Phytochemistry 52 (1999) 95-98

# Quinoline alkaloids from Acronychia laurifolia

Baoliang Cui<sup>a</sup>, Heebyung Chai<sup>a</sup>, Yumi Dong<sup>a</sup>, F. David Horgen<sup>a</sup>, Bertel Hansen<sup>b</sup>, Domingo A. Madulid<sup>c</sup>, Djaja D. Soejarto<sup>a</sup>, Norman R. Farnsworth<sup>a</sup>, Geoffrey A. Cordell<sup>a</sup>, John M. Pezzuto<sup>a</sup>, A. Douglas Kinghorn<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Program for Collaborative Research in the Pharmaceutical Sciences, Department of Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacognosy, College of Pharmacy, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, 60612, USA

<sup>b</sup>Botanical Museum, University of Copenhagen, DK-1123 Copenhagen, K, Denmark

<sup>c</sup>Botany Division, National Museum, Manila, Philippines

Received 26 October 1998; received in revised form 4 January 1999

#### **Abstract**

Bioassay-directed fractionation of a root extract of *Acronychia laurifolia* (Rutaceae) using the KB-V1<sup>+</sup> human tumor cell line led to the isolation of six quinoline alkaloids. One of these alkaloids is novel, namely, 2,3-methylenedioxy-4,7-dimethoxyquinoline and the other five were identified as the known compounds, evolitrine, γ-fagarine, skimmianine, kokusaginine and maculosidine. Two known bis-tetrahydrofuran lignans, sesamolin and yangambin, were also identified. The structure of the new alkaloid was determined by spectroscopic methods. All of the isolates were evaluated against a panel of human cancer cell lines; four of the alkaloids showed weak cytotoxic activity. © 1999 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Acronychia laurifolia; Rutaceae; Quinoline alkaloids; 2,3-methylenedioxy-4,7-dimethoxyquinoline; Lignans; Cytotoxic activity

#### 1. Introduction

As part of our continuing search for novel plant-derived anticancer agents, the roots of Acronychia laurifolia Blume (Rutaceae) were investigated. Several quinoline alkaloids have been documented previously as constituents of plants classified in the genus Acronychia (Svoboda, 1966; Svoboda, Poore, Simpson, 1966; Lamberton, 1966; Lahey, & McCamish, 1968; Fong, Farnsworth, & Svoboda, 1969; Lahey, McCamish, & McEwan, 1969; De Silva, De Silva, Mahendran, & Jennings, 1979; Funayama, & Cordell, 1984; Xu, & Xue, 1984; Bowen, Dennis, & Osborne, 1985; Kumar, Karunarantne, & Meegalle, 1989; Bissoue et al., 1996). The alkaloid fraction of A. laurifolia leaves was reported to have CNS-depressant activity in a rat model (Chowrashi, Mukherjee, & Sikdar, 1969). Flavonols from A. pedunculata and the

In the present paper, activity-guided fractionation of the chloroform-soluble extract of the roots of *A. lauri-folia* using the KB-V1<sup>+</sup> human cancer cell line led to the isolation of one new and five known quinoline alkaloids (1–6), along with two known bis-tetrahydro-furan lignans (7,8). Alkaloids 2 and 4–6 showed weak cytotoxic activity when evaluated against a panel of human cancer cell lines, while compounds 1, 3, 7 and 8 were inactive in this regard (Table 1).

### 2. Results and discussion

Compounds **2–8** were identified as evolitrine (Narasimhan, & Mali, 1974), γ-fagarine (Collins,

known benzenoid, acrovestone, from *A. porteri*, have been reported to be cytotoxic against the KB cell line (Wu et al., 1989; Lichius et al., 1994). The isolation of β-sitosterol, seselin, norbraylin and acrovestone has been previously reported from *A. laurifolia* (Govindachari et al., 1969; Seccombe, & Kennard, 1974; Rahman, Taufiq-Yap, & Sukari, 1996).

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author.

Table 1 Evaluation of the cytotoxic potential of isolates **2**, **4**, **5** and **6** obtained from *A. laurifolia*<sup>a</sup>

Compound	Cell line <sup>b</sup>							
	BC1	Lu1	Col2	KB	KB-V1 +	KB-V1	LNCaP	ASK <sup>c</sup>
2	5.8	> 20	> 20	> 20	2.9	2.8	> 20	
4	5.6	> 20	> 20	> 20	4.4	4.3	> 20	_
5	> 20	> 20	> 20	> 20	4.4	14.4	> 20	_
6	> 20	> 20	> 20	> 20	4.5	10.2	> 20	_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Results are expressed as ED<sub>50</sub> values (μg/ml) (Likhitwitayawuid et al. 1993).

Gray, Grundon, Harrison, & Spyropoulos, 1973), skimmianine (Liu, Wei, Wang, & Gao, 1991), kokusaginine (Lahey, & McCamish, 1968), maculosidine (Xu, & Xue, 1984), sesamolin (Haslam, 1970) and yangambin (MacRae, & Towers, 1985), respectively, by comparison with reported data.

Alkaloid 1 was obtained as plates (MeOH), mp 176-8° and its molecular formula of C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>11</sub>O<sub>4</sub>N was determined by HREIMS. Analysis of the <sup>1</sup>H- and <sup>13</sup>C-NMR spectra of 1 indicated that it was a quinoline alkaloid biogenetically related to alkaloids 2-6, differing in the absence of a furan ring functionalized at the C-2 and C-3 positions. In the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR spectrum of 1, three aromatic proton signals were observed at  $\delta$  7.85 (1H, d, J = 9.1 Hz), 7.16 (1H, d, J = 2.5 Hz) and 6.99 (1H, dd, J = 9.1, 2.5 Hz) and two methoxy groups at  $\delta$  4.25 (3H, s) and 3.88 (3H, s) were comparable in their chemical shifts to those of evolitrine (2). These five resonances in 1 were assigned to H-5, H-8, H-6, CH<sub>3</sub>O-4 and CH<sub>3</sub>O-7, respectively. The <sup>1</sup>H- and <sup>13</sup>C-NMR signals at  $\delta$  6.00 (2H, s) and  $\delta$  99.0 (t) and a HETCOR experiment indicated the presence of a methylenedioxy group (OCH<sub>2</sub>O) in 1. In a HMBC NMR experiment performed on 1, the methylenedioxy proton signal at  $\delta$  6.00 (2H, s) showed cross-correlation peaks with the  $^{13}$ C-NMR resonances at  $\delta$  160.1 (s) and 121.9 (s), assignable to C-2 and C-3, respectively. The above evidence suggested that the location of the methylenedioxy group should be at the C-2 and C-3 positions. Assignments of all of the protons and carbons for 1 were made through <sup>1</sup>H-<sup>1</sup>H COSY, NOESY, APT, HETCOR and HMBC NMR experiments. Consequently, the structure of 1 was identified as the new alkaloid 2,3-methylenedioxy-4,7-dimethoxy-quinoline.

Compounds 1–8 were evaluated against a panel of human cancer cell lines as summarized in Table 1. Compounds 1, 3, 7 and 8 were inactive in all test systems. Alkaloids 2 and 4 showed cytotoxic activity against the BC1 and drug-resistant KB-V1 cell lines. With the multidrug-resistant cell line, no advantage was noted in the presence of vinblastine for these compounds. On the other hand, alkaloids 5 and 6 were found to be weakly active against the KB-V1<sup>+</sup> cell line in the absence of vinblastine, but activity was enhanced 2–3-fold when vinblastine was added to the incubation medium. All compounds were inactive against the ASK cell line.

In the present investigation, *A. laurifolia* was collected from a marked plot in the tropical rain forest. The rationale for using this approach to plant selection in drug discovery programs has been described previously (Soejarto, 1991).

## 3. Experimental

MPs. uncorr.; IR: film; <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectra were recorded on either a 300 or 360 MHz NMR instrument with tetramethylsilane (TMS) as an internal standard in CDCl<sub>3</sub>. HETCOR spectra were recorded on 300 MHz NMR instrument. HMBC data were obtained using a 500 MHz NMR instrument. Lowand high-resolution MS were measured with a Finnigan MAT-90 instrument (70 eV). Column chromatography was carried out with Merck silica gel G (70–230 and 230–400 mesh) and Aldrich RP-C<sub>18</sub> silica gel.

## 3.1. Plant material

The roots of A. laurifolia [syn. A. pedunculata (L.) Miq.] (Rutaceae) were collected from a marked plot in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Key: BC1=human breast cancer; Lu1=human lung cancer; Co12=human colon cancer; KB=human epidermoid carcinoma; KB-V1<sup>+</sup>=drug-resistant KB assessed in presence of vinblastine;  $(1\mu g/ml)$ ; KB-V1<sup>-</sup>=drug-resistant KB assessed in absence of vinblastine; LNCaP=hormone-dependent human prostate cancer; ASK=rat glioma.

c = Reversal of astrocyte formation was not observed when tested at a concentration of 100 µg/ml for the ASK cell line.

a forest on the northeast base of Thumb Peak, Barangay Simpocan, Municipality of Puerto Princesa, Palawan, Philippines, in September, 1992 by F.D.H. (D. Horgen, R. Majaducon and E. Burlaza 45) and identified by one of us (B.H.). A voucher specimen (FM2167711) has been deposited at the Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, II.

#### 3.2. Extraction and isolation

The air-dried roots (500 g) of A. laurifolia were extracted with three changes of MeOH  $(1 \times 2 \ 1)$  $2 \times 1.5$  l). The resultant extracts were combined, concentrated under a vacuum, dissolved in MeOH-H2O (4:1, 400 ml) and washed with hexanes (3  $\times$  200 ml). The lower layer was concentrated under reduced pressure and partitioned between 10% MeOH (300 ml) and CHCl<sub>3</sub> (3 × 200 ml). The CHCl<sub>3</sub>-soluble extract (2.2 g) was subjected to silica gel column chromatography and eluted with hexanes-acetone-MeOH mixtures in a gradient. Fractions 8–12, eluted with hexanes–acetone (20:1), were purified over a silica gel column using mixtures of hexanes-EtOAc (8:1) to afford 7 (10 mg). Fractions 14-18, eluted with hexanes-acetone-MeOH (12:1:0.1), were combined and purified by silica gel column chromatography using mixtures of hexanes-EtOAc-MeOH (6:1:0.1) to afford 3 which was crystallized from MeOH (colorless needles, 82 mg). Fraction 20, eluted with hexanes-acetone-MeOH (10:1:0.1), was purified over a silica gel column using mixtures of hexanes-EtOAc-MeOH (5:1:0.1) to afford 1 which was crystallized from MeOH (colorless plates, 102 mg). Fractions 7–11, eluted from the first column with hexanes-acetone-MeOH (15:1:0.1), were combined and chromatographed over a silica gel column eluted with mixtures of hexanes–acetone (10:1  $\rightarrow$  6:1) to yield 2 (8 mg). Subfractions 7–10, eluted with hexanes– acetone (8:1), represented a mixture of 2 and 4. These alkaloids were purified by reversed-phase C<sub>18</sub> silica gel column chromatography eluted with MeOH-CH<sub>3</sub>CN- $H_2O$  mixtures (45:5:50  $\rightarrow$  60:5:35) to provide **2** (6 mg) and 4 (2 mg). Subfractions 53-57, eluted with hexanes-acetone (6:1), were purified by a silica gel column using mixtures of CHCl<sub>3</sub>-acetone (80:1  $\rightarrow$  20:1) to afford 5 (14 mg), 6 (8 mg) and 8 (23 mg).

#### 3.3. 2,3-Methylenedioxy-4,7-dimethoxyquinoline (1)

Plates, mp 176–8°; UV  $\lambda_{\rm max}^{\rm MeOH}$  nm (log  $\varepsilon$ ): 242 (1.5), 255 (2.8), 308 (3.5), 335 (3.8); IR  $\nu_{\rm max}$  (film) cm<sup>-1</sup>: 2915, 1620, 1586, 1320, 1200, 1143; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  7.85 (1H, d, J = 9.1 Hz, H-5), 7.16 (1H, d, J = 2.5 Hz, H-8), 6.99 (1H, dd, J = 9.1, 2.5 Hz, H-6), 6.00 (2H, s, OCH<sub>2</sub>O), 4.25 (3H, s, CH<sub>3</sub>-4), 3.88 (3H, s, CH<sub>3</sub>-7); <sup>13</sup>C NMR (360 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>):  $\delta$  160.1 (s, C-2), 159.7 (s, C-7), 144.7 (s, C-10), 142.2 (s,

C-4), 122.5 (d, C-5), 121.9 (s, C-3), 115.3 (d, C-8), 115.2 (s, C-9), 107.2 (d, C-6), 99.0 (t, OCH<sub>2</sub>O), 59.3 (q, CH<sub>3</sub>-4), 55.3 (q, CH<sub>3</sub>-7); main HMBC correlations: OCH<sub>2</sub>O/C-2,C-3, CH<sub>3</sub>O-4/C-4, H-5/C-4,C-6,C-7,C-10, H-6/C-8,C-9, CH<sub>3</sub>O-7/C-7, H-8/C-6,C-9; EIMS (70 eV) m/z (rel. int.): [M]<sup>+</sup> 233 (65), 160 (100), 117 (16), 77 (7), 57 (6); HREIMS m/z: 233.0916 (calcd for C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>11</sub>O<sub>4</sub>N, 233.0912).

Evolitrine (2), γ-fagarine (3), skimmianine (4), kokusaginine (5), maculosidine (6), sesamolin (7) and yangambin (8) were identified by comparison with reported data (Lahey, & McCamish, 1968; Haslam, 1970; Collins et al., 1973; Narasimhan, & Mali, 1974; Xu, & Xue, 1984; MacRae, & Towers, 1985; Liu et al., 1991).

### 3.4. Bioassay evaluation

Compounds 1–8 were evaluated for cytotoxic activity against a panel of human cancer cell lines according to established protocols (Likhitwitayawuid, Angerhofer, Cordell, Pezzuto, & Ruangrungsi, 1993). ED $_{50}$  values of  $<5~\mu g/ml$  for pure compounds were regarded as being significantly active. Antimitotic activity was assessed using cultured rat glioma cells (Swanson, Jiang, De Souza, & Pezzuto, 1988). Results for compounds exhibiting significant activity in one or more cell lines are given in Table 1.

### Acknowledgements

This investigation was supported by grant U19-CA52956 from the National Cancer Institute, NIH, Bethesda, MD. We are grateful to Mr. R.B. Dvorak of the Department of Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacognosy, College of Pharmacy, University of Illinois at Chicago for the MS data and the Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Laboratory of the Research Resources Center, University of Illinois at Chicago, for the maintenance of NMR instruments used in this investigation.

### References

Bissoue, A. N., Muyard, F., Regnier, A., Bevalot, F., Vaquette, J., Hartley, T. G., & Waterman, P. G. (1996). Biochemical Systematics and Ecology, 24, 805.

Bowen, I. H., Dennis, R., & Osborne, S. J. (1985). *Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology (Supplement)*, 37, 138.

Chowrashi, B. K., Mukherjee, B., & Sikdar, S. (1969). Indian Journal of Physiology and Pharmacology, 20, 250.

Collins, J.F., Gray, G.A., Grundon, M.F., Harrison, D.M., & Spyropoulos, C.G. (1973). Journal of the Chemical Society, Perkin Transactions I, 94.

De Silva, L. B., De Silva, U. L. L., Mahendran, M., & Jennings, R. (1979). Phytochemistry, 18, 1255.

- Fong, H. H. S., Farnsworth, N. R., & Svoboda, G. H. (1969). *Lloydia*, 32, 110.
- Funayama, S., & Cordell, G. A. (1984). Journal of Natural Products, 47, 285.
- Govindachari, T. R., Jadhav, S. J., Joshi, B. S., Kamat, V. N., Mohamed, P. A., Parthasarathy, P. C., Patankar, S. J., Prakash, D., Rane, D. F., & Viswanathan, N. (1969). *Indian Journal of Chemistry*, 7, 308.
- Haslam, E. (1970). Journal of the Chemical Society, 2332.
- Kumar, V., Karunarantne, V., & Meegalle, M. R. S. K. (1989). Phytochemistry, 28, 1278.
- Lahey, F. N., & McCamish, M. (1968). Tetrahedron Letters, 12, 1525.
- Lahey, F. N., McCamish, M., & McEwan, T. (1969). Australian Journal of Chemistry, 22, 447.
- Lamberton, J. A. (1966). Australian Journal of Chemistry, 19, 1995.
- Lichius, J. J., Thoison, O., Montagnac, A., Pais, M., Gueritte-Voegelein, F., Sevenet, F., Cosson, J. P., & Hadi, A. H. (1994). Journal of Natural Products, 57, 1012.
- Likhitwitayawuid, K., Angerhofer, C. K., Cordell, G. A., Pezzuto, J. M., & Ruangrungsi, N. (1993). *Journal of Natural Products*, 56, 30

- Liu, S. L., Wei, L. X., Wang, D., & Gao, C. Y. (1991). Yaoxue Xuebao, 26, 836.
- MacRae, W. D., & Towers, G. H. N. (1985). *Phytochemistry*, 24, 561.
- Narasimhan, N. S., & Mali, R. S. (1974). Tetrahedron, 30, 4153.
- Rahman, M., Taufiq-Yap, Y. H., & Sukari, M. A. (1996). *Fitoterapia*, 67, 180.
- Seccombe, R. C., & Kennard, C. H. L. (1974). *Journal of Applied Crystallography*, 7, 512.
- Soejarto, D.D. (1991). International Research Congress on Natural Products (32nd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Pharmacognosy), Chicago, IL, July 21–26. Abstract S-1.
- Svoboda, G. H. (1966). Lloydia, 29, 206.
- Svoboda, G. H., Poore, G. A., Simpson, P. J., & Boder, G. B. (1966). Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 55, 758.
- Swanson, S. M., Jiang, J.-X., De Souza, N. J., & Pezzuto, J. M. (1988). *Journal of Natural Products*, 51, 929.
- Wu, T. S., Wang, M. L., Jong, T. T., McPhail, A. T., McPhail, D. R., & Lee, K. H. (1989). Journal of Natural Products, 52, 1284.
- Xu, W. H., & Xue, Z. (1984). Hua Hsueh Hsueh Pao, 42, 899.