.1, 84.6, 83.4, 82.2, 61.9, 35.6, 29.0, 28.7, 25.7, 18.0, 8.4, 7.6, −4.4; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 579$ (MH⁻); ESIMS-HR calcd for C₃₁H₃₉N₂O₇Si 579.2532, found 579.2536 (MH[−]).

9-Hydroxy-5-[(β-D-ribofuranosyl)methyl]-pyrrolo-[3,4-c] carbazole-1,3-dione (7b). Compound 24 (10 mg, 0.017 mmol) was

treated with 80% aqueous TFA (1 mL) at room temperature for 1 h. The reaction was concentrated, and the residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 0.7 cm \times 15 cm, chloroform/MeOH = 9/1−0/1)) to give 7b (3.6 mg, 53%) as a red solid. ¹ H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 11.59 (s, 1H), 10.59 (s, 1H), 9.22 (s, 1H), 8.22 (d, 1H, H-10, J = 2.3 Hz), 7.64 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.42 (d, 1H, H-7, J = 8.6 Hz), 7.04 (dd, 1H, H-8, $J = 2.3$, 8.6 Hz), 4.90 (t, 1H, 5'-OH, $J = 5.2$ Hz), 4.84 (d, 1H, 2'-OH, $J = 5.7$ Hz, exchanged with D_2O), 4.81 (d, 1H, 3'-OH, $J = 5.8$ Hz, exchanged with D_2O), 4.05 (m, 1H, H-1'), 3.88 (dt, 1H, H-3', $J = 5.2$, 5.7 Hz), 3.74 (dt, 1H, H-2', $J = 5.2$, 5.8 Hz), 3.67 (dt, 1H, H-4′, J = 4.0, 4.6 Hz), 3.42 (m, 2H, H-5′), 3.26 (dd, 1H, H-1″a, J = 4.1, 14.4 Hz), 3.12 (dd, 1H, H-1″b, J = 8.6, 14.9 Hz); 13 C NMR (125 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 170.6, 170.6, 151.3, 143.9, 135.5, 127.4, 124.8, 123.4, 121.1, 119.4, 117.9, 117.8, 112.2, 108.9, 84.2, 82.0, 74.6, 70.9, 61.6, 35.5; ESIMS-LR m/z = 397 (MH[−]); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{20}H_{17}O_7N_2$ 397.1041, found 397.1042 (MH⁻)

9-tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-5-{[5-deoxy-5-iodo-2,3-O-(3 pentylidene)-β-D-ribofuranosyl]methyl}-pyrrolo-[3,4-c] carbazole-1,3-dione (25). A mixture of 24 (375 mg, 0.65 mmol), PPh₃ (530 mg, 2.0 mmol), imidazole (157 mg, 2.3 mmol) and iodine (508 mg, 2.0 mmol) in DMF (10 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 40 min. The mixture was partitioned between AcOEt (150 mL) and saturated aqueous $\text{Na}_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_3$ (100 mL). The organic layer was washed with brine (100 mL), dried over $Na₂SO₄$, filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel

column chromatography (φ 2.5 cm \times 13 cm, hexane/AcOEt = 4/1) to give 25 (393 mg, 88%) as a red foam. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 9.51 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 8.48 (d, 1H, H-10, $J = 2.3$ Hz), 7.77 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 7.69 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.48 (d, 1H, H-7, J = 8.6 Hz), 7.11 (dd, 1H, H-8, $J = 2.3$, 8.6 Hz), 4.57 (dd, 1H, H-2', $J = 5.8$, 7.5 Hz), 4.39 (dd, 1H, H-3', $J = 4.6$, 7.5 Hz), 4.27 (ddd, 1H, H-1', $J = 2.3$, 5.8, 8.6 Hz), 3.80 (dd, 1H, H-4′ J = 4.6, 8.6 Hz), 3.48 (m, 2H, H-1″a, H-5'a), 3.32 (m, 2H, H-1"b, H-5'b), 1.75(q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, J = 7.5 Hz), 1.63 (q, 2H, pentylidene-CH₂, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 1.04 (s, 9H, tbutyl), 0.94 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH₃, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 0.90 (t, 3H, pentylidene-CH3, J = 7.5 Hz), 0.31 (s, 3H, methyl), 0.31 (s, 3H, methyl); ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 169.7, 169.2, 150.4, 145.1, 136.7, 126.3, 126.0, 124.3, 122.5, 122.1, 121.2, 120.7, 120.4, 115.0, 112.1, 85.5, 84.8, 84.7, 82.5, 37.1, 29.8, 29.3, 26.0, 18.5, 8.6, 8.0, −4.2, -4.2 ; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 713$ (MNa⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{31}H_{39}IN_2O_6N_4Si$ 713.1514, found 713.1528 (MNa⁺).

5-[(5-Deoxy-β-D-ribofuranosyl)methyl]-9-hydroxypyrrolo- [3,4-c]carbazole-1,3-dione (26). A solution of 25 (69 mg, 0.1

mmol) in 80% aqueous TFA (1 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 15 min. The reaction mixture was concentrated to give a triol as a red solid. A mixture of the triol and 10%Pd/C (2 mg) in EtOH (1 mL) was vigorously stirred under H_2 atmosphere at room temperature for 5 days. The insolubles were filtered off through Celite pad, and the filtrate was concentrated. The residue was purified by preparative TLC (chloroform/MeOH = $4/1$) to give 26 (12 mg, 98%) as a yellow solid. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CD₃OD) δ 8.32 (d, 1H, H-10, J = 2.3 Hz), 7.67 $(s, 1H, H-4), 7.40$ (d, $1H, H-7, I = 9.2$ Hz), 7.07 (dd, $1H, H-8, I = 2.3$, 9.2 Hz), 4.18 (m, 1H, H-1′), 3.88 (t, 1H, H-2′, J = 5.5 Hz), 3.80 (dd, 1H, H-4', $J = 6.0$, 6.4 Hz), 3.49 (t, 1H, H-3', $J = 6.0$ Hz), 3.38 (dd, 1H, H-1"a, $J = 4.6$, 15.1 Hz), 3.21 (dd, 1H, H-1"b, $J = 7.8$, 15.1 Hz), 1.16 (d, 3H, Me, $j = 6.4$ Hz); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, CD₃OD) δ 172.9, 171.9, 152.5, 145.7, 137.5, 127.8, 126.6, 125.0, 123.0, 121.1, 118.8, 112.8, 110.7, 84.0, 80.4, 77.4, 75.6, 36.7, 30.8, 19.2; ESIMS-LR $m/z =$ 381 (MH⁻); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{20}H_{17}O_6N_2$ 381.1092, found 381.1094 (MH[−]).

3-(5-tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-1H-indol-3-yl)-2,5-dihydro-4-{1E-3-(2,3,4,6-O-tetraacetyl-β-D-glucopyranosyl)-1-propen-

yl}-1H -pyrrole-2,5-dione (28). A mixture of 21 (15 mg, 0.037 mmol), 27^{32} (27 mg, 0.073 mmol), Pd₂(dba)₃ (4 mg, 0.0037 mmol), Bu₃N (20 μ L, 0.08 mmol) and tri(2-furyl)phosphine (3.5 mg, 0.015 mmol) in [DM](#page-10-0)F (1 mL) was stirred at 80 °C for 3 h. The residue was partitioned between AcOEt (30 mL) and H_2O (20 mL \times 3). The organic layer was washed with brine (20 mL), dried over $Na₂SO₄$, filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 0.7 cm \times 9 cm, hexane/AcOEt = 2/1) to give 28 (16 mg, 60%) as a red foam. $^1\text{H NMR}$ (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 9.33 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 7.63 (d, 1H, H-2, J = 2.3 Hz), 7.26 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 7.22 (d, 1H, H-7, J = 8.6 Hz), 6.99 (d, 1H, H-4, J = 2.3 Hz), 6.86 (dt, 1H, H-2", $J = 6.9$, 16.0 Hz), 6.77 (dd, 1H, H-6, $J =$ 2.3, 9.2 Hz), 6.54 (d, 1H, H-3", J = 16.0 Hz), 5.17 (t, 1H, H-3', J = 9.8 Hz), 5.04 (t, 1H, H-4′, J = 9.7 Hz), 4.89 (t, 1H, H-2′, J = 9.8 Hz), 4.15 (dd, 1H, H-6'a, $J = 4.6$, 12.6 Hz), 3.81 (dd, 1H, H-6'b, $J = 1.7$, 12.6 Hz), 3.58 (m, 2H, H-5′ and H-1′), 2.40 (m, 2H, H-1″), 2.01 (s, 3H, OAc), 2.00 (s, 3H, OAc), 1.99 (s, 3H, OAc), 1.98 (s, 3H, OAc), 0.99 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.17 (s, 3H, methyl), 0.17 (s, 3H, methyl); 13C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 171.9, 171.8, 171.1, 170.5, 169.8, 169.7, 150.2, 136.7, 131.9, 131.5, 130.0, 127.9, 126.0, 122.5, 117.1, 112.4, 111.4, 105.2, 75.3, 74.4, 72.0, 68.5, 62.1, 36.5, 25.8, 20.8, 20.7, 20.7, 18.2, 14.2, 14.0, -4.3 ; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 735$ (MNa⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{35}H_{44}N_2O_{12}NaSi$ 735.2556, found 735.2570 (MNa⁺).

9-tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-5-{(2,3,4,6-O-tetraacetyl-β-D- glucopyranosyl)methyl}-pyrrolo-[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3-dione

(29). A mixture of 28 (16 mg, 0.022 mmol) and 10%Pd/C (3 mg) in 1,3-dichlorobenzene (2 mL) was heated under reflux for 1.5 h. The insolubles were filtered off through Celite pad, and the filtrate was concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 0.7 cm \times 10 cm, hexane/AcOEt = 3/1) to give **29** $(7 \text{ mg}, 45\%)$ as a red foam. ^{1}H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 9.48 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 8.49 (d, 1H, H-10, J = 2.3 Hz), 7.64 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.53 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 7.50 (d, 1H, H-7, J = 8.6 Hz), 7.12 (dd, 1H, H-8, $J = 2.3$, 8.6 Hz), 5.20 (t, 1H, H-3', $J = 9.7$ Hz), 5.08 (t, 1H, H-4′, J = 9.7 Hz), 4.95 (t, 1H, H-2′, J = 9.7 Hz), 4.36 (dd, 1H, H-6′a, J $= 1.8, 12.6$ Hz), 4.09 (dd, 1H, H-6′b, J = 5.2, 12.6 Hz), 3.81 (m, 1H, H-1′), 3.63 (ddd, 1H, H-5′, J = 1.8, 5.2, 10.3 Hz), 3.21 (dd, 1H, H-1″a, $J = 8.6$, 14.9 Hz), 3.14 (dd, 1H, H-1"b $J = 1.2$, 14.9 Hz), 2.18 (s, 3H, OAc), 2.03 (s, 3H, OAc), 2.00 (s, 3H, OAc), 1.90 (s, 3H, OAc), 1.04 $(s, 9H, t$ -butyl), 0.30 $(s, 3H, \text{methyl})$, 0.30 $(s, 3H, \text{methyl})$; ¹³C NMR $(125 \text{ MHz}, \text{CDCl}_3)$ δ 171.0, 170.4, 170.2, 169.8, 169.6, 169.4, 150.1, 144.7, 136.6, 125.9, 125.1, 124.0, 122.3, 121.7, 120.8, 119.9, 79/08. 76.1, 74.0, 71.2, 68.1, 61.9, 35.1, 20.7, 20.5, 20.5, 20.4, 18.3, −4.4, -4.4 ; ESIMS-LR $m/z = (MNa^+)$; ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{35}H_{42}N_2O_{12}N_4Si$ 733.2399, found 733.2407 (MNa⁺).

9-tert-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-5-{(β-D-glucopyranosyl) methyl}-pyrrolo-[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3-dione (30). A mixture of 29

 $(7 \text{ mg}, 0.0098 \text{ mmol})$ and K_2CO_3 (1 mg, 0.003 mmol) in MeOH (1 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 1 h. The reaction mixture was neutralized with AcOH and partitioned between AcOEt (30 mL) and $H₂O$ (20 mL). The organic layer was washed with brine (20 mL), dried over Na_2SO_4 , filtered, and concentrated to give 30 (5.3 mg, quant.) as a red form. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO- \dot{d}_6) δ 11.36 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 10.98 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 8.36 (d, 1H, H-10, J = 2.3 Hz), 7.62 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.51 (d, 1H, H-7, J = 8.6 Hz), 7.08 (dd, 1H, H-8, $J = 2.9$, 8.6 Hz), 5.22 (d, 1H, OH, $J = 5.8$ Hz), 4.98 (d, 1H, OH, $J =$ 4.0 Hz), 4.94 (d, 1H, OH, $J = 5.8$ Hz), 4.68 (t, 1H, OH, $J = 5.8$ Hz), 3.64 (ddd, 1H, H-6′a, J = 1.8, 5.2, 11.5 Hz), 3.52 (m, 1H, H-1′), 3.48 $(m, 1H, H-1"a)$, 3.39 $(m, 1H, H-6'b)$, 3.19 $(dt, 1H, H-4', J = 3.4, 8.6)$ Hz), 3.13 (m, 2H, H-1″b and H-5′), 3.01 (m, 2H, H-2′ and H-3′), 0.99 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.24 (s, 6H, dimethyl); 13C NMR (125 MHz, CDCl3) δ 170.7, 170.6, 148.9, 144.3, 136.8, 127.9, 125.1, 123.8, 121.5, 121.1, 120.2, 118.2, 113.8, 112.8, 80.6, 79.3, 78.1, 73.1, 70.5, 61.6, 34.5, 25.8, 18.1, -4.4; ESIMS-LR $m/z = (MH^-)$; ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{27}H_{33}N_2O_8Si$ 541.2012, found 541.2023 (MH⁻).

5-{(β-D-Glucopyranosyl)methyl}-9-hydroxypyrrolo-[3,4-c] carbazole-1,3-dione (8b). A solution of 30 (5.3 mg, 0.0098 mmol)

in 80% aqueous TFA (1 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 15 min. The reaction mixture was concentrated. The residue was purified by preparative TLC (chloroform/MeOH = $4/1$) to give 8b (3.6 mg, 86%) as a yellow solid. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 11.27 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 10.95 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 9.23 (s, 1H, phenol-OH), 8.22 (d, 1H, H-10, J = 2.3 Hz), 7.59 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.45 (d, 1H, H-7, $J = 8.6$ Hz), 7.02 (dd, 1H, H-8, $J = 2.3$, 8.6 Hz), 5.29 (s, 1H, OH), 5.04 (s, 1H, OH), 4.97 (s, 1H, OH), 4.66 (s, 1H, OH), 3.63 (d, 1H, H-6'a, J = 11.5 Hz), 3.52 (m, 1H, H-1'), 3.48 (d, 1H, H-1"a, J = 17.2 Hz), 3.39 (m, 1H, H-6′b), 3.19 (t, 1H, H-4′, $J = 9.2$ Hz), 3.12 (m, 2H, H-1″b and H-5′), 3.01 (m, 2H, H-2′ and H-3′); 13C NMR (125 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 170.6, 151.4, 144.1, 135.5, 127.6, 124.9, 123.4, 121.1, 119.7, 118.1, 117.7, 112.6, 108.8, 80.5, 79.1, 78.0, 73.1, 70.3, 61.4, 34.3; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 451$ (MNa⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{32}H_{40}N_2O_8N$ aSi 451.1117, found 451.1111 (MNa⁺).

5-{(6-Azido-6-deoxy-β-D-glucopyranosyl)methyl}-9-tert-butyldimethylsilyloxypyrrolo-[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3-dione (31). A

mixture of 30 (355 mg, 0.65 mmol) in pyridine (5 mL) was treated with TsCl (148 mg, 0.77 mmol) at 0 $^{\circ}$ C, and the resulting mixture was stirred at room temperature for 12 h. Water was added to the mixture, which was stirred for additional 2 h and partitioned between AcOEt (50 mL) and H₂O (30 mL \times 3). The organic layer was washed with brine (30 mL), dried over Na_2SO_4 , filtered, and concentrated to give a tosylate. A mixture of the tosylate and sodium azide (65 mg, 1.0 mmol) in DMF (5 mL) was stirred at 50 $^{\circ}$ C for 10 h. The reaction was partitioned between AcOEt (50 mL) and H₂O (30 mL \times 3). The organic layer was washed with brine (30 mL), dried over Na₂SO₄, filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel

column chromatography (φ 1.5 cm \times 17 cm, chloroform/MeOH = 30/1) to give 31 (269 mg, 73%) as a red solid. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-d6) δ 11.50 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 10.94 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 8.35 (d, 1H, H-10, $J = 2.3$ Hz), 7.68 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.48 (d, 1H, H-7, $J =$ 8.6 Hz), 7.07 (dd, 1H, H-8, J = 2.3, 8.6 Hz), 5.34 (d, 1H, OH, J = 5.8 Hz), 5.18 (d, 1H, OH, $J = 5.8$ Hz), 5.13 (d, 1H, OH, $J = 5.2$ Hz), 3.70 $(dt, 1H, H-1', J = 2.3, 9.2 Hz), 3.55 (dd, 1H, H-1''a, J = 1.8, 15.5 Hz),$ 3.29 (m, 3H, H-4′ and H-5′- and H-6′a), 3.10 (m, 4H, H-1″b and H-2′ and H-3′ and H-6′b), 0.97 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.23 (s, 6H, dimethyl); 13C NMR (125 MHz, DMSO-d₆) δ 170.6, 148.8, 144.1, 136.8, 127.4, 124.8, 123.9, 121.4, 121.1, 119.5, 117.9, 113.3, 112.5, 78.9, 78.7, 77.9, 73.7, 71.1, 51.7, 33.3, 25.7, 28.1, −4.5; ESIMS-LR m/z = 566 (MH[−]); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{27}H_{32}N_5O_7Si$ 566.2077, found 566.2084 $(MH⁻)$.

5-[(6-Amino-6-deoxy-β-D-ribofuranosyl)methyl]-9-hydroxypyrrolo-[3,4-c]carbazole-1,3-dione hydrochloride salt (8a). A

mixture of 31 (269 mg, 0.47 mmol), triphenylphosphine (370 mg, 1.41 mmol) and $H₂O$ (0.42 mL, 23.5 mmol) in THF (5 mL) was stirred at 50 °C for 1 h. Then the solution was treated with $NAHCO₃$ (160 mg, 1.9 mmol) and $Boc₂O$ (0.44 mL, 1.9 mmol) at room temperature for 30 min. The reaction mixture was partitioned between AcOEt (50 mL) and H_2O (30 mL). The organic layer was washed with brine (30 mL), dried over Na_2SO_4 , filtered, and concentrated. The residue was purified by silica gel column chromatography (φ 1.5 cm × 16 cm, chloroform/MeOH = $50/1-30/1$) to give a Bocprotected amine. This material was treated with 4 M HCl/AcOEt (1 mL) at room temperature for 45 min. The reaction was concentrated and filtrated, and the residue was triturated from AcOEt to give 8a as a yellow solid (221 mg, 99%). ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO- \bar{d}_6) δ 11.50 (s, 1H, indole-NH), 10.94 (s, 1H, maleimide-NH), 8.35 (d, 1H, H-10, $J = 2.3$ Hz), 7.68 (s, 1H, H-4), 7.48 (d, 1H, H-7, $J = 8.6$ Hz), 7.07 (dd, 1H, H-8, $J = 2.3$, 8.6 Hz), 5.34 (d, 1H, OH, $J = 5.8$ Hz), 5.18 (d, 1H, OH, $J = 5.8$ Hz), 5.13 (d, 1H, OH, $J = 5.2$ Hz), 3.70 (dt, 1H, H-1', $J =$ 2.3, 9.2 Hz), 3.55 (dd, 1H, H-1″a, J = 1.8, 15.5 Hz), 3.29 (m, 3H, H-4′, H-5′ and H-6′a), 3.10 (m, 4H, H-1″b, H-2′, H-3′ and H-6′b), 0.97 (s, 9H, t-butyl), 0.23 (s, 6H, dimethyl); ¹³C NMR (125 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 170.7, 170.6, 151.3, 144.2, 135.6, 129.8, 126.4, 124.9, 123.3, 121.0, 120.1, 117.9, 117.7, 112.4, 108.8, 79.1, 77.6, 76.0, 72.3, 71.3, 33.1; ESIMS-LR $m/z = 428$ (MH⁺); ESIMS-HR calcd for $C_{21}H_{22}N_3O_7$ 428.1452, found 428.1454 (MH⁺).

Molecular Docking. UCN-01/the active site of Chk1 complex structure (PDB code: 1nvq)³³ was used for the docking. The docking calculations were performed using the Schrö dinger software suite with default settings if not indica[ted](#page-10-0) otherwise. For protein preparation, all the crystallographic water molecules were removed, hydrogens were added, and bond orders were assigned using Maestro's Protein Preparation Wizard (Maestro ver. 8.6). The added hydrogen atoms were minimized with all heavy atoms fixed using the OPLS2001 force field. For each of the three structures, energy grids were built using the default value of protein atom scaling. This box was centered around the centroid of the UCN-01. Docking was performed using
Schrödinger Glide.^{34–36} Calculation was conducted using the standard-precision (SP) mode with default settings. As for global energy-minimized c[onform](#page-10-0)ation search, key binding site side residues were refined in the presence of inhibitor by a 100,000-step MCMM conformational search in MacroModel 9 (Schrodinger, LLC, New York, NY).

Chk1 Kinase Assay. Recombinant human Chk1 was obtained from Cyclex. The test compounds and were dissolved in DMSO, and

diluted in four different concentrations, respectively. The assay was performed using a Cyclex Checkpoint Activity Kit according to the manufacturer's instructions. Chk1 inhibitory activity was calculated based on Chk1 activity in the presence and absence of compounds. Kinase activity was determined by reading the absorbance at dual wavelengths 450/540 nm on a microplate reader.

■ ASSOCIATED CONTENT

6 Supporting Information

Preparation of ${}^{1}H$, ${}^{13}C$ NMR spectra for all new compounds. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

■ [AUTHOR INF](http://pubs.acs.org)ORMATION

Corresponding Authors

*E-mail: matuda@pharm.hokudai.ac.jp

*Telephone: E-mail: ichikawa@pharm.hokudai.ac.jp

Notes

The auth[ors](mailto:matuda@pharm.hokudai.ac.jp) [declare](mailto:matuda@pharm.hokudai.ac.jp) [no](mailto:matuda@pharm.hokudai.ac.jp) [competing](mailto:matuda@pharm.hokudai.ac.jp) fi[nancial interest](mailto:ichikawa@pharm.hokudai.ac.jp).

■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Ms. S. Oka and Ms. A. Tokumitsu (Center for Instrumental Analysis, Hokkaido University) for measurement of mass spectra.

■ REFERENCES

(1) Omura, S.; Iwai, Y.; Hirano, A.; Nakagawa, A.; Awaya, J.; Tsuchiya, H.; Takahashi, Y.; Masuma, R. J. Antibiot. 1977, 30, 275− 282.

(2) Caponigro, F.; French, R. C.; Kaye, S. B. Anticancer Drugs 1997, 8, 26−33.

(3) Karaman, M. W.; Herrgard, S.; Treiber, D. K.; Gallant, P.; Atteridge, C. E.; Campbell, B. T.; Chan, K. W.; Ciceri, P.; Davis, M. I.; Edeen, P. T.; Faraoni, R.; Floyd, M.; Hunt, J. P.; Lockhart, D. J.; Milanov, Z. V.; Morrison, M. J.; Pallares, G.; Patel, H. K.; Pritchard, S.; Wodicka, L. M.; Zarrinkar, P. P. Nat. Biotechnol. 2008, 26, 127−132. (4) Takahashi, I.; Kobayashi, E.; Asano, K.; Yoshida, M.; Nakano, H.

J. Antibiot. 1987, 40, 1782−1784.

(5) Sausville, E. A.; Arbuck, S. G.; Messmann, R.; Headless, D.; Lush, R. D. J. Clin. Oncol. 2001, 19, 2319−2333.

(6) Senderowicz, A. M. Oncologist 2002, 7, 12−19.

(7) Akinaga, S.; Nomura, K.; Gomi, K.; Okabe, M. Cancer Chemother. Pharmacol. 1993, 32, 183−189.

(8) Kase, H.; Iwahashi, K.; Matsuda, Y. J. Antibiot. 1986, 39, 1059− 1065.

(9) Elliott, L. H.; Wilkinson, S. E.; Sedgwick, A. D.; Hill, C. H.; Lawton, G.; Davis, P. D.; Nixon, J. S. Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 1990, 171, 148−154.

(10) Tapley, P.; Lamballe, F.; Barbacid, M. Oncogene 1992, 7, 371− 381.

(11) Rü egg, U. T.; Burgess, G. M. Trends Pharmacol. Sci. 1989, 10, 218−220.

(12) Nettleton, D. E.; Doyle, T. W.; Krishnan, B.; Matsumoto, G. K.; Clardy, J. Tetrahedron Lett. 1985, 26, 4011−4014.

(13) Bush, J. A.; Long, B. H.; Catino, J. J.; Bradner, W. T.; Tomita, K. J. Antibiot. 1987, 40, 668−678.

(14) Arakawa, H.; Iguchi, T.; Morita, M.; Yoshinari, T.; Kojiri, K.; Suda, H.; Okura, A.; Nishimura, S. Cancer Res. 1995, 55, 1316−1320. (15) Luo, Y.; Leverson, J. D. Expert Rev. Anticancer Ther. 2005, 5, 333−342.

(16) Chen, Z.; Xiao, Z.; Chen, J.; Ng, S. C.; Sowin, T.; Sham, H.; Rosenberg, S.; Fesik, S.; Zhang, H. Mol. Cancer Ther. 2003, 2, 543− 548.

(17) Bucher, N.; Britten, C. D. Br. J. Cancer 2008, 98, 523−528.

(18) Chen, Z.; Xiao, X.; Gu, W.; Xue, J.; Bui, M. H.; Kovar, P.; Li, G.; Wang, G.; Tao, Z.-F.; Tong, Y.; Lin, N.-H.; Sham, H. L.; Wang, J. Y. J.;

The Journal of Organic Chemistry **Article Article Article Article Article**

Sowin, T. J.; Rosenberg, S. H.; Zhang, H. Int. J. Cancer 2006, 119, 2784−2794.

(19) Akinaga, S.; Nomura, K.; Gomi, K.; Okabe, M. Cancer Chemother. Pharmacol. 1993, 32, 183−189.

(20) (a) Sausville, E. A.; Arbuck, S. G.; Messmann, R.; Headless, D.; Lush, R. D. J. Clin. Oncol. 2001, 19, 2319−2333. (b) Senderowicz, A. M. Oncologist 2002, 7, 12−19.

(21) Sako, Y.; Osada, A.; Ichikawa, S.; Matsuda, A. Bioorg. Med. Chem. 2010, 18, 7878−7889.

(22) Alternatively, β -C-furanosides can be stereoselectively prepared by a two-step sequence involving nucleophilic addition of a suitably protected ribonic γ-lactone followed by Lewis acid-promoted silane reduction. For examples, see (a) Gudmundsson, K. S.; Drach, J. C.; Townsend, L. B. J. Org. Chem. 1997, 119, 5499−5511. (b) Calzada, E.; Clarke, C. A.; Roussin-Bouchard, C.; Wightman, R. H. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1995, 1, 517−518.

(23) Keck, G. E.; Enholm, E. J.; Kachensky, D. F. Tetrahedron Lett. 1984, 25, 1867−1870.

(24) Saito, T.; Nishimoto, Y.; Yasuda, M.; Baba, A. J. Org. Chem. 2006, 71, 8516−8522.

(25) Jung, K.; Muller, M.; Schmidt, R. Chem. Rev. 2000, 100, 4423− 4442.

(26) Kozikowski, A. P.; Sorgi, K. L. Tetrahedron Lett. 1983, 24, 1563−1566.

(27) McDevitt, J. P.; Lansbury, P. T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1996, 118, 3818−3828.

(28) Hirano, S.; Ichikawa, S.; Matsuda, A. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2005, 44, 1854−1856.

(29) Hirano, S.; Ichikawa, S.; Matsuda, A. J. Org. Chem. 2007, 72, 9936−9946.

(30) Ichikawa, S.; Hayashi, R.; Hirano, S.; Matsuda, A. Org. Lett. 2008, 10, 5107−5110.

(31) Teller, S.; Eluwa, S.; Koller, M.; Uecker, A.; Beckers, T.; Baasner, S.; Böhmer, F.-D.; Mahboobi, S. *Eur. J. Med. Chem.* 2000, 35, 413−427.

(32) Tam, R. Y.; Ferreira, S. S.; Czechura, P.; Chaytor, J. L.; Ben, R. N. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 17494−17501.

(33) Chen, P.; Luo, C.; Deng, Y.; Ryan, K.; Register, J.; Margosiak, S.; Tempczyk-Russell, A.; Nguyen, B.; Myers, P.; Lundgren, K.; Kan, C. C.; O'Connor, P. M. Cell 2000, 100, 681−692.

(34) Glide, version 5.0; Schrö dinger, L.L.C.: New York, 2008.

(35) Friesner, R. A.; Banks, J. L.; Murphy, R. B.; Halgren, T. A.; Klicic, J. J.; Mainz, D. T.; Repasky, M. P.; Knoll, E. H.; Shelley, M.; Perry, J. K.; Shaw, D. E.; Francis, P.; Shenkin, P. S. J. Med. Chem. 2004, 47, 1739−1749.

(36) Halgren, T. A.; Murphy, R. B.; Friesner, R. A.; Beard, H. S.; Frye, L. L.; Pollard, W. T.; Banks, J. L. J. Med. Chem. 2004, 47, 1750− 1759.