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#### Abstract

Sugar amino acids (SAAs) were designed and synthesized as new non-peptide peptidomimetics utilizing carbohydrates as peptide building blocks. They represent sugar-like ring structures that carry an amino and a carboxylic functional group and have a specific conformational influence on the backbone of peptides due to their distinct substitution patterns in rigid pyranose sugar rings. Five different SAAs (SAA1 $\alpha$, SAA $1 \beta$, SAA2, SAA3, and SAA4) have been synthesized that show the ability to constrain linear backbone conformations or distinct turn structures. Linear and cyclic peptides involving SAAs have been prepared in solution as well as by solid phase synthesis. SAA1 $\alpha$ and SAA2 were incorporated into two linear Leu-enkephalin analogs, replacing the natural Gly-Gly dipeptide. NMR studies provide evidence for the conformation-inducing effect of the carbohydrate moiety. SAA2 and SAA3 have been placed in cyclic hexapeptide analogs of somatostatin; SAA4 was incorporated in a model peptide. The conformation of the cyclic peptides cyclo(-SAA2-Phe-d-Trp-Lys-Thr-), cyclo(-SAA3-Phe-d-Trp-Lys(Boc)-Thr(tBu)-), and cyclo(-SAA4-Ala-D-Pro-Ala-Ala-) have been analyzed by various NMR techniques in combination with distance geometry calculations and subsequent molecular dynamic simulations. The determined solution conformations were compared to representative idealized peptide backbones. SAA2 and SAA3 induce a $\beta$-turn structure while SAA4 mimics a $\gamma$-turn. Both enkephalin analogs were not active in the guinea pig ileum assay. The somatostatin analog containing SAA2 has an inhibition constant ( $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ ) of $0.15 \mu \mathrm{M}$ for the inhibition of the release of growth hormone.


In recent years the interest in a rational design of amino acid and peptide mimetics has steadily grown due to the pharmacological limitations of bioactive peptides. A large variety of modifications of peptide structures has been used for conformationally directed drug design to investigate the active peptidereceptor binding conformation. ${ }^{1}$ Constrained peptidomimetics and cyclization of peptides remain of special interest to obtain a distinct, bioactive conformation, especially in the field of combinatorial synthesis for high throughput screening. ${ }^{2}$ Carbohydrates present as an attractive option for non-peptide scaffolding as they contain well-defined and readily convertible substituents ${ }^{3}$ with a rigid pyran ring.

Carbohydrates are frequently found in proteins as a result of enzyme-mediated glycosylation in post-translational modification processes. ${ }^{4}$ Sugar amino acids (SAAs) in particular occur in nature as subunits of oligosaccharides (neuraminic acid), in cell walls of bacteria (muraminic acid), and in some antibiotics. ${ }^{5}$ The syntheses of SAAs ${ }^{6}$ so far concentrated on the use of SAA
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Figure 1. Example of a sugar amino acid (SAA2).
analogs as biopolymer building blocks ${ }^{7,8}$ to mimic oligo- and polysaccharide structures via amide bond linkages.

Two years ago we reported one example of a sugar amino acid as a new type of peptidomimetic (Figure 1). ${ }^{9,10}$ The novel SAA was successfully incorporated into a cyclic peptide with the $\beta$-turn motif of the somatostatin containing tetrapeptide Phe-
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Figure 2. Structures of sugar amino acids (SAAs) discussed in this work.

D-Trp-Lys-Thr. The conformational analysis clearly typified two $\beta$-turns. We herein report a systematic approach using several sugar amino acids (SAAs) as a new class of building blocks for peptide scaffolds and conformational restrained peptidomimetics. ${ }^{9,10}$ SAAs unit the functional groups of amino acids with the rigidity of pyranoid ring structures. ${ }^{11}$ Figure 2 shows a construction kit for predetermined constrained local conformations in synthetic peptides containing a series of six SAAs; ${ }^{10}$ these units offer possibilities as mimetic structures for both amino acids and dipeptide isosteres. The syntheses of all SAAs were performed using readily available starting materials. SAA compounds of type $\mathbf{1} \alpha,{ }^{6} \mathbf{3},{ }^{12}$ and $\mathbf{5}^{13}$ have already been synthesized by other groups, although they have not been used as structural units in peptides.

The SAAs shown in Figure 2 contain a six-membered ring with all substituents in equatorial positions, except for the methoxy group in SAA1 $\alpha$. Therefore, the chair conformation is very stable and rigid, consequently allowing a prediction on the conformational restriction introduced to peptides. As will be demonstrated, SAA1 $\alpha$ and SAA1 $\beta$ constrain a linear peptide conformation, whereas the others are turn mimetics. Thereby the turn diameter is decreasing from SAA 2 to SAA5 (Figure 2). SAA2 and SAA3 serve as $\beta$-turn mimetics and SAA4 as a $\gamma$-turn mimetic, and SAA5 can be regarded as a homoproline derivative (or hydroxylated pipecolic acid).

In order to explore the effect of the dipeptide isosteres SAA1 $\alpha$ and SAA 2 on the conformation of linear peptides by NMR spectroscopy, we synthesized the Leu-enkephalin analogs H-TyrSAA1 $\alpha$-Phe-Leu-OMe (19) and H-Tyr-SAA2-Phe-Leu-OMe (20) in which the SAAs replace the Gly-Gly dipeptide of the natural sequence H-Tyr-Gly-Gly-Phe-Leu-OH (Figure 3).

The dipeptide Gly-Gly serves as a spacer in enkephalin between the messenger amino acid Tyr which is essential for
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Figure 3. SAA1 $\alpha$ and SAA2 incorporated into enkephalin anlogs 19 and 20.
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Figure 4. SAA2, SAA3 and SAA4 incorporated in cyclic peptides 26, 33, and 36.
the activity and the address sequence Phe-Leu responsible for the selectivity. ${ }^{14}$ The conformational influence of SAA2, SAA3, and SAA4 on the peptide backbone of three cyclic peptides (Figure 4) was investigated in more detail by NMR spectroscopy, distance geometry, and subsequent molecular dynamic calculations.

The highly active somatostatin cyclic hexapeptide cyclo(-Phe-Pro-Phe-D-Trp-Lys-Thr-) ${ }^{15}$ was used as a classical peptide for design of peptidomimetics, ${ }^{16}$ since the solution structure revealed two $\beta$-turns. ${ }^{17}$ The sequence Phe-d-Trp-Lys-Thr remained in

[^3]Scheme 1. Synthesis of the Protected Building Block SAA1 $\beta$

a $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn being part of many other active somatostatin analogs. ${ }^{18}$ In cyclo(-SAA2-Phe-D-Trp-Lys-Thr-) and cyclo(-SAA3-Phe-d-Trp-Lys-Thr-) the SAAs replaced the two neighboring amino acids Phe-Pro to investigate the resulting turn pattern. SAA4 was incorporated in a model peptide of the sequence cyclo(-SAA4-Ala-d-Pro-Ala-Ala-).

Synthesis of the SAA Building Blocks. Cbz-SAA $1 \alpha-\mathrm{OH}$ was synthesized as described by Heyns and Paulsen starting from the $\alpha$-methyl glycoside in an overall yield of $37 \% .^{6}$ The $\beta$-anomer Cbz-SAA1 $\beta$-OH (4) was prepared from glucosamine which was transformed to glycosyl bromide 1 with acetyl bromide (Scheme 1). ${ }^{19}$

The $\beta$-methyl glycoside ${ }^{20}$ was obtained by treatment of bromide 1 with methanol and pyridine and further protected by the benzyloxycarbonyl (Cbz) group. Deacetylation of 2 was achieved by methanolysis, and the resulting compound $\mathbf{3}$ was selectively oxidized at the free primary hydroxyl group with oxygen on a platinum catalyst in aqueous solution by the method of Heyns and Paulsen ${ }^{6}$ in an overall yield of $49 \%$.

The synthesis of SAA2 has already been published by our group. ${ }^{9}$ SAA2 was obtained as Cbz-SAA2-OMe in an overall yield of $12 \%$ and adequately deprotected for further synthesis. The enantiomer of SAA $\mathbf{2}$ was prepared by Fuchs and Lehmann ${ }^{7}$ in 11 steps starting from glucose.

H-SAA3-OMe (8) has already been described by Nitta et al., ${ }^{12}$ who prepared the azide from the unstable bromide (obtained from $\alpha / \beta$ acetate mixture) using $\mathrm{NaN}_{3}$ in $53 \%$ yield for this step. Because of the unsatisfactory yields, we have improved the synthesis following the route outlined in Scheme 2. The glucuronolactone was converted to the methyl ester with methanol via base catalysis and was then acetylated by a mixture of acetic anhydride and sodium acetate. ${ }^{21}$ Crystallization allowed an excellent separation of the $\beta$-acetate $\mathbf{6}$ from the

[^4]$\alpha$-anomer. Other acetylation methods, i.e., acetic anhydride/ pyridine or acetic anhydride/perchloric acid also provide the acetylated glucuronolactone along with $\alpha$-acetate. The $\beta$-azide 7 was obtained from 6 with tin tetrachloride and trimethylsilyl azide ${ }^{22}$ in an overall yield of 43\%. Catalytic reduction at low temperature provided H-SAA3-OMe (8), which was used without further purification.

The synthesis of Fmoc-SAA4-(tri-O-benzyl)-OH, 15 (Scheme 3), followed a procedure published for the stereoselective $C$-glycosidation of 2-acetamido-2-deoxy-d-glucose. ${ }^{23}$ With D-glucosamine as the starting material, the partially benzylated sugar 9 was obtained in two steps according to a procedure of Fletcher and Inch. ${ }^{24}$ The amino function was subsequently protected by $\mathrm{Cbz}-\mathrm{Cl}$ to obtain $\mathbf{1 0}$ in $90 \%$ yield. Chlorination of the anomeric hydroxyl group provided the $\alpha$-chloro compound which was treated with tributyltin lithium to afford 11 in $79 \%$ yield. ${ }^{23}$ The generation of the glycosyl dianion $\mathbf{1 2}$ was accomplished in two separate temperature steps: first, deprotonation of the urethane nitrogen at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using 1 equiv of BuLi ; second, transmetalation at $-55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using 1.2 equiv of BuLi . The dianion 12 was visualized by a deep red color of the solution and was subsequently trapped by carbon dioxide to afford $\mathbf{1 3}$ in $83 \%$ yield. For the application of SAA4 in solid phase peptide synthesis, $\mathbf{1 3}$ was transformed into the Fmoc derivative 15. TFA/thioanisole ${ }^{25}$ or catalytic hydrogenolysis on $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}^{26}$ were not selective for removal of the Cbz group in 13. The best result for cleaving the Cbz group was obtained by using trimethylsilyl iodide in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} .{ }^{27}$ However, the $\mathrm{C}^{7}-O$-benzyl ether of $\mathbf{1 3}$ was cleaved to some extend. While the amount of side product was temperature independent, the yield was optimized by varying the reaction time. The crude reaction mixture was treated with Fmoc- $\mathrm{ONSu}^{28}$ to afford 15 in $48 \%$ yield.

The synthesis of SAA5 has been published by Fleet et al. ${ }^{13}$ As part of our ongoing study this azasugar will be incorporated into peptides to compare its conformational and pharmaceutical influences as a proline and pipecolic acid surrogate.

Synthesis of the SAA Peptides. The enkephalin analogs 19 and 20 (Figure 3) were assembled starting from dipeptide H-Phe-Leu-OMe, which was coupled with the monoprotected SAAs using standard peptide solution protocol with $\mathrm{EDCl} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}$ (1-ethyl-3-(3-(dimethylamino)propyl)carbodiimide hydrochloride) and HOBt (1-hydroxybenzotriazole) as coupling reagents in an overall yield of $34 \% 19$ and $50 \%$ 20. Protection of the hydroxyl groups of SAA1 $\alpha$ and SAA 2 was not necessary. In these syntheses the chemical behavior of the SAAs was similar to that of unprotected threonine.

Cyclo(-SAA2-Phe-D-Trp-Lys-Thr-) (27) was synthesized using THF and DMF as a solvent mixture in the coupling reactions. $\mathrm{EDCl} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}$ and HOBt were used as coupling agents, and the cyclization step was activated with TBTU (2-(1H-benzotriazol-1-yl)-1,1,3,3-tetramethyluronium tetrafluoroborate). By using such strong activation, some $\beta$-elimination in SAA2

[^5]Scheme 2. Synthesis of the Protected Building Block SAA3


Scheme 3. Synthesis of the Protected Building Block SAA4

wasobserved as TBTU reacted with the unprotected sugar hydroxyl groups.

Cyclo(-SAA3-Phe-D-Trp-Lys(Boc)-Thr(tBu)-) (33) was also synthesized in solution. Contrary to the C-glycosidic SAA2, the free amine of SAA3 was unstable due to epimerization. Therefore, hydrogenation of the azide 7 on $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ was performed in THF since anomerization is known to occur preferably in protic solvents. After isolation of compound $\mathbf{8}$, the amine was immediately coupled with IIDQ (1-(isobutoxycarbonyl)-2-isobutoxy-1,2-dihydroquinoline). ${ }^{29}$ Coupling with $\mathrm{EDCl} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}$ in THF gave more side products than IIDQ, because of the low nucleophilicity of the anomeric amine. Further couplings were performed with standard peptide coupling procedures (see Experimental Section) and by adding $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ as a scavenger for the hydroxyl groups during cyclization with TBTU.

The peptide cyclo(-SAA4-Ala-d-Pro-Ala-Ala-) (36) was synthesized by solid phase synthesis. The pentapeptide analog H-Ala-SAA4(tri- $O$-benzyl)-Ala-D-Pro-Ala-OH (34) was assembled on the 2-chlorotritylchloride resin using Fmocchemistry and cleaved from the resin by HOAc/trifluoroethanol in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. Compound $\mathbf{1 5}$ was used in 1.1 equiv and all other amino acids in 1.7 equiv relative to the determined loading of the resin. The subsequent cyclization was performed at high dilution using TBTU as a coupling agent. The protecting groups were removed by hydrogenolysis in the presence of $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$.

Conformational Analysis. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum in DMSO $-d_{6}$ of the linear peptide 19 shows large ${ }^{3} J(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})$ coupling constants around 10 Hz between the ring protons of SAA $1 \alpha$, and this implies that the pyranoid ring of SAA1 $\alpha$ is in the predicted ${ }^{4} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ chair conformation. In Figure 5 the dihedral angles of SAA $1 \alpha$ are compared to those of the backbone of a dipeptide with a cis amide bond. The $\omega_{i}$ angle of SAA1 $\alpha$ is fixed to $-60^{\circ}$, whereas the $\psi_{i}$ and $\varphi_{i+1}$ angles are about $180^{\circ}$.

[^6]The dihedral angles $\varphi_{i}$ and $\psi_{i+1}$ display no conformational restriction. Therefore the peptidomimetic SAA1 $\alpha$ can be used to replace two adjacent amino acids introducing conformational constraints at the $\psi_{i}, \omega_{i}$, and $\varphi_{i+1}$ angle. These restrictions result in an extended peptide conformation. In agreement with a linear conformation, ROE cross signals were only found between adjacent amino acids.

Analysis of the ${ }^{3} J(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})$ coupling constants in peptide 20 indicates that the pyranoid ring of SAA2 is in the all-equatorial chair conformation, fixing the backbone angles $\omega_{i}$ and $\varphi_{i+1}$ around $180^{\circ}$. The $\varphi_{i}$ and both $\psi$ angles are not restricted, which allows SAA2 to form loop structures. The homonuclear ${ }^{3} J(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})$ coupling constants between the methylene protons of $\mathrm{C}^{7}$ and the $\mathrm{H}^{6}$ in 20 were 1.0 and 8.5 Hz , respectively. This indicates a preferred conformation about the $\mathrm{C}^{6}-\mathrm{C}^{7}$ bond in 20 with one of the methylene protons oriented antiperiplanar to $\mathrm{H}^{6}\left(\chi_{1}=\right.$ $-60^{\circ}$ or $\chi_{1}=-180^{\circ}$. The assignment of the two diastereotopic protons was performed using the distance information of a ROESY spectrum (see Experimental Section). The ROE cross signals between aromatic protons of the tyrosine side chain and $\mathrm{H}^{2}$ of SAA2 show a distance of 3.8 and 3.9 Å. Obviously SAA2 induces a bent structure, without acting as a rigid $\beta$-turn mimetic. Presuming a trans amide bond between Tyr and SAA2, such short distances are only possible if $\mathrm{H}^{7}($ pro-S $)$ is antiperiplanar to $\mathrm{H}^{6}\left(\psi_{i}=-60^{\circ}\right)$. In the case of the other rotamer $\left(\psi_{i}=\right.$ $180^{\circ}$ ), the distance would be larger than $6.5 \AA$. This turn structure is also in agreement with Newman's 1,5 -repulsion theory. ${ }^{30}$ The other possible rotamer would result in a strong sterical repulsion between the $\mathrm{NH}-$ and HO - substituent of SAA2 (Figure 5).

The conformational analyses of the cyclic peptides were carried out using the side chain protected cyclo(-SAA2-Phe-D-Trp-Lys(Cbz)-Thr-) (26), cyclo(-SAA3-Phe-d-Trp-Lys(Cbz)-$\operatorname{Thr}(\mathrm{tBu})-$ ) (33), and cyclo(-SAA4-Ala-D-Pro-Ala-Ala-) (36). The
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Figure 5. Comparison of SAA1 $\alpha$ with the natural dipeptide D-SerSer and SAA2 with Gly-Xaa and characteristic long-range NOE effects in the linear peptide $\mathbf{2 0}$.
hydroxyl groups of the sugar moiety were unprotected in all cases. The conformational analyses were based on NMR spectroscopy in DMSO- $d_{6}$ at 300 K : Interproton distances were calculated from NOESY and ROESY cross peak volumes, homonuclear proton coupling constants were obtained from 1D spectra or P.E. COSY spectra, and temperature dependence of the amide protons has been measured by 1D spectra in the range 300-340 K.

The starting geometries for the MD simulations were obtained by distance geometry (DG) with a modified version ${ }^{31}$ of the DISGEO ${ }^{32}$ program using proton-proton distances and ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}\right)$ and ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta}\right)$ proton-proton coupling constants. ${ }^{33}$ The following distance restraint MD simulations (rMD) were performed in explicit DMSO solvent ${ }^{34}$ with the CVFF ${ }^{35}$ force field of the Discover ${ }^{36}$ program. The last 150 ps of the rMD simulation were collected and analyzed. The depicted structures were obtained by averaging over the last 50 ps and energyminimized by 300 steps steepest descent (for details, see Experimental Section). In order to compare the rMD calculations with experimental data, distances were calculated by $\left\langle r^{-3}\right\rangle$ averaging over the trajectory; coupling constants were obtained

[^8]from averaging the $J$ values of each individual conformation over the trajectory. Moreover radial distribution functions (radf) ${ }^{37}$ were calculated to judge solvent accessibility of the amide protons.

Cyclo(-SAA2 ${ }^{1}-$ Phe $^{2}-\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{Trp}^{3}-\mathrm{Lys}^{4}(\mathrm{Cbz})-\mathrm{Thr}^{5}$-) (26) shows only one conformer in the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum. Large ${ }^{3} J(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})$ coupling constants (approximately 9 Hz ) between the carbohydrate protons indicated a ${ }^{4} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ analog chair conformation. The backbone amide bonds of $\mathbf{2 6}$ are all trans configurated as no strong $\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}-\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ NOE were detectable.

Figure 6 shows the averaged and minimized structure of 26 consistent with a pseudo- $\beta / \beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn arrangement with D-Trp in the $i+1$ position of the distorted $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn and the dipeptide isostere SAA2 in the $i$ and $i+1$ positions of a pseudo- $\beta$-turn as indicated by the backbone dihedral angles in Table 1. As expected, radial distribution functions indicated solvent accessibility only for amide protons with large negative temperature coefficients. The analysis of the trajectory revealed large fluctuations for the $\varphi$-angles of D-Trp and Phe. This flexibility was most likely to cause large deviations between the experimental and calculated ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}\right)$ coupling constants (Phe ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}\right)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}(\exp )$ and $10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}($ calcd $), ~ D-T r p ~{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}\right)$ $=5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$ (exp) and 9.2 Hz (calcd)), especially since the Karplus curve has a steep slope for the relevant coupling constants. For the side chain of Lys (diastereotopic assignment according to Wüthrich et al. ${ }^{38}$ ), the Pachler equations ${ }^{39}$ predicted a population of $51 \%$ for the preferential $\chi_{1}$ angle of $-60^{\circ}$, whereas according to the Pachler equations no predominant side chain orientation exists for D-Trp and Phe in solution. The synclinal orientation of the $\mathrm{Thr}^{5} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}-\mathrm{H}^{\beta}$ protons was confirmed by the $\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}-\mathrm{H}^{\beta}$ coupling constant of 4.6 Hz and the ROEs between $\mathrm{Thr}^{5} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}-$ $\mathrm{H}^{\beta}$ and $\mathrm{Thr}^{5} \mathrm{H}^{\beta}-\mathrm{SAA} 2 \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}$.

The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum of cyclo(-SAA3 ${ }^{1}-$ Phe $^{2}-\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{Trp}^{3}{ }^{3}$ Lys $^{4}$ -(Boc)- $\mathrm{Thr}^{5}(\mathrm{tBu})-$ ) (33) in DMSO- $d_{6}$ at 300 K showed three conformations with ratios of $80: 15: 5$. The ROESY spectrum proved them to be different conformers of the same molecule by exchange peaks. Only the major conformation could be completely assigned. The large ${ }^{3} J(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})$ coupling constants (approximately 9 Hz ) between the carbohydrate protons were characteristic for a ${ }^{4} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ analog chair conformation.

Figure 7 shows the averaged backbone conformation of $\mathbf{3 3}$ with a $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime} / \mathrm{pseudo}-\beta$-turn arrangement. D-Trp occupies the $i$ +1 position of a distorted $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn. SAA $\mathbf{3}$ is acting as a $\beta$-turn mimetic (Table 2). The corresponding hydrogen bond between Thr carbonyl oxygen and Phe amide proton is present to a degree of $13 \%$ during the rMD simulation. Only the ROE between $\mathrm{D}-\operatorname{Tr}^{3} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ and $\mathrm{D}-\operatorname{Trp}^{3} \mathrm{H}^{2}$ is significantly violated due to flexibility which was indicated by the homonuclear $\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}-\mathrm{H}^{\beta}$ coupling constant and the fact that the $\mathrm{D}-\operatorname{Trp}^{3} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}-\mathrm{D}-\operatorname{Trp}^{3} \mathrm{H}^{2}$ and $\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{Trp}^{3} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}-$ $\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{Tr}{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}^{4}$ ROEs cannot be met by a single side chain conformer. Both Thr and Phe had a flexible side chain as indicated by the ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta}\right)$ coupling constants (Thr ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta}\right)=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, Phe ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta}\right)=7.8^{\mathrm{t}}$ and $\left.5.6^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{Hz}\right)$. As in the case of 26 only the Lys side chain occupied a preferred rotamer. According to the Pachler equations, $\chi_{1}=-60^{\circ}$ was populated to $81 \%$. Similar to compound 26, large fluctuations were observed for the $\varphi$-angles of D-Trp and Phe during the simulation. For all amide protons radial distribution functions were calculated from the 150 ps rMD trajectory. They agree well with the temperature coefficients.
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Figure 6. Stereoplot of cyclo(-SAA2-Phe-d-Trp-Lys(Cbz)-Thr-) (26) obtained by averaging the last 150 ps of the rMD tarjectory and subsequent energy minimization by 300 steps steepest descent. The depicted orientation of the side chains of D-Trp and Phe is arbitrary due to their flexibilty.

Table 1. Backbone Dihedral Angles for 26

|  | $\varphi$ | $\psi$ | $\omega$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SAA2 | $111\left(\mathrm{ThrCO}^{2}-\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{C}^{7}-\mathrm{C}^{6}\right)$ | $-63\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{C}^{7}-\mathrm{C}^{6}-\mathrm{O}\right)$ | $-177\left(\mathrm{C}^{7}-\mathrm{C}^{6}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{C}^{2}\right)$ |
|  | $177\left(\mathrm{C}^{6}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{C}^{2}-\mathrm{CO}\right)$ | $-26\left(\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{C}^{2}-\mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{PheH}^{\mathrm{N}}\right)$ | $172\left(\mathrm{C}^{2}-\mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{PheC} \alpha\right)$ |
| Phe | -122 | 105 | -173 |
| D-Trp | 95 | -112 | -177 |
| Lys | -108 | -37 | -173 |
| Thr | -123 | 126 | 175 |



Figure 7. Stereoplot of cyclo(-SAA3-Phe-D-Trp-Lys(Boc)-Thr(tBu)-) (33) obtained by averaging the last 150 ps of the rMD tarjectory and subsequent energy minimization by 300 steps steepest descent. The depicted orientation of the side chains of D-Trp and Phe is arbitrary due to their flexibility.

The 1D-proton spectrum of cyclo(-SAA4 ${ }^{1}-\mathrm{Ala}^{2}-\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{Pro}^{3}-\mathrm{Ala}^{4}$ Ala $^{5}$-) (36) shows two conformations in a ratio of $80: 20$, which were both assigned. Surprisingly the second conformation does not result from a cis Pro bond as would be expected. Exchange
peaks in the ROESY spectrum proved that the two sets of signals result from two conformers of the same compound. The major conformation formed an all-trans configuration around the amide bonds, since no strong $\mathrm{H} \alpha-\mathrm{H} \alpha$ ROEs were observed.

Table 2. Backbone Dihedral Angles for the Major Conformation of $\mathbf{3 3}$

|  | $\varphi$ | $\psi$ | $\omega$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SAA3 | $53\left(\mathrm{ThrCO}-\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{C} 1-\mathrm{O}\right)$ | $178\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{C} 1-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{C}^{5}\right)$ | $-174\left(\mathrm{C}^{1}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{C}^{5}-\mathrm{CO}\right)$ |
|  | $-58\left(\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{C}^{5}-\mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{PheH}^{\mathrm{N}}\right)$ | 173 | -178 |
| Phe | $\left.-\mathrm{C}^{5}-\mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{PheC} \alpha\right)$ |  |  |
| D-Trp | 139 | -117 | 179 |
| Lys | -94 | -54 | 179 |
| Thr | -114 | 139 | -168 |



Figure 8. Stereoplot of cyclo(-SAA4-Ala-D-Pro-Ala-Ala-) (36) obtained by averaging the last 150 ps of the rMD tarjectory and subsequent energy minimization by 300 steps steepest descent.

Table 3. Backbone Dihedral Angles of the Major Conformation of 36

|  | $\varphi$ | $\psi$ | $\omega$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SAA4 | $114\left(\mathrm{Ala}^{5} \mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{C}^{2}-\mathrm{C}^{1}\right)$ | $-53\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{C}^{2}-\mathrm{C}^{1}-\mathrm{CO}\right)$ |  |
| $\mathrm{Ala}^{2}$ | -85 | $-63\left(\mathrm{C}^{2}-\mathrm{C}^{1}-\mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{Ala}^{2} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}\right)$ | $-177\left(\mathrm{C}^{1}-\mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{Ala}^{2} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}\right)$ |
| $\mathrm{D}^{2}-\mathrm{Pro}^{3}$ | 76 | 136 | 178 |
| $\mathrm{Ala}^{4}$ | -86 | -111 | 173 |
| $\mathrm{Ala}^{5}$ | -142 | -39 | -178 |

The chemical shifts of the proline $\beta$ - and $\gamma$-carbons indicated that the preceding amide bond is trans-configurated. ${ }^{40}$ The distance of 273 pm for SAA4H ${ }^{2}$ and SAA4H ${ }^{4}$ (see Supporting Information) was also indicative for a ${ }^{4} C_{1}$ chair conformation close to the corresponding value of $\beta$-D-glucose.

Figure 8 shows the averaged and minimized structure of the major conformation of $\mathbf{3 6}$ with a $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime} /$ pseudo- $\gamma$-turn arrangement. D-Pro occupies the $i+1$ position of a $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn SAA4 acting as a $\gamma$-turn mimetic (Table 3).

During the simulation a frequent switch between a $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$ - and a $\gamma$-turn was observed for residues located in the $\beta$-turn region. Hence, hydrogen bonding occurred for both types of turns. This flexibility of the $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn might cause the violation of the ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{Ala}^{5} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}\right)$ coupling constant. ${ }^{41}$

This clearly shows that SAA4 occupies the $i+1$ position of the pseudo- $\gamma$-turn forming a hydrogen bond between the $\mathrm{Ala}^{2}$ amide proton and the SAA4 carbonyl populated to $38.8 \%$.

In the minor conformation, the carbohydrate moiety exists in a ${ }^{4} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ chair conformation as confirmed by the large homonuclear coupling constants between the carbohydrate protons.

[^10]Furthermore, the carbon chemical shifts of $\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{Pro}^{3}$ indicate a trans configuration at the preceding amide bond. No strong $H^{\alpha}-H^{\alpha}$ NOEs were detectable for the second conformation. Due to the low population, no structural calculations were performed. Carbon chemical shifts of D-Pro ${ }^{3}$ were very similar for both conformers, so no change of the local structure is expected. Available ROE data $\left(\mathrm{Ala}^{5} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{Ala}^{4} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, 306 \mathrm{pm} ; \mathrm{Ala}^{4} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\right.$ D-Pro ${ }^{3}, 231 \mathrm{pm} ; \mathrm{Ala}^{5} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}$-D-Pro ${ }^{3}, 389 \mathrm{pm} ; \mathrm{Ala}^{4} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-\mathrm{Ala}^{4} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}, 315$ pm ) and the small negative temperature coefficient $\mathrm{Ala}^{5} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}$ are in agreement with a $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn with $\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{Pro}^{3}$ in the $i+1$ position. The experimental data indicate a different conformation for both conformers at SAA4H ${ }^{\mathrm{N}}$. The chemical shift changed drastically (from 7.99 ppm to 6.23 ppm ). The change of the temperature coefficient for $\mathrm{SAA} 4 \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}$ from $-6.5 \mathrm{ppb} / \mathrm{K}$ to $-1.0 \mathrm{ppb} / \mathrm{K}$ indicated an internal orientation of this amide proton, which was confirmed by ROE data (shortening of the $\mathrm{Ala}^{5} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}-$ SAA4H ${ }^{\mathrm{N}}$ distance from 370 pm to 251 pm ). The existence of such conformers suggests that the rotation about the bond between $\mathrm{SAA} 4 \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}$ and the $\mathrm{SAA4C}{ }^{1}$ is hindered.

[^11]

Figure 9. Superposition of $\mathbf{2 6}$ (black) and an idealized $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime} / \beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn arrangement (gray); superposition of $\mathbf{3 3}$ (black) and an idealized $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime} / \beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn arrangement (gray); and superposition of $\mathbf{3 6}$ (black) and an idealized $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime} / \gamma$-turn-arrangement (gray).

Biological Tests. The two enkephalin analogs $\mathbf{1 9}$ and 20 and the somatostatin analog 27 were tested for their biological activity. The enkephalin analogs $\mathbf{1 9}$ and $\mathbf{2 0}$ show no activity in the guinea pig ileum assay. ${ }^{42}$ The somatostatin analog 27 has an inhibition constant $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{50}\right)$ of $0.15 \mu \mathrm{M}$ in displacing the receptor-bound radioligand $\left[{ }^{125}\right.$ I]Try ${ }^{11}$ somatostatin-14 in AtT20 cell membranes obtained from mice hypophyses. In fact, compound 27 is only 75 times less active than the highly potent somatostatin analog cyclo(-Phe-Pro-Phe-D-Trp-Lys-Thr-). This is particularly remarkable, since 27 does not contain the lipophilic residues on both sides of the active tetrapeptide sequence that are considered to be important for high somatostatin activity. ${ }^{15,18}$

## Conclusion

The conformational analyses of the cyclic peptides presented here show that the replacement of the amino acids by SAAs introduced the proposed turn motifs combining the structural features of peptides and carbohydrates. As confirmed by the large ${ }^{3} J(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})$ coupling constants, the carbohydrate ring remains in the ${ }^{4} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ conformation rendering a significant influence on the peptide backbone. Figure 9 shows the superpositions of the averaged and minimized structures of 26, 33, and 36 with cyclic peptide backbones consistent with idealized turn structures. ${ }^{43} 26$ and 33 were compared with the appropriate $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime} /$ $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn replacing the Phe-Pro residues of the cyclic hexapeptide cyclo(-Phe-Pro-Phe-D-Trp-Lys-Thr-). ${ }^{18}$ The backbone dihedral angles and the temperature coefficients were in agreement with the corresponding data in the literature. ${ }^{44}$ Peptide $\mathbf{3 6}$ containing SAA4 was superimposed with the backbone of a cyclic pentapeptide with an idealized $\beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime} / \gamma$-turn arrangement. Although SAA4 has one more backbone atom than a natural $\alpha$-amino

[^12]acid, the superposition showed that SAA4 meets the geometric requirements to form a $\gamma$-turn.

Obviously the dipeptide isostere SAA2 mimics a $\beta$-turn in peptide 26. SAA3 whose backbone is one atom shorter than that of a dipeptide isostere is suited as a $\beta$-turn mimetic in 33 just as well. In comparison to SAA3 in 33 the carbohydrate moiety of SAA $\mathbf{2}$ in $\mathbf{2 6}$ is slightly out of plane of the $\beta / \beta \mathrm{II}^{\prime}$-turn arrangement. Apparently $\mathbf{2 6}$ and $\mathbf{3 3}$ form very similar backbone structures.

The superposition of the cyclic SAA containing peptides with the idealized turns show that the SAA building blocks form the proposed turn structures. The SAAs of the peptide construction kit may thus become a tool for a rational design of peptide conformations. A main advantage of the SAAs is that the conformational restriction changes significantly while the structure of the sugar moiety is more or less preserved. The protocol developed also allows the use of SAAs in solid phase peptide syntheses as well as in combinatorial synthesis. Libraries may be composed of different SAAs alone or including other natural or unnatural amino acids. The hydroxyl groups of the SAA can be modified, e.g., by benzylation or other derivatives. Such modifications will change the physical and chemical properties without changing the backbone structure in the cyclic peptide. The protecting groups could even serve as mimics for additional peptidic structures. Moreover, the presented SAAs can also be used as building blocks of oligo- and polysaccharide analogs. ${ }^{8}$

## Experimental Section ${ }^{45}$

General Methods. Solvents for moisture sensitive reactions were distilled and dried according to standard procedures. All other solvents were distilled before use. $\mathrm{Pt} / \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ were donated by Degussa, Frankfurt/M., Germany. Flash column chromatography (FC) was performed with indicated solvents on silica gel 60, 230-400 mesh (Merck KGaA , Darmstadt). All reactions were monitored by thin-layer chromatography with 0.25 mm precoated silica gel 60 plates with $\mathrm{F}_{254}$ indicator (Merck KGaA, Darmstadt). Melting points were obtained on a Büchi-Tottoli apparatus and are uncorrected. Optical rotation were determined with a Perkin-Elmer 241 polarimeter. IR spectra were recorded on a Perkin-Elmer 257 spectrophotometer. FAB mass spectra were recorded on Varian MAT 311 A using NOBA or glycol matrices. Elemental analysis were performed on a Heraeus EA415-0 analyzer. RP-HPLC analysis were carried out on Beckman System Gold using a Nucleosil-7 $\mathrm{C}_{18}$ column; solvent $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+0.1 \% \mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{COOH}$, and
solvent $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}+0.1 \% \mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{COOH}$, with UV detection at 220 and 254 nm .

Proton signals were assigned by the combined use of TOCSY, ${ }^{46}$ z-TOCSY, ${ }^{47}$ DQF-COSY, ${ }^{48}$ and/or P.E. COSY ${ }^{49}$ spectra. Carbon shifts were obtained with HMQC ${ }^{50}$ and HMQC-COSY ${ }^{51}$ experiments. The HMQC experiment was performed with a BIRD-puls. ${ }^{52}$ In addition, for peptide 36 a $\mathrm{HMBC}^{53}$ spectrum with a low-pass $J$ filter ${ }^{54}$ was recorded and used for the assignment of the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ resonances. In this case, sequential assignment was performed with the HMBC spectrum whereas in the other cases the correct sequence was confirmed by a ROESY ${ }^{55}$ with a pulsed spinlock ${ }^{56}$ (33) and a $\operatorname{NOESY}^{57}$ experiment (26).

Quantitative information on interproton distances was obtained from NOESY and ROESY spectra with mixing times of 120 and 150 ms , respectively. Integrals from the ROESY experiment were offset corrected. ${ }^{58}$ For all distance calculations the isolated two-spin approximation was used. Interproton distances and homonuclear coupling constants were employed (for details, see Supporting Information) for structure calculation.

Structure Calculations. Structure calculations were performed using distance geometry to generate a starting structure for subsequent restrained MD refinements. For distance geometry (DG), a modified version of the DISGEO program using proton-proton distances and ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}\right)$ and ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta}\right)$ homonuclear coupling constants as restraints using the Karplus equation. For the following MD simulations in explicit $\mathrm{DMSO}^{59}$ the Discover program with the CVFF force field was used. It is especially parametrized for peptides and small organic molecules, but proved to be useful in simulations for saccharides. ${ }^{60}$ Hence, it is an adequate choice for the mainly peptidic compounds investigated here.

Synthesis of SAA1 $\beta$ (3,4,6-Tri- $O$-acetyl-2-[ $N$-(benzyloxycarbon-yl)amino]-2-deoxy-1- $O$-methyl- $\boldsymbol{\beta}$-d-glucopyranoside, 2). 3,4,6-Tri-$O$-acetyl-2-amino-2-deoxy- $\alpha$-D-glucopyranosyl bromide hydrobromide $\mathbf{1}^{19}(123 \mathrm{~g}, 0.27 \mathrm{~mol})$ was dissolved in dry $\mathrm{MeOH}(1 \mathrm{~L})$ and pyridine $(22 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.27 \mathrm{~mol})$ added. After 6 h the solvent was evaporated and the residue dried in vacuo. $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(112 \mathrm{~g}, 1.12 \mathrm{~mol})$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1 \mathrm{~L})$ and added to EtOAc $(1.4 \mathrm{~L})$. Benzyl chloroformate (100 $\mathrm{mL}, 300 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \%$ solution in toluene) was added under vigorous stirring. After the evolution of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ stopped, the organic phase was separated, washed three times with $0.5 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and three times
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with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$, and dried $\left(\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}\right)$. The solvent was evaporated to yield $115 \mathrm{~g}(94 \%)$ as a colorless solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(250 \mathrm{MHz}$, DMSO$\left.d_{6}, 300 \mathrm{~K}\right): \delta 7.45\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}\right), 7.23-7.38\left(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right), 4.77-5.15$ $\left(\mathrm{m}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{PhCH}_{2}, \mathrm{H}^{3}, \mathrm{H}^{4}\right), 4.47\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{1}\right), 4.20\left(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{6 t}\right), 4.02(\mathrm{dd}$, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{6 \mathrm{~h}}\right), 3,79\left(\mathrm{ddd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right), 3.48\left(\mathrm{ddd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right), 3.32\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$, $1.84+1.97+2.02\left(3 \mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CO}\right) ;{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{1}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right)=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{2}, \mathrm{H}^{3}\right)=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{3}, \mathrm{H}^{4}\right)$ $=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{4}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right)=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{5}, \mathrm{H}^{6 a}\right)=4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{5}, \mathrm{H}^{6 \mathrm{~b}}\right)=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{6 \mathrm{a}}, \mathrm{H}^{6 \mathrm{~b}}\right)=12.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right)=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{NO}_{10}$ : C, 55.63 ; H, 6.00; N, 3.09. Found: C, 55.75; H, 6.00; N, 3.07.

Methyl 2-[ $N$-(Benzyloxycarbonyl)amino]-2-deoxy- $\beta$-d-glucopyranoside (3). Acetate $2(62 \mathrm{~g}, 0.14 \mathrm{~mol})$ was dissolved in dry MeOH $(400 \mathrm{~mL})$, and dimethylethylamine ( 20 mL ) was added. After 24 h the solvent was evaporated, and the residue was recrystallized from $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to yield $44 \mathrm{~g}(99 \%)$ as colorless needles. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 250 MHz , DMSO- $\left.d_{6}+10 \% \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 300 \mathrm{~K}\right): \delta 7.27-7.36\left(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right), 4.98(\mathrm{~s}$, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{PhCH}_{2}\right), 4.13\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{1}\right), 3.66\left(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{6 t}\right), 3.43\left(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{6 \mathrm{~h}}\right)$, $3.31\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 3.31-3.02\left(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{2}, \mathrm{H}^{3}, \mathrm{H}^{4} ; \mathrm{H}^{5}\right) ;{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{1}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right)$ $=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{5}, \mathrm{H}^{6 \mathrm{a}}\right)=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{6 \mathrm{a}}, \mathrm{H}^{6 \mathrm{~b}}\right)=11.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{1} \mathrm{O}_{7}$ : C, $55.04 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.47$; $\mathrm{N}, 4.28$. Found: C, 55.00; H, 6.56; N, 4.31 .

2-[ $N$-(Benzyloxycarbonyl)amino]-1- $O$-methyl-2-deoxy- $\beta$-d-glucopyranuronic Acid (4). Compound 3 ( $10.0 \mathrm{~g}, 31 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and stirred with $10 \% \mathrm{Pt} / \mathrm{C}(5.0 \mathrm{~g}$, ca. $50 \%$ $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) at $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under a stream of $\mathrm{O}_{2}$. The gas was pumped through the closed apparatus and purified by passing through 4 N NaOH . The pH of the mixture was maintained between 7 and 8 by addition of $10 \%$ $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$. Catalyst ( 2 g ) was added after 15 and 30 h . After 50 h the catalyst was removed by filtration. The filtrate was neutralized with ion exchange resin ( 20 g , Aldrich, Amberlyst 15 , strongly acidic, $\mathrm{H}^{+}$ form), stirred for 10 min , filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to 30 mL . The product crystallized at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, yielding $5.2 \mathrm{~g}(54 \%)$ as colorless needles. Mp: $142{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec. $[\alpha]^{20}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-35.7^{\circ}(c=1.0, \mathrm{MeOH}) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $250 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{DMSO}-d_{6}+10 \% \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 300 \mathrm{~K}$ ): $\delta 7.37-7.31(\mathrm{~m}$, $\left.5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right), 4.98\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{PhCH}_{2}\right), 4.61\left(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{1}\right), 3.76\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right)$, $3.45-3.35\left(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{2}, \mathrm{H}^{3}, \mathrm{H}^{4}\right), 3.23\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{1}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right)=$ $2.1 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \beta \mathrm{H}^{4}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right)=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$. FAB-MS: $342[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{8}$ : C, $52.79 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.61 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.10$. Found: C, 52.47; H, 5.68; N, 4.21.

Synthesis of SAA2 (7-Amino-2,6-anhydro-L-glycero-L-gulo-7-deoxyheptonic Acid, 5). Cbz-SAA2-OMe ${ }^{9}(0.36 \mathrm{~g}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{MeOH}(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ and treated with $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(1.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.2$ $\mathrm{mmol})$. After 1 h , ion exchange resin ( 0.5 g , Aldrich, Amberlyst 15, strongly acidic, $\mathrm{H}^{+}$form) was added and stirred for 10 min . The resin was filtered off and washed with $\mathrm{MeOH} .10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ catalyst $(50 \mathrm{mg}$ ) was added to the filtrate, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h under an hydrogen atmosphere. The catalyst was filtered off, and the solvent was removed in vacuo to yield $201 \mathrm{mg}(97 \%)$ as colorless crystals. Mp: $>250{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ dec. $[\alpha]^{20}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:-41.2^{\circ}\left(c=1, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$. FABMS: $230\left([\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}\right)$.

Synthesis of SAA3 (1,2,3,4-Tetra-O-acetyl- $\boldsymbol{\beta}$-d-glucuronic Acid Methyl Ester, 6). Glucuronolactone ( $43 \mathrm{~g}, 240 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was suspended in dry $\mathrm{MeOH}(1.5 \mathrm{~L})$, and dimethylethylamine $(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. The reaction mixture was stirred for 3 h until the glucuronolactone was dissolved. The solvent was evaporated and the foam used without purification. Acetic anhydride ( $210 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.2 \mathrm{~mol}$ ) and sodium acetate $(21 \mathrm{~g}, 260 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added, and the suspension was stirred for 8 days. The reaction mixture was poured onto 1 L ice water and stirred overnight. The $\beta$-acetate was separated by filtration, washed with water, and recrystallized from EtOAc/hexanes. The mother liquor was extracted three times with ether ( 200 mL ), and the combined ether extracts were washed with saturated sodium bicarbonate solution and brine, dried $\left(\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}\right)$, and evaporated. The resulting solid was recrystallized from $\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes to yield $42.8 \mathrm{~g}(47 \%) . R_{f}(\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes, 1:1): $0.53 ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $250 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{DMSO}-d_{6}$ ): $\delta 6.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $\left.8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{1}\right), 5.51\left(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{3}\right), 5.01(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{4}\right), 4.97\left(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right), 4.67\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right)$, $3.63\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{3}\right), 2.08-1.97\left(4 \mathrm{~s}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CO}\right)$.

2,3,4-Tri- $O$-acetyl-1-azido-1-deoxy-D-glucuronic Acid Methyl Ester (7). Trimethylsilyl azide ( $15.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 190 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to a stirred solution of acetate $6(31 \mathrm{~g}, 82 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dry $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(450 \mathrm{~mL})$
with $\mathrm{SnCl}_{4}(4.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 29 \mathrm{mmol})$. The solution was stirred at room temperature for 3 h , then diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(300 \mathrm{~mL})$, and washed three times with $10 \% \mathrm{~K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ solution $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and twice with brine $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. After drying $\left(\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}\right)$, the solution was concentrated in vacuo and recrystallized from EtOAc/hexanes to yield $26.8 \mathrm{~g}(91 \%)$ as white solid. $R_{f}\left(\right.$ EtOAc/hexanes, 1:1): 0.60; ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $(250 \mathrm{MHz}$, DMSO$\left.d_{6}\right): \delta 5.40\left(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{3}\right), 5.19\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{1}\right)$, $5.05\left(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{4}\right), 4.87\left(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right), 4.57(\mathrm{~d}$, $\left.J=9.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right), 3.66\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{OCH}_{3}\right), 2.04-1.98\left(3 \mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}-\right.$ CO); FAB-MS: $360\left(3,[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\right), 317\left(66,\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{N}_{3}\right]^{+}\right), 257(23)$, 154 (100). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9}$ : C, 43.46; H, 4.77; N, 11.70. Found: C, 43.27; H, 4.77; N, 11.61.

Synthesis of SAA4 (2-[(Benzyloxycarbonyl)amino]-3,4,6-tri- $\boldsymbol{O}$ -benzyl-2-deoxy-d-glucosamine, 10). Benzyl chloroformate ( 4.9 mL , $14 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \%$ solution in toluene) diluted in $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ was slowly added to a solution of $\mathbf{9}^{24}(7.0 \mathrm{~g}, 14 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(6.0$ $\mathrm{g}, 71 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{MeOH}(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 3 h additional $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ ( $6.0 \mathrm{~g}, 71 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and benzyl chloroformate $(2.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 7.2 \mathrm{mmol})$ were added, and the suspension was stirred overnight at room temperature. The reaction mixture was concentrated, suspended in EtOAc (1 L), filtered, and concentrated again. The crude product was crystallized from EtOAc/hexanes to yield $8.03 \mathrm{~g}(90 \%)$ as colorless crystals. $R_{f}$ (hexanes/acetone, 1:2): 0.39. Mp: 192-193 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (hexanes/EtOAc). $[\alpha]^{20}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}:+57.7\left(c=1.06, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(250 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$, DMSO- $\left.d_{6}\right):$ $7.42\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}\right), 7.34-7.18\left(\mathrm{~m}, 20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{\text {arom }}\right), 6.75(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{HO}), 5.12-4.95\left(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{PhCH}_{2}, \mathrm{H}^{1}\right), 4.77-4.43(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{PhCH}_{2}\right), 3.44-3.35(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $76.7 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{DMSO}-d_{6}$ ): 156.2 , 138.9, 138.4, 138.3, 137.2, 128.3-127.3, 91.3, 79.8, 78.7, 74.1, 74.0, 72.4, 69.9, 69.3, 65.3, 55.8. FAB-MS: $566\left(4,\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\mathrm{H}\right]^{+}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{37} \mathrm{NO}_{7}$ : C, 72.02; H, 6.39; N, 2.40. Found: C , 72.14; H, 6.44; N, 2.41.

Tributyl[2-[(benzyloxycarbonyl)amino]-3,4,6-tri- $O$-benzyl-2-deoxy-$\boldsymbol{\beta}$-d-glucopyranosyl]stannane (11). Compound 10 ( $7.0 \mathrm{~g}, 12 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was treated with $\mathrm{SOCl}_{2}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ at room temperature for 30 min and concentrated to dryness, and the product was coevaporated with dry $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The yellow solid was dissolved in dry THF (100 mL ) and added within 20 min to a solution of $\mathrm{Bu}_{3} \mathrm{SnLi}^{23 \mathrm{~b}, 61}$ in THF (ca. 3 equiv) at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The mixture was stirred for 1 h at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, quenched with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, warmed to room temperature, diluted with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and extracted twice with EtOAc (700 $\mathrm{mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried $\left(\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}\right)$ and concentrated to afford a yellow oil. Purification was achieved by FC (hexanes/ EtOAc, gradient 1:0 to $4: 1$ ) to yield $8.10 \mathrm{~g}(79 \%)$ as colorless oil. $R_{f}$ (hexanes/acetone, 3:1): 0.91. $[\alpha]^{20} \mathrm{D}:-2.7\left(c=1.0, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 7.64\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}\right.$ ), 7.34-7.12(m, $\left.20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{\text {arom }}\right), 5.06-4.44\left(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{PhCH}_{2}\right), 3.79(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.67-3.57(\mathrm{~m}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 3.49-3.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): 170.6, 155.8, 138.5, 138.2, 138.1, 137.1, 128.3-127.2, 83.7, 78.0, 77.7, 74.2, 73.9, $72.3,65.2,54.5$. FAB-MS (calcd for $\left.\mathrm{C}_{47} \mathrm{H}_{63} \mathrm{NO}_{6}{ }^{120} \mathrm{Sn}\right): 801(40,[\mathrm{M}$ $-\mathrm{Bu}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$), 711 (6), 291 (20, $\left[\mathrm{SnBu}_{3}\right]^{+}$), 236 (40), 180 (100). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{47} \mathrm{H}_{63} \mathrm{NO}_{6} \mathrm{Sn}$ : C, $65.89 ; \mathrm{H}, 7.41$; N, 1.63; Found: C, 66.12; H, 7.33; N, 1.65.

Conversion of 11 with $\mathbf{B u L i}$ and Addition of $\mathrm{CO}_{\mathbf{2}}$. Stannane 11 $(8.1 \mathrm{~g}, 9.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in dry THF $(60 \mathrm{~mL})$. At $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, $\mathrm{BuLi}(5.9 \mathrm{~mL} 1.6 \mathrm{M}$ solution in hexanes, 9.5 mmol$)$ was added within 10 min . The reaction mixture was then warmed to $-55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and BuLi $(7.1 \mathrm{~mL}, 11 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added within 5 min while the color of the solution changed to deep red. $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ was pumped for 15 min through the reaction mixture which was quenched after 1 h with $10 \% \mathrm{KHSO}_{4}$ solution ( 50 mL ) at $-55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, warmed to room temperature, and extracted twice with EtOAc $(500 \mathrm{~mL})$. Purification was achieved by FC (hexanes/acetone, 1:0, 1:1, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH} / \mathrm{HOAc}, 50: 7: 3$ ) to afford $\mathbf{1 3}$ in $4.77 \mathrm{~g}(83 \%)$ as colorless solid, $\mathbf{1 1}$ in $0.46 \mathrm{~g}(5.7 \%)$ and $\mathbf{1 4}$ in 0.59 g ( $11 \%$ ).

3-[(Benzyloxycarbonyl)amino]-2,6-anhydro-4,5,7-tri- $O$-benzyl-D-glycero-D-gulo-heptonic Acid (13). $R_{f}\left(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}, 1: 3\right): ~ 0.59$. Mp: $155{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .[\alpha]^{20} \mathrm{D}:+15.1\left(c=1.0, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}(500 \mathrm{MHz}$, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ): $\delta 7.64\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}\right), 7.34-7.12\left(\mathrm{~m}, 20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{\text {arom }}\right)$, 5.06-4.44 (m, 8H, $\left.\mathrm{PhCH}_{2}\right), 3.80-3.78(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.67-3.57(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 3.49-3.41 (m, 2H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ): 170.6, 155.8,
(61) Prahash, H.; Silser, H. H. Inorg. Chem. 1972, 11, 2258-2259.
138.5, 138.2, 138.1, 137.1, 128.3-127.2, 83.7, 78.0, 77.7, 74.2, 73.9, $72.3,68.7,65.2,54.5$. FAB-MS: $634\left(28,[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}\right), 517(18), 182$ (34), 147 (100). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{37} \mathrm{NO}_{8}: \mathrm{C}, 70.69 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.09$; N, 2.29. Found: C, 70.71; H, 6.03; N, 2.33.

Treatment of 13 with Trimethylsilyl Iodide, followed by FmocONSu. Acid $13(1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 1.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in dry $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(10$ mL ) at room temperature in a Falcon tube. Trimethylsilyl iodide (0.49 $\mathrm{mL}, 4.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 12 min, treated with $\mathrm{MeOH}(100 \mu \mathrm{~L})$, diluted with THF $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, and treated with Fmoc-ONSu ( $720 \mathrm{mg}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The pH of the solution was maintained at $7-8$ by addition of DIEA, and the completion of the reaction was followed by HPLC $\left(30 \rightarrow 90\right.$, B in A, $30 \mathrm{~min}: t_{\mathrm{R}^{-}}$ $($ amine $)=20.4$ vs $t_{\mathrm{R}}($ urethane $\left.)=26.4 \mathrm{~min}\right)$. After 14 and 24 h additional Fmoc-ONSu was added. Purification was achieved by FC (acetone/hexanes, 1:3, and acetone/hexanes $(+0.1 \% \mathrm{TFA})$, gradient 1:2 to $2: 1$ ) to yield $\mathbf{1 5}$ in $546 \mathrm{mg}(48 \%), \mathbf{1 6}$ in 62 mg ( $6.3 \%$ ), and $\mathbf{1 7}$ in 223 mg ( $17 \%$ ).

3-[(9-Fluorenylmethoxycarbonyl)amino]-2,6-anhydro-4,5,7-tri- $O$ -benzyl-3-deoxy-D-glycero-D-gulo-heptonic Acid (15). $\quad R_{f}\left(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} /\right.$ $\mathrm{MeOH}, 1: 3): 0.79 . t_{\mathrm{R}} 20.9 \mathrm{~min}(58 \rightarrow 72$, B in $\mathrm{A}, 30 \mathrm{~min}) .[\alpha]^{20}{ }_{\mathrm{D}}$ : $+13.8(c=0.92$, THF $) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500.13 MHz, DMSO- $\left.d_{6}\right): \delta 12.84$ (s, 1 H, HOOC), $7.87(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.66-7.62(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.41-7.16\left(\mathrm{~m}, 19 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{\text {arom }}\right), 4.71-4.54(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{PhCH}_{2}\right), 4.31(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=10.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.25-4.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{PhCH}_{2}\right), 3.86\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right), 3.77-3.60\left(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{3}, \mathrm{H}^{4}, \mathrm{H}^{5}, \mathrm{H}^{6}\right)$, $3.49\left(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{7}\right) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ): 169.7, 155.7, 143.9, 143.7, 140.7, 138.4, 138.1, 138.0, 128.5-126.9, 125.2, 125.0, 120.1, $83.2\left(\mathrm{C}^{4}\right), 78.2\left(\mathrm{C}^{2}\right), 77.6\left(\mathrm{C}^{5}, \mathrm{C}^{6}\right), 74.2,74.0,72.3,68.8\left(\mathrm{C}^{7}\right), 65.7$, $54.4\left(\mathrm{C}^{3}\right), 46.6\left(\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{H}}\right)$. FAB-MS: $722\left(6,[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}\right), 700(24,[\mathrm{M}+$ $1]^{+}$), 478 (10), 179 (100). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{37} \mathrm{NO}_{8}: \mathrm{C}, 73.80 ; \mathrm{H}$, 5.90; N, 2.00. Found: C, 73.70; H, 5.92; N, 2.01.

Cbz-SAA1 $\alpha$-Phe-Leu-OMe. General Procedure for Coupling of Peptide and SAA. In a representative experiment, H-Phe-Leu-OMe was dissolved in THF ( 5 mL ) and cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Cbz-SAA $1 \alpha-\mathrm{OH}$ $(0.68 \mathrm{~g}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol})$, $\mathrm{HOBt}(0.3 \mathrm{~g}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol})$, and $\mathrm{EDCl} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}(0.40 \mathrm{~g}$, 2.1 mmol ) were added. The pH was adjusted to 7 by dropwise addition of NMM ( N -methylmorpholine). After 10 h the solvent was evaporated and the residue dissolved in EtOAc $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solution was washed three times with $0.5 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and three times with aqueous $5 \%$ $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried $\left(\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}\right)$ and concentrated to yield $0.90 \mathrm{~g}(73 \%)$ as a colorless solid.

Cbz-Tyr-SAA1 $\alpha$-Phe-Leu-OMe. General Procedure for Removal of Cbz Protecting Group. In a representative experiment CbzSAA1 $\alpha$-Phe-Leu-OMe ( $0.62 \mathrm{~g}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in MeOH (5 $\mathrm{mL}), 10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ catalyst $(50 \mathrm{mg})$ was added, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h under an $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ atmosphere. The catalyst was filtered off, and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The residue was coupled with Cbz-Tyr-OH ( $0.32 \mathrm{~g}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) as mentioned above. After 10 h the solvent was evaporated, and the residue was chromatographed on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}, 12: 1\right)$ to afford $0.41 \mathrm{~g}(53 \%)$ as a colorless solid. $R_{f}\left(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}, 12: 1\right): 0.20$.

H-Tyr-SAA1 $\alpha$-Phe-Leu-OMe•HCl (19). Cbz-Tyr-SAA1 $\alpha$-Phe-Leu-OMe ( $155 \mathrm{mg}, 0.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was hydrogenated as above. The catalyst was filtered off, a saturated solution of HCl in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added, and the solvent was removed in vacuo to give $112 \mathrm{mg}(94 \%)$ as a colorless solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{DMSO}-d_{6}, 300 \mathrm{~K}$ ): 9.25 (s, 1 H , HO-Tyr), $8.49\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{SAA} 1 \alpha \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}\right.$ ) $8.27\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, LeuH $^{\mathrm{N}}$ ), 8.17 (d, 1 H , PheH ${ }^{\mathrm{N}}$ ), $7.97\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{TyrH}^{\mathrm{N}}\right), 7.28-7.15\left(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right), 7.13(\mathrm{~d}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\operatorname{TyrH}^{3^{\prime}}\right), 6.68$ (d, 2H, Tyr TyrH ${ }^{2}$ ), $5.23-5.10$ (m, 2H, HO-SAA1 $\alpha$ ), $4.58\left(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{PheH}^{\alpha}, \mathrm{SAA} 1 \alpha \mathrm{H}^{1}\right.$ ), 4.27 (ddd, 2H, LeuH ${ }^{\alpha}$ ), 3.96 (ddd, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{TyrH}^{\alpha}$ ), $3.89\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{SAA} 1 \alpha \mathrm{H}^{5}\right), 3.72\left(\mathrm{ddd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{SAA} 1 \alpha \mathrm{H}^{2}\right), 3.63$ (s, 3H, LeuOMe), 3.57 (dd, 1H, SAA1 $\alpha \mathrm{H}^{3}$ ), $3.38\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{SAA} 1 \alpha \mathrm{H}^{4}\right)$, 3.26 (s, 3H, SAA1 $\alpha \mathrm{OMe}$ ), 3.08, 2.82 (m, 4H, PheH ${ }^{\beta}, \mathrm{TyrH}^{\beta}$ ), 1.70$1.45\left(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{LeuH}^{\beta}, \mathrm{LeuH}^{\gamma}\right), 0.85+0.90\left(2 \mathrm{~d}, 6 \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{LeuH}^{\delta}\right)$; ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \alpha \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{1}\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \alpha \mathrm{H}^{1}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right)=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \alpha \mathrm{H}^{4}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right)=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{PheH}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}\right)=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{LeuH}^{\gamma}, \mathrm{H}^{\delta}\right)=$ $6.1 \mathrm{~Hz} .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{DMSO}-d_{6}, 300 \mathrm{~K}\right): \delta 72.1\left(\mathrm{C}^{4}\right), 71.2$ $\left(\mathrm{C}^{5}\right), 70.2\left(\mathrm{C}^{3}\right), 54.7(\mathrm{SAA} 1 \alpha \mathrm{OMe}), 53.5\left(\mathrm{C}^{2}\right), 53.4\left(\mathrm{PheC}^{\alpha}\right), 53.0$ $\left(\mathrm{TyrC}^{\alpha}\right), 51.7(\mathrm{LeuOMe}), 50.3\left(\mathrm{LeuC}^{\alpha}\right), 39.4\left(\mathrm{LeuC}^{\beta}\right), 36.9\left(\mathrm{TyrC}^{\beta}\right)$, $36.0\left(\mathrm{PheC}^{\beta}\right)$, $23.9\left(\mathrm{LeuC}^{\gamma}\right), 22.5\left(\mathrm{LeuC}^{\delta}\right), 21.1\left(\mathrm{LeuC}^{\delta}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{45} \mathrm{ClN}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{10}$ : C, 56.42; H, 6.66; N, 8.22. Found: C, 56.44; H, 6.68; N, 8.21.

Table 4. Proton and Carbon Chemical Shifts of $\mathbf{2 6}$ and Temperature Coefficients

| ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} /{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ | SAA2 |  | Phe |  | D-Trp |  | Lys |  | Thr |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | 7.62 |  | 7.38 |  | 8.51 |  | 8.54 |  | 7.26 |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\alpha} / \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.49 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $77.2$ | 4.53 | 52.3 | 4.32 | 54.6 | 3.91 | 53.3 | 4.20 | 57.6 |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\beta} / \mathrm{C}^{\beta}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.09 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{3}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72.3 \\ & \left(\mathrm{C}^{3}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 2.96/2.81 | 37.8 | 2.99/2.83 | 26.5 | $1.60{ }^{\text {pros }} / 1.39{ }^{\text {proR }}$ | 30.8 | 3.90 | 66.5 |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\gamma} / \mathrm{C}^{\gamma}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.16 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{4}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76.7 \\ & \left(\mathrm{C}^{4}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 10.78 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  | 0.94 | 22.8 | 0.96 | 18.5 |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\delta} / \mathrm{C}^{\delta}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.98 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{5}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70.6 \\ & \left(C^{5}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $6.85-7.10$ | 125.7-128.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.09 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 123.3 \\ & \left(\mathrm{C}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 1.24 | 28.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.95 \\ & (\mathrm{OH}) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\epsilon} / \mathrm{C}^{\epsilon}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.14 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{6}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78.3 \\ & \left(\mathrm{C}^{6}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 7.55 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{4}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 117.9 \\ & \left(\mathrm{C}^{4}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 2.88 | 39.9 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{7} / \mathrm{C}^{7}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.28 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{proR}}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39.6 \\ & \left(\mathrm{C}^{7}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 7.02 \\ & \left(H^{5}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 117.7 \\ & \left(\mathrm{C}^{5}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.98 \\ & (\mathrm{HN}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 3.41 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{proS}}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 7.09 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{6}\right) \\ & 7.35 \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}^{7}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120.4 \\ & \left(\mathrm{C}^{6}\right) \\ & 110.9 \\ & \left(\mathrm{C}^{7}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.98 \\ & \left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}(\mathrm{Cbz})\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65.0 \\ & \left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}(\mathrm{Cbz})\right) \\ & 127-128+110.0 \\ & \left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}(\mathrm{Cbz})\right) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\Delta \delta / \Delta \mathrm{T}[\mathrm{ppb} / \mathrm{K}]$ for the amide H | -6.8 |  | -1.8 |  | -9.8 |  | -6.8 |  | -0.5 |  |

Cbz-SAA2-Phe-Leu-OMe. Cbz-SAA2-OMe ( $180 \mathrm{mg}, 0.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{MeOH}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(0.75 \mathrm{~mL})$. After 2 h HOBt ( $75 \mathrm{mg}, 0.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added, and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The Cbz group of Cbz-Phe-Leu-OMe ( $320 \mathrm{mg}, 0.75 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was removed as described above, and the deprotected compound was dissolved in THF ( 5 mL ). This solution was given to the residue of the saponification and coupled with EDCI (see above). After 10 h the solvent was evaporated, and the residue was purified by $\mathrm{FC}\left(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} /\right.$ $\mathrm{MeOH}, 9: 1)$ to yield pure 30 in 220 mg ( $71 \%$ ) as a colorless solid. FAB-MS: $638[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$.

H-Tyr-SAA2-Phe-Leu-OMe•HCI (20). The Cbz group of Cbz-SAA2-Phe-Leu-OMe ( $220 \mathrm{mg}, 0.36 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was removed and coupled with EDCI as above. The solvent was evaporated, and the residue was chromatographed on silica gel $\left(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}, 9: 1\right)$. For the removal of the Boc group the purified peptide was treated with saturated $\mathrm{HCl} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{MeSH}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ for 1 h . The solvent was removed in vacuo to give $185 \mathrm{mg}(75 \%) \mathbf{2 0}$ as a colorless solid. FABMS: $645[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} ;{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}, 300 \mathrm{~K}$ ): $\delta 9.37$ ( $\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{HO}-\mathrm{Tyr}$ ), $8.43\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, LeuH $\left.^{\mathrm{N}}\right), 8.41\left(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, SAA2H $\left.^{\mathrm{N}}\right), 8.06$ $\left(\mathrm{d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{PheH}^{\mathrm{N}}\right), 8.04\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{TyrH}^{\mathrm{N}}\right), 7.28-7.15\left(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right), 7.02$ (d, 2H, TyrH ${ }^{3}$ ), 6.72 (d, 2H, TyrH ${ }^{3}$ ), 5.14 (m, 3H, 3 HO-SAA2), 4.55 (ddd, 1H, PheH ${ }^{\alpha}$ ), $4.30\left(\mathrm{ddd}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right.$, LeuH $\left.^{\alpha}\right), 3.93\left(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{TyrH}^{\alpha}\right), 3.65$ (dd, 1H, H ${ }^{7 \mathrm{t}}\left(\right.$ pro-R)), $3.61\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}\right.$, LeuOMe), $3.57\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right), 3.19$ (ddd, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{4}$ ), 3.16 (ddd, 1H, H ${ }^{3}$ ), 3.11 (dd, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{PheH}^{\beta t}$ ), 3.03 (ddd, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{6}\right), 2.98\left(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{7 \mathrm{~h}}\right.$ (pro-S)), $2.95\left(\mathrm{ddd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right), 2.91(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{TyrH}^{\beta \mathrm{t}}\right), 2.83$ (dd, H, $\mathrm{TyrH}^{\beta h}$ ), 2.82 (dd, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{PheH}^{\beta \mathrm{h}}$ ), 1.65-1.50 (m, $\left.3 \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{LeuH}^{\beta}, \mathrm{LeuH}^{\gamma}\right), 0.83+0.88\left(2 \mathrm{~d}, 6 \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{LeuH}^{\delta}\right) ;{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{TyrH}^{\alpha}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta \mathrm{t}}\right)$ $=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{TyrH}^{\alpha}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta \mathrm{h}}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{TyrH}^{\beta t}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta \mathrm{h}}\right)=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 2 \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{7 \mathrm{t}}(\right.$ pro-R $\left.)\right)=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA}^{2} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{7}(\right.$ pro-S $\left.)\right)=4.7 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 2 \mathrm{H}^{7 \mathrm{t}}, \mathrm{H}^{7 \mathrm{~h}}\right)=12.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 2 \mathrm{H}^{7 \mathrm{t}}(\right.$ pro- $\left.R), \mathrm{H}^{6}\right)=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA}^{2} \mathrm{H}^{7 \mathrm{~h}}(\right.$ pro-S $\left.), \mathrm{H}^{6}\right)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 2 \mathrm{H}^{4}, \mathrm{H}^{3}\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, ${ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{SAA} 2 \mathrm{H}^{3}, \mathrm{H}^{2}\right)=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{PheH}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}\right)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{PheH}^{\alpha}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta t}\right)=$ $9.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{PheH}^{\alpha}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta \mathrm{h}}\right)=5.5 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J\left(\mathrm{PheH}^{\beta \mathrm{t}}, \mathrm{H}^{\beta \mathrm{h}}\right)=13.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} J($ Leu$\left.\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz} .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$, DMSO- $\left.d_{6}, 300 \mathrm{~K}\right): \delta=130.0$ $\left(\mathrm{TyrC}^{2}\right), 125.3+127.7+128.7\left(\mathrm{Phe}^{\text {arom }}\right), 115.0\left(\mathrm{TyrC}^{2}\right), 78.1\left(\mathrm{C}^{2}\right)$, $78.1\left(\mathrm{C}^{6}\right), 77.1\left(\mathrm{C}^{4}\right), 72.0\left(\mathrm{C}^{3}\right), 71.2\left(\mathrm{C}^{5}\right), 53.8\left(\mathrm{PheC}^{\alpha}\right), 53.5\left(\mathrm{TyrC}^{\alpha}\right)$, $51.7\left(\mathrm{LeuOCH}_{3}\right), 50.2\left(\mathrm{LeuC}^{\alpha}\right), 40.8\left(\mathrm{C}^{7}\right), 39.3\left(\mathrm{LeuC}^{\beta}\right), 37.1\left(\mathrm{PheC}^{\beta}\right)$, $36.2\left(\mathrm{TyrC}^{\beta}\right), 24.3\left(\mathrm{LeuC}^{\gamma}\right), 22.5\left(\mathrm{LeuC}^{\delta \mathrm{a}}\right), 21.2\left(\mathrm{LeuC}^{\delta \mathrm{b}}\right)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{45} \mathrm{ClN}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{10}$ : C, $56.42 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.66 ; \mathrm{N}, 8.22$. Found: C, $52.78 ; \mathrm{H}$, 5.96; N, 7.32.

Cbz-SAA2-Phe-d-Trp-OMe (22). Cbz-SAA2-OMe (0.72 g, 2.0 $\mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{MeOH}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(3.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. After $2 \mathrm{~h} \mathrm{HOBt}(300 \mathrm{mg}, 2.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added, and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The Boc group of $21(0.92 \mathrm{~g}, 1.84 \mathrm{mmol})$ was removed by adding HCl in ether ( 4 mL , saturated at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) to a stirred solution of the protected peptide with addition of $\mathrm{MeSH}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ as a scavenger. The solution was stirred at room temperature for 30 min and evaporated in vacuo. The deprotected compound was dissolved in THF ( 10 mL ). This solution was added to the residue of the saponification and coupled as above. After 10 h the solvent was evaporated, and the residue was dissolved in EtOAc ( 100 mL ). The
solution was washed three times with $0.5 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and three times with aqueous $5 \% \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried $\left(\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}\right)$ and concentrated. The product was precipitated in $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to yield $0.81 \mathrm{~g}(59 \%)$ as a colorless solid.

Boc-Lys(Cbz)-Thr-SAA2-Phe-D-Trp-OMe (24). Compound 23 $(0.50 \mathrm{~g}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{MeOH}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$, THF $(5 \mathrm{~mL})$, and $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(1.5 \mathrm{~mL})$. After $2 \mathrm{~h} \mathrm{HOBt}(150 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added, and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The Cbz group of $22(0.69 \mathrm{~g}$, 1.0 mmol ) was removed as described above, and the deprotected compound was dissolved in THF ( 8 mL ) and DMF ( 2 mL ). This solution was added to the residue of the saponification and coupled as above. After 10 h the solvent was evaporated, and the residue was chromatographed $\left(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}, 4: 1\right)$ to give $0.74 \mathrm{~g}(73 \%)$ of 24 as a colorless solid.

Cyclo(-SAA2-Phe-D-Trp-Lys(Cbz)-Thr-) (26). 24 (0.51 g, 0.5 mmol) was dissolved in $\mathrm{MeOH}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$, THF ( 5 mL ), and 1 N NaOH ( 0.75 mL ). After 4 h ion exchange resin ( 1 g , Aldrich, Amberlyst 15, strongly acidic, $\mathrm{H}^{+}$form) was added and stirred for 10 min . The resin was filtered off, and the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo. The residue was treated with saturated $\mathrm{HCl} / \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{MeSH}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ for 1 h . The solvent was removed in vacuo, and the residue was dissolved in DMF ( 0.5 L ). HOBt ( $90 \mathrm{mg}, 0.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), DIEA $(0.43 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$, and TBTU ( $190 \mathrm{mg}, 0.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added under stirring. After 1 h the solvent was removed in vacuo. The residue was chromatographed $\left(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}, 4: 1\right)$ to give $246 \mathrm{mg}(56 \%)$ of $\mathbf{2 6}$ as a colorless solid. FAB-MS: $887[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{45} \mathrm{H}_{55} \mathrm{~N}_{7} \mathrm{O}_{12}$ : C, 61.01; H, 6.26; N, 11.07. Found: C, 59.39; H, 6.14; N, 10.40 .

Cyclo(-SAA2-Phe-d-Trp-Lys-Thr-) (27). The Cbz group of 26 (30 $\mathrm{mg}, 0.033 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was removed as described above. The product was lyophilized from $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{tBuOH}(1: 1)$ to give 24 mg ( $97 \%$ ) of 27 as a colorless solid. FAB-MS: $753[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$.

Cbz-Thr(tBu)-SAA3(tri- $\boldsymbol{O}$-acetyl)-OMe (28). Azide 7 (3.7 g, 10.4 $\mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in THF $(140 \mathrm{~mL})$, and $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(1 \mathrm{~g})$ was added. After 10 min of ultrasonification the reaction mixture was hydrogenated on an ice bath for 2 h . The solution was reduced in vacuo. Cbz-Thr-(tBu)-OH was prepared from DCHA salt by dissolving Cbz-Thr(tBu) $\mathrm{OH} \cdot \mathrm{DCHA}(5.1 \mathrm{~g}, 10.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ in EtOAc $(600 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washing the organic phase four times with 1 N HCl and once with brine. After being dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, the solvent was evaporated. The foam was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$, IIDQ ( 3.04 g ) was added on an ice bath, and the reaction mixture was stirred overnight. The solvent was evaporated. FC (EtOAc/hexanes, 1:1) yielded 3.5 g (54\%) as a white solid. $R_{f}(\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes, 2:1): 0.60 .

Cbz-Lys(Boc)-Thr(tBu)-SAA3(tri- $O$-acetyl)-OMe (30). Compound $28(1.9 \mathrm{~g}, 3.05 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in EtOAc $(60 \mathrm{~mL})$ and after addition of $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(900 \mathrm{mg})$ hydrogenated for 1 h . The solution was filtered through Celite. Cbz-Lys(Boc)-ONSu ( $1.45 \mathrm{~g}, 3.04 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in EtOAc ( 30 mL ), and NMM was added to adjust the pH to 8. After being stirred overnight the solvent was evaporated and subjected to FC (EtOAc/hexanes, 1:1) to yield $2.2 \mathrm{~g}(85 \%) . R_{f}(\mathrm{EtOAc} /$ hexanes, 2:1): 0.33.

Table 5. Proton and Carbon Chemical Shifts of the Major Conformation of $\mathbf{3 3}$ and Temperature Coefficients

| ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} /{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ | SAA3 |  | Phe |  | D-Trp |  | Lys |  | Thr |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | 8.47 |  | 7.55 |  | 8.27 |  | 8.36 |  | 7.17 |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\alpha} / \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ | 4.37 | 81.0 | 4.35 | 53.4 | 4.42 | 54.2 | 3.86 | 53.9 | 4.00 | 54.0 |
|  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{1}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{C}^{1}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\beta} / \mathrm{C}^{\beta}$ | 3.60 | 70.6 | 2.98/2.87 | 35.8 | 2.96/2.82 | 27.0 | $1.55{ }^{\text {proS }} / 1.37 \mathrm{proR}$ | 31.0 | 3.87 | 66.3 |
|  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{2}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{C}^{2}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\gamma} / \mathrm{C}^{\gamma}$ | $3.18$ | 76.4 |  |  | 10.75 |  | 0.9 | 22.8 | 1.04 | 19.0 |
|  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{3}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{C}^{3}\right)$ |  |  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\delta} / \mathrm{C}^{\delta}$ | 3.30 | 72.4 | 6.93/7.07/7.12 | 129.0/127.8/125.8 | 7.00 | 121.5 | 1.22 | 29.0 |  |  |
|  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{4}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{C}^{4}\right)$ |  |  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{2}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{C}^{2}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\epsilon} / \mathrm{C}^{\epsilon}$ | 3.62 | 77.7 |  |  | 7.50 | 118.0 | 2.80 | 39.5 |  |  |
|  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{5}\right)$ | $\left(C^{5}\right)$ |  |  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{4}\right)$ | $\left(C^{4}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 6.98 | $118.0$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}: 6.74$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{5}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{C}^{5}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 7.07 | 120.7 | Boc: 1.35 | Boc: 22 | $t$-Bu 1.12 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{6}\right)$ | $\left(C^{6}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 7.35 | 111.2 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\left(\mathrm{H}^{7}\right)$ | $\left(\mathrm{C}^{7}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\Delta \delta / \Delta \mathrm{T}[\mathrm{ppb} / \mathrm{K}]$ for the amide H | $-7.0$ |  | 0.0 |  | -5.9 |  | $-7.3$ |  | 0.0 |  |

Table 6. Proton and Carbon Chemical Shifts for the Major Conformation of $\mathbf{3 6}$ and Temperature Coefficients

| ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} /{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ | SAA4 |  | $\mathrm{Ala}^{2}$ |  | Pro ${ }^{3}$ |  | $\mathrm{Ala}^{4}$ |  | $\mathrm{Ala}^{5}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} / \mathrm{CO}$ | 7.99 | 167.3 | 7.73 | 170.4 |  | 171.9 | 8.58 | 172.2 | 7.54 | 170.1 |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\alpha} / \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ | $3.53\left(\mathrm{H}^{1}\right)$ | 79.7( $\mathrm{C}^{1}$ ) | 4.31 | 46.2 | 4.13 | 59.0 | 3.92 | 49.1 | 4.06 | 49.4 |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\beta} / \mathrm{C}^{\beta}$ | $3.97\left(\mathrm{H}^{2}\right)$ | 51.5( $\mathrm{C}^{2}$ ) | 1.22 | 16.0 | $1.98{ }^{\text {proR }} / 1.79{ }^{\text {proS }}$ | 28.2 | 1.25 | 17.0 | 1.15 | 17.3 |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\gamma} / \mathrm{C}^{\gamma}$ | $3.17\left(\mathrm{H}^{3}\right)$ | 75.4( $\mathrm{C}^{3}$ ) |  |  | 2.12/1.88 | 24.6 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{H}^{\delta} / \mathrm{C}^{\delta}$ | $3.25\left(\mathrm{H}^{4}\right)$ | 69.6( $\mathrm{C}^{4}$ ) |  |  | 3.65/3.51 | 46.2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $3.12\left(\mathrm{H}^{5}\right)$ | 80.9( $\mathrm{C}^{5}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $3.65 / 3.49\left(\mathrm{H}^{6}\right)$ | 60.8( $\mathrm{C}^{6}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\Delta \delta / \Delta T[\mathrm{ppb} / \mathrm{K}]$ for the amide H | $-6.5$ |  | $-5.2$ |  |  |  | $-6.9$ |  | -0.1 |  |

Cbz-Lys(Boc)-Thr(tBu)-SAA3-Phe-d-Trp-OMe (31). Cbz-Lys( Boc )- $\operatorname{Thr}(\mathrm{tBu})-\mathrm{SAA} 3$ (tri- $O$-acetyl)-OMe $(1.1 \mathrm{~g}, 1.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in THF ( 20 mL ) and $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(5.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ added. After 3 h Amberlyst $15(1.7 \mathrm{~g})$ was added and the suspension stirred for 15 min . The solid was removed by filtration. The solution was used without further purification. Cbz-Phe-d-Trp-OMe (29) (640 mg, 1.3 mmol ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{MeOH}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$, and after addition of $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(320$ mg ) the solution was hydrogenated for 1 h . The solvent was evaporated and the foam redissolved in THF ( 10 mL ) and added to the Cbz-Lys-(Boc)-Thr(tBu)-SAA3-OH. The solution was cooled on an ice bath, and $\mathrm{EDCl} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}(290 \mathrm{mg}, 1.5 \mathrm{mmol}), \mathrm{HOBt}(235 \mathrm{mg}, 1.5 \mathrm{mmol})$, and NMM ( $380 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) were added. The reaction mixture was stirred overnight. The solvent was evaporated and after redissolving EtOAc $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ washed three times ( 50 mL each) with 1 N HCl , three times with saturated $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$, and once with brine. The organic phase was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and the solvent removed by evaporation. $\mathrm{FC}\left(\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} /\right.$ $\mathrm{MeOH}, 15: 1)$ gave 1.05 g of a white solid in $77 \%$ yield. $R_{f}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} /\right.$ $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 4: 1$ ): 0.71.

H-Lys(Boc)-Thr(tBu)-SAA3-Phe-d-Trp-OH (32). Methyl ester 31 ( $360 \mathrm{mg}, 0.34 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{MeOH}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$, and THF ( 20 $\mathrm{mL})$ and $1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added. After 3 h Amberlyst 15 $(0.6 \mathrm{~g})$ was added, and the mixture was stirred for 15 min . The resin was removed by filtration and the solvent evaporated. The foam was redisolved in $\mathrm{MeOH}(20 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and after addition of $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(200$ mg ) hydrogenated for 1 h . After evaporation of the solvent the foam was purified by preparative $\operatorname{HPLC}\left(35 \rightarrow 55\right.$, B in A, $30 \mathrm{~min}, t_{\mathrm{R}} 11.2$ $\mathrm{min})$, yielding $150 \mathrm{mg}(48 \%) . R_{f}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 4: 1\right): 0.59$.

Cyclo(-Lys(Boc)-Thr(tBu)-SAA3-Phe-D-Trp-) (33). The linear peptide $32(45 \mathrm{mg}, 0.05 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in NMP $(250 \mathrm{~mL})$ and water $(0.45 \mathrm{~mL})$ added. The solution was stirred for 15 min and added dropwise to the coupling mixture of $\mathrm{HOBt}(38.3 \mathrm{~g}, 0.25 \mathrm{mmol})$, TBTU ( $48.2 \mathrm{~g}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and DIEA $(45 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ in NMP $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ over 1 h . The solvent was evaporated, and the peptide was purified by preparative HPLC ( $35 \rightarrow 55$, B in A, $30 \mathrm{~min}, t_{\mathrm{R}} 20.2 \mathrm{~min}$ ) to yield $10 \mathrm{mg}(22 \%)$. FAB-MS: $894[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$.

Cyclo(-SAA4-Ala-d-Pro-Ala-Ala-) (36). Fmoc-Ala-OH (0.2 g, 0.7 $\mathrm{mmol})$ was coupled to 2-chlorotrityl chloride resin $(0.4 \mathrm{~g}, 1.25 \mathrm{mmol}$ $\mathrm{Cl}^{-} / \mathrm{g}$ resin) which was used to initiate the synthesis with Fmoc-d-

Pro-OH ( $0.236 \mathrm{~g}, 0.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), Fmoc-Ala-OH ( $0.218 \mathrm{~g}, 0.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and 15 ( $0.315 \mathrm{~g}, 0.46 \mathrm{mmol})$ for chain elongation; TBTU/HOBt was used for activation. The peptide was cleaved with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} /$ trifluoroethanol/ HOAc ( $8: 1: 1$ ) to yield 265 mg ( $82 \%$ ) of crude H-Ala-SAA4-(tri- $O$ -benzyl)-Ala-D-Pro-Ala-OH (34), which was purified by preparative HPLC $\left(40 \rightarrow 70\right.$, B in A, $\left.30 \mathrm{~min}, t_{\mathrm{R}} 13.6 \mathrm{~min}\right)$. FAB-MS: $810(14$, $\left.[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}\right) ; 788\left(100,[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\right)$.
$34(52.2 \mathrm{mg})$ was dissolved in NMP $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and added slowly to a solution of TBTU ( 70.2 mg ), HOBt ( 58.2 mg ), and DIEA ( pH of solution was approximately 7.5) in NMP ( 300 mL ). After 3 h at room temperature the solution was treated with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and concentrated and the product purified by preparative HPLC $(40 \rightarrow 70$, B in A, 30 $\min , t_{\mathrm{R}} 20.7 \mathrm{~min}$ ). FAB-MS for cyclo(SAA4-(tri- $O$-benzyl)-Ala-d-Pro-Ala-Ala) (35): $792\left(3,[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}\right)$.

The cyclic peptide was dissolved in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{HOAc}(30 \mathrm{~mL}, 1: 1)$ and hydrogenated for 24 h in the presence of $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(30 \mathrm{mg}$ of $5 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C})$. The product was purified by preparative $\operatorname{HPLC}(5 \rightarrow 40$, B in A, 30 $\left.\min , t_{\mathrm{R}} 12.5 \mathrm{~min}\right)$ to yield 36 in $22.9 \mathrm{mg}(68 \%)$.
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