CONFORMATIONAL DEFORMATION OF RING C IN 148-ESTRA-

1,3,5(10),15-TETRAEN-17-ONES1

James R. Bull* Department of Chemistry, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7700, South Africa

Jan L.M. Dillen Department of Chemistry, University of Pretoria, Pretoria 0002, South Africa

Mark A. Sefton Australian Wine Research Institute, Waite Road Urrbrae, South Australia

(Received in UK 4 September 1990)

High-field n.m.r. analysis of four 3-methoxy-14 β -Abstract: estra-1,3,5(10),15-tetraen-17-ones provides evidence for conformational deformation of ring C to a twist-boat form in These observations are supported by molecular solution. mechanics (MM2) calculations, which predict that the ring C chair and ring C twist-boat conformers have similar steric energies, slightly favouring the latter. An X-ray crystal 3-methoxy-14-methyl-148-estradetermination on structure 1,3,5(10),15-tetraen-17-one revealed that ring C does indeed adopt a twist-boat conformation in the solid state.

As part of an ongoing investigation into new synthetic routes to 14substituted 19-norsteroids,² we recently examined the potential of baseand acid-mediated rearrangements of 14,15-methylene 17-ketones for generating products or intermediates which could be used for such purposes.

An exploratory study revealed that, whereas 3-methoxy-14,15amethylene-estra-1,3,5(10)-trien-17-one (1)³ was inert to a variety of strong bases, it readily underwent rearrangement in the presence of toluene-p-sulphonic acid in refluxing xylene, to give a complex mixture of products. Limited success attended our efforts to purify and characterise all the components, but a major product (40%) was identified as 3-methoxy-15-methyl-14 β -estra-1,3,5(10),15-tetraen-17-one (4), accompanied by lesser amounts (ca 18%) of an impure product, tentatively identified as 3methoxy-17a-homo-14 β -estra-1,3,5(10),8-tetraen-17a-one (2) contaminated with the inseparable pentaene (3).



Although our further interest in the synthetic utility of acidmediated rearrangements of (1) terminated with this finding, the products were characterised as fully as their purity allowed. The 15-methyl compound (4) failed to crystallise, but a 500 MHz n.m.r. spectrum verified the homogeneity of chromatographed material. Furthermore, certain signals provided diagnostic evidence for the assigned structure, in particular, the distinctive coupling between 8β -H and 14β -H (J 5.1 Hz) which, together with an n.O.e enhancement of the 14β -H signal by irradiation of that of 13β -CH₃, verified the assignment of 14β -configuration. Rearrangements of this nature are unexceptional and are supported by analogy.^{3,4} The favourable dispersion of the 500 MHz proton n.m.r. spectrum of compound (4) encouraged us to carry out a comprehensive assignment of signals, as part of a programme to map chemical shift and coupling patterns associated with changes in configuration and substitution at C(14).^{2,5,6} The results of this analysis (Table 1) revealed that the trends for ring A and ring B proton signals corresponded with expectations based upon our work, 2.5.6 and that of other groups which have studied estrone-based systems.⁷⁻⁹ However, the signals of protons attached to C(9) - C(12) of compound (4) were markedly different, and suggested that ring C adopts a conformation other than the normally-favoured chair in this case.

Compound	4	5	6	7	
Proton	Ch	emical shifts	(δ/p.p.m)		
6a-H	2.78	2.79	2.84	2.82	
6 <i>β−</i> H	2.82	2.79	2.91	2.83	
7a-H	1.74	1.35	1.69	1.42	
7 β- Η	2.01	2.17	1.94	2.40	
8 <i>6</i> -н	2.07	1.56	1.92	1.88	
9a-H	2.40	2.26	2.25	2.21	
11a-H	2.14	2.27	2.17	2.23	
11 <i>8</i> -H	1.43	1.36	1.41	1.42	
12a-H	1.83	1.85	1.79	1.86	
12β-H	1.52	1.56	1.59	1.68	
13 <i>β</i> -CH ₃	1.10	1.02	1.15	1.10	
$14\beta - H(CH_3)$	2.70	(1.19)	2.83	-	
15-H(CH ₃)	(2.16)	7.38	7.60	7.37	
16-H	5.95	6.13	6.20	6.26	
<u>Protons</u>		Coupling cons	stants <u>(J/Hz)</u>		
9a,11a	8.3	6.7	6.2	7.5	(3.5)d
9a,118	8.7	10.5	10.0	10.1	(11.5)4
11a.11ß	-13.6	-12.8	-13.4	-13.0	(-13.0)
$11\alpha, 12\alpha$	6.3	7.5	5.7	6.8	(3.5)d
11a,12B	9.3	6.5	7.3	8.2	(3.5)4
11β , 12α	5.0	6.8	8.0	5.2	(13.5)4
118,128	6.5	6.0	5.6	7.2	(3.5)
120,128	-13.8	-14.0	-14.0	-13.9	(-13.5)
8 <i>β</i> ,14 <i>β</i>	5.1	-	5.7	-	,
Other	1.3(14,151)	5.9(15,16)	2.4(14,15)	5.9(19	5,16)
	1.3(14,16)		2.4(14,16)		
	1.2(151,16)		5.9(15,16)		

TABLE 1 ¹H N.m.r. Data^{a,b} for 3-Methoxy-14β-estra-1,3,5(10),15tetraen-17-ones(4) - (7)

- Data were recorded for CDCl₃ solutions at 500 MHz (internal standard CHCl₃ δ 7.2400). Assignments were made with the aid of proton-proton correlation spectroscopy (COSY), selective proton-proton spin decoupling, and difference n.O.e. spectroscopy (see Table 2); for these purposes, some spectra were also run in CDCl₃ C₆D₆ mixtures in order to improve dispersion of specific signals. In those cases where stereochemical assignments for 11-H₂ and 12-H₂ could not be made directly by these methods, chemical shift correlations were applied.
- ^b The following signals were recorded for all compounds : δ 3.74 ± 0.01(3H, s, OCH₃), 6.58 ± 0.02(1H, d, J 2.8Hz, 4-H), 6.69 ± 0.01(1H, dd, J 8.6 and 2.8Hz, 2-H), and 7.04 ± 0.02(1H, d, J 8.6Hz, 1-H).
- c Ring B proton-proton coupling constants are omitted from the Table since all are similar (± 1Hz) to those recorded elsewhere for 3-methoxy-14 β -estra-1,3,5(10)-trienes (ref. 2).
- ^d Average magnitude of proton-proton coupling constants for 14β -methyl steroids having ring C in a chair conformation (ref. 2).



A comparison of the magnitude of atypical coupling constants in compounds (4) - (7) shows that $J_{116,12\alpha}$ (5 - 8 Hz) is significantly smaller than that of steroids in which ring C is in a chair conformation, whereas $J_{9\alpha,11\alpha}$ (6.2 - 8.3 Hz), $J_{11\alpha,12\alpha}$ (5.7 - 7.5 Hz), $J_{11\alpha,12\beta}$ (6.5 -9.3 Hz), and $J_{11\beta,12\beta}$ (5.6 - 7.2 Hz) are larger. The magnitude of $J_{9\alpha,11\beta}$ (8.7 - 10.5 Hz) is slightly smaller than normal. These ranges exclude the occurrence of the chair conformation of ring C in solution, and are compatible, either with discrete non-chair conformations or with rapid conformational interconversion between energetically similar states. The latter interpretation is supported by difference n.O.e. experiments, in which selected irradiations were performed in an attempt to localise the spatial environment of the protons attached to C(11) and C(12) (Table 2).

Compound	Solvent	Irradiated peak	Observed enhancements (difference n.O.e.s)
(4) (4)	CDCl ₃ CDCl ₃	13 β-Ме 9а-Н	8β -H,11 β -H,12 α -H,12 β -H,and 14 β -H 7 α -H and 12 α -H
(5)	CDC1 ₃ -C ₆ D ₆ (1:1)	13 β-Me	8β -H,11 β -H,12 α -H, and 14 β -Me
(5)	$CDCl_3 - C_6D_6$ (1:1)	1 4β-Me	7β-H,8β-H,15-H, and 13β-Me
(5)	C ₆ D ₆	12a-H	12β-Н
(5)	C ₆ D ₆	12 <i>β-</i> H	12a-H
(6)	C ₆ D ₆	13 β-Me	8β -H,11 β -H,12 α -H,12 β -H, and 14 β -H
(7)	CDCl ₃ -C ₆ D ₆	124-10	90-4 12-4 and 120-4
(7)	(1;1)	1 <i>3p</i> -Me	$\delta p = n, 12a = n, and 12p = n$
(7)	$(1 \cdot 1)$	8 <i>8-</i> H	128-H
(7)	CDC1C.D.		
(*)	(1:1)	12a-H	12 <i>8</i> -H
(7)	CDC1C_D		•
X · F	(1:1)	12 <i>8-</i> H	8β -H and 12α -H

Table 2: N.O.e. Enhancements of Ring B and C Proton Signals in (4) - (7)

Thus, in all four compounds (4) - (7), irradiation of the 13β -CH₃ signal resulted in enhancement of the 12α -H signal as well as that of 12β -In addition, mutual enhancements were observed between 8β -H and 12β -H. Н. These results are compatible with a boat or twist-boat conformation of ring C, but not with a chair. On the other hand, irradiation of the 13β - CH_3 signal in compounds (4) -(6) also enhanced that of 11β -H. In one case (4), irradiation of the 9a-H signal resulted in enhancement of the 12a-HThese responses indicate a chair-like conformation for ring C. signal. Although some of the foregoing correlations appear to reflect mutual inconsistencies, it is possible that ring C conformations or conformational equilibria differ within the series (4) - (7) and are also influenced differently by solvent interactions. However, attempts to 'freeze out' discrete conformations by recording n.m.r. spectra at -60°C were unsuccessful.

The experimental conclusions were supported by molecular mechanics (MM2) calculations on compounds (4) -(7). In each case, energy minimisations revealed small differences between the normal conformer having a ring B half-chair, ring C chair and that having a ring B half-chair, ring C twist-boat. However, in all cases the deformed conformers were favoured by a small margin (0.42 -1.3 kcal mol⁻¹). By contrast, the MM2 calculations on 3-methoxy-14 β -estra-1,3,5(10),15-tetraene (8) and 3-methoxy-14 β -estra-1,3,5(10)-trien-17-one (9) reflected steric energy margins of 1.28 and 4.2 kcal mol⁻¹ respectively, favouring undeformed conformers (Table 3).

Conform	ñ					
ationb	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
HC	14.15	18.17	13.62	16.51	17.55	19.08
BC	17.88	21.14	17.32	19.94	20.41	21.76
HB	13.73	16.87	12.71	15.76	18.83	23.28
BB	18.45	21.61	17.38	20.59	23.40	27.19

Table 3: Steric Energies• (kcal mol-1) of 3-Methoxy-14β-estra-1,3,5(10)-trienes (4)-(9)

- Calculated with Allinger's MM2 force field (ref. 13), modified for appropriate management of a phenyl ring (ref. 14).

^b Conformational descriptors (combinations of H, half-chair; C, chair; B, boat-like) refer sequentially to rings B and C.

The puckering parameters of the compounds (4) - (9) are given in Table 4, and reveal a close correspondence in the predicted conformation of the deformed ring C in the $14\beta-\Delta^{15}-17$ -ketones (4) - (7); thus, the conformation approximates to a twist-boat having a two-fold axis of symmetry through C(11) and C(14).

		Ring B			R	Ring C			Ring D		
		Q	θ	ø	Q	θ	\	Q	*		
(4)	HB	0.520	128	46	0.729	85	12	0.099	346		
• •	HC	0.524	129	41	0.557	15	72	0.220	164		
(5)	HB	0.527	128	43	0.733	86	19	0.115	346		
• •	HC	0.543	129	32	0.552	19	95	0.250	164		
(6)	HB	0.518	129	42	0.725	85	16	0.098	345		
• •	нс	0.530	129	43	0.548	19	83	0.209	164		
(7)	НВ	0.520	129	42	0.729	85	17	0.113	346		
	HC	0.535	130	33	0.552	18	88	0.236	164		
(8)	HB	0.529	128	44	0.739	87	26	0.186	359		
	HC	0.538	129	35	0.560	15	90	0.342	176		
(9)	НВ	0.525	128	47	0.730	86	20	0.349	45		
	HC	0.542	130	29	0.553	10	113	0.377	146		

Table 4:	Calculated	Puckering	Parameters.	of	Compounds	(4) -	(9)
----------	------------	-----------	-------------	----	-----------	----	-----	----	---

• Puckering parameters are defined conventionally (ref. 15), numbering clockwise from C(5) (ring B), C(8) (ring C), and C(13) (ring D), and are given by $Q(\mathbf{A})$, $\theta(\circ)$, and $\phi(\circ)$

We ascribe the observed effects in compounds (4) - (7) to conformational transmission induced by flattening of ring D, and the attendant closure of the ring junction torsion angle, $\phi_{17,13,14,15}$, to an extent that cannot be accommodated by a ring C chair. Thus, the MM2 calculations reveal that neither a 17-oxo-group nor a Δ^{15} -bond alone suffice to induce deformation of ring C. The 14β -H-17-ketone (9) displays the largest steric energy margin (4.2 kcal mol⁻¹) favouring the ring C chair, and has a calculated $\phi_{17,13,14,15}$ of 36.2° , whereas the 14β -H- Δ^{15-} compound (8) has an intermediate steric energy margin (1.28 kcal mol⁻¹) and $\phi_{17,13,14,15}$ 32.3°. By contrast, the MM2 calculation for the ring C chair conformer of the 14β -methyl- Δ^{15-} 17-ketone (5) gives the smallest $\phi_{17,13,14,15}$ of -23.5° and the largest steric energy margin (4.2 kcal mol⁻¹) favouring the ring C twist-boat.

8148

The converse interpretation is complementary. Thus, in the MM2 calculations for the ring C twist-boat conformers, the calculated torsion angles ($\phi_{17,13,14,15}$) are: (5) 10.8°; (8) 17.4°; (9) 15.6°; which suggests a trend toward accommodation of ring D puckering in (8) and (9).

In the light of these findings, an X-ray crystal structure determination was carried out on 3-methoxy-14-methyl-14 β -estra-1,3,5(10),15-tetraen-17-one (5).² Details of this investigation are given in the Experimental section, and a perspective drawing of the structure is shown in Figure 1. The puckering parameters derived from this structure determination are Q 0.525Å, θ 133.1°, and ϕ 39° for ring B; Q 0.749Å, θ 88.1°, and ϕ 26.2° for ring C; and Q 0.187Å and θ 352.8° for ring D. These values reveal that the overall conformation of (5) in the solid state approximates to the HB form, and that ring C indeed favours a nonchair conformation. The measured parameters for ring C tend toward the twist form of the twist-boat conformation, whereas the calculations predict a slight tendency toward the boat form. In addition, the measurements reveal that ring C is more puckered than predicted.



Figure 1 X-Ray structure and atom numbering scheme of compound (5)

Nevertheless, the calculated and measured geometries show remarkably good overall agreement, and confirm that the MM2 energy minimisation provides a reliable measure of the conformational preferences in this series of compounds. Although the solid state structure determination does not exclude a dynamic conformational equilibrium in solution, the evidence for such a state is inconclusive, and the experimental data are equally well reconciled with discrete non-chair conformers of (4) - (7).

EXPERIMENTAL

For general directions, see ref. 2

Acid Catalysed Rearrangement of 3-Methoxy-14,15a-methylene-estra-1,3,5(10)-trien-17-one (1)

A solution of the ketone³ (1) (190 mg) and toluene-p-sulphonic acid (950 mg) in xylene (60 ml) was heated at reflux temperature under nitrogen for 5 h. Work-up with ether and evaporation of the solvent in vacuo gave a residue which was chromatographed on silica gel (80 g) with ethyl acetate-benzene (1:49) giving, inter alia, 3-methoxy-17a-homo-14 β -estra-1,3,5(10),8-tetraen-17a-one (2) (34 mg) [contaminated with a small amount of 3-methoxy-17a-homo-14 β -estra-1,3,5(10),8-tetraen-17a-one (2) (34 mg) [contaminated with a small amount of 3-methoxy-17a-homo-14 β -estra-1,3,5(10),6,8-pentaen-17a-one (3)] m.p. 140 - 151°C (from methanol) (Found: M⁺, 296.178. C₂₀H₂₄O₂ requires M, 296.178); v_{max} 1695 cm⁻¹ (CO); λ_{max} 272 nm (log ϵ 4.19); $\delta_{\rm H}$ (90 MHz) 1.04 [0.3H, s, 13 β -CH₃ of (3)], 1.13 [2.7H, s, 13 β -CH₃ of (2)], 3.80 [2,7H, s, CH₃ of (2)], 3.90 [0.3H, s, OCH₃ of (3)], and 6.6 - 7.2 (3H, m, arom. H); m/z(%) 296 [M⁺ of (2), 100] and 294 [M⁺ of (3), 13], followed by 3-methoxy-15-methyl-14 β -estra-1,3,5(10),15-tetraen-17-one (4) (76 mg) as an oil (Found: M⁺, 296.178. C₂₀H₂₄O₂ requires M, 296.178); v_{max} 1680 cm⁻¹ (CO); λ_{max} 232 nm (log ϵ 4.17); m/z(%) 296 [M⁺, 40), 187(100), and 186(40).

Crystal Data of (5)

 $C_{20}H_{24}O_2$, $M_r = 296.2$ g mol⁻¹, orthorhombic space group $P2_12_12_1$, a = 7.7998(6)Å, b = 7.8182(8)Å, c = 26.839(2)Å, V = 1636.7Å³, Z = 4, $D_r = 1.20$ g cm⁻¹, μ (Cu) = 5.2 cm⁻¹. A colourless, well-shaped crystal (0.10 x 0.12 x 0.20 mm) was used for data collection.

Data Collection and Processing

The 2052 intensities were measured at room temperature with an Enraf-Nonius CAD4-diffractometer using graphite monochromated Cu-K α radiation (λ = 1.54184Å). A pure ω -scan was employed, and the ω -angle changed as 0.49 + 0.14 tan0. The horizontal aperture was fixed to 1.3 mm, the vertical slit to 4 mm. The scan-speed varied between 5.49° min⁻¹ and a speed corresponding to a measuring time of 50 s/refl. The unit cell and orientation matrix were determined using 25 reflections in the range 13 - 47° in 0. The stability of the crystal was tested every hour (loss 0.6%), and the orientation (allowed deviation 0.05°) every 200 reflections with three control reflections. Data were corrected for Lorentz and polarisation effects.

Structure Analysis and Refinement

The structure of (5) was solved uneventfully by direct methods¹⁶ and refined¹⁷ anisotropically using a full-matrix method with $\sigma_{\rm F}^{-2}$ weights. All hydrogen atoms were placed at calculated positions and refined with a common isotropic thermal parameter ($U = 0.101 {\rm \AA}^2$), riding upon their associated carbon atoms. Final residuals were R = 0.087 and $R\omega = 0.052$ for 1609 intensities > σ and 209 refined parameters. Final fractional coordinates are given in Table 5. Coordinates of hydrogen atoms, and tables of anisotropic thermal parameters, bond lengths and valence angles, and a complete list of observed and calculated structure factors are available as supplementary material.

	x/a	y/b	z/c	U(eq)
C(1)	-1038(7)	983(7)	-2885(2)	61(3)
C(2)	-296(8)	896(7)	-2415(2)	66(4)
C(3)	-1119(7)	-84(8)	-2051(2)	62(4)
C(4)	-2635(7)	-922(8)	-2152(2)	62(4)
C(5)	-3365(7)	-837(7)	-2628(2)	55(3)
C(6)	-5003(8)	-1818(8)	-2733(2)	69(4)
C(7)	-5993(7)	-1044(8)	-3172(2)	67(4)
C(8)	-4803(7)	-916(7)	-3630(2)	60(3)
C(9)	-3363(6)	363(7)	-3516(2)	55(3)
C(10)	-2563(7)	131(7)	-3000(2)	52(3)
C(11)	-1981(6)	320(8)	-3932(2)	64(4)
C(12)	-2733(7)	-210(9)	-4444(2)	73(4)
C(13)	-4596(8)	368(9)	-4510(2)	67(4)
C(14)	-5823(7)	-417(8)	-4113(2)	65(4)
C(15)	-7004(7)	1071(10)	-4007(2)	66(4)
C(16)	-6466(9)	2585(10)	-4179(2)	72(4)
C(17)	-4848(9)	2315(10)	-4455(2)	79(5)
C(18)	-5135(7)	-55(8)	-5054(2)	88(5)
C(19)	-6833(9)	-1980(8)	-4298(2)	92(5)
•0(20)	-3924(7)	3421(7)	-4608(2)	110(4)
0(21)	-513(5)	-287(5)	-1564(1)	73(3)
C(22)	1134(8)	416(9)	-1450(2)	91(5)

Table 5: Fractional Coordinates $(x10^4)$ and EquivalentIsotropic Thermal Parameters $(x10^3 \ \AA^2)$ for (5)

REFERENCES

- 1. Aspects of this investigation were carried out at the former National Chemical Research Laboratory, Pretoria, South Africa.
- 2. J. R. Bull, J Floor, and M. A. Sefton, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1, 1987, 37, and refs. cited.
- R. Prousa, B. Schönecker, D. Tresselt, and K. Ponsold, J. Prakt. Chem., 1986, 328, 55.
- K.B. Wiberg and S.R. Kass, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1985, 107, 988; K.B. Wiberg, S.R. Kass, and K.C. Bishop III, *ibid.*, 1985, 107, 996; K.B. Wiberg, S.R. Kass, A. de Meijere, and K.C. Bishop III, *ibid.*, 1985, 107, 1003.
- 5. K. Bischofberger, J.R. Bull, and A.A. Chalmers, Magn. Reson. Chem., 1987, 25, 780.
- 6. J.R. Bull and A.A. Chalmers, S. Afr. J. Chem., 1990, 43, 46.
- S.Top, G.Jaouen, A. Vessieres, J.P. Abjean, D. Davoust, C.A. Rogers, B.G. Sayer, and M.J. McGlinchey, Organometallics, 1985, 4, 2143.
- D. Liebfritz, E. Haupt, M. Fergel, W.E. Hull, and W.D. Weber, Liebigs Ann. Chem., 1982, 1971.
- A.G.J. Sedee, G.M.J. Beijersbergen van Henegouwen, M.E. de Vries, and C. Erkelens, Steroids, 1985, 45, 3280.

- 10. J.R. Bull, J. Floor, and G.J. Kruger, J. Chem. Res.(M), 1979, 2525.
- 11. J.R. Bull and J. Floor, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans.1, 1981, 437.
- 12. J.R. Bull and M.A. Sefton, unpublished results.
- 13. N.L. Allinger and Y.H. Yuh, QCPE, 1980, 395.
- 14. H.D. Beckhaus, Chem. Ber., 1983, 116, 86.
- 15. D. Cremer and J.A. Pople, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1975, 97, 1354.
- 16. P. Main, S.J. Fiske, S.E. Hull, L. Lessinger, G. Germain, J-P. deClerg, and M.M. Woolfson, MULTAN80, 1980, Universities of York, England, and Louvain, Belgium.
- 17. G.M. Sheldrick, SHELX76, 1976, University of Cambridge, England.