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ABSTRACT: Cyclic tetrapeptide and depsipeptide natural products have proven useful as biological probes and drug candidates due to their potent activities as histone deacetylase (HDAC) inhibitors. Here, we present the syntheses of a class of cyclic tetrapeptide HDAC inhibitors, the azumamides, by a concise route in which the key step in preparation of the noncanonical disubstituted β-amino acid building block was an Ellman-type Mannich reaction. By tweaking the reaction conditions during this transformation, we gained access to the natural products as well as two epimeric homologues. Thus, the first total syntheses of azumamides B–D corroborated the originally assigned structures, and the synthetic efforts enabled the first full profiling of HDAC inhibitory properties of the entire selection of azumamides A–E. This revealed unexpected differences in the relative potencies within the class and showed that azumamides C and E are both potent inhibitors of HDAC10 and HDAC11.

INTRODUCTION

Macrocyclic peptides have played important roles in the field of epigenetics due to their potent activities as inhibitors of histone deacetylase (HDAC) enzymes. One of the two HDAC targeting drugs (1 and 3) that are approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for clinical treatment of cutaneous T-cell lymphoma is the macrocyclic natural product romidepsin (3). Furthermore, a cyclic tetrapeptide, trapoxin, played an instrumental role in the first isolation of a mammalian HDAC enzyme. Thus, this class of inhibitors holds promise as tool compounds as well as potential drug candidates targeting HDACs.

Though clearly bearing an overall resemblance to the classical cyclic tetrapeptide HDAC inhibitors [including, for example, apicidin (4)], the azumamides (5–9) are structurally unique in that their extended Zn2+-coordinating amino acid (shown in yellow in Figure 1) is a disubstituted β-amino acid. Furthermore, we found the azumamides interesting due to the relatively strong potencies reported for azumamide E against class I HDACs in spite of its weak Zn2+-coordinating carboxylic acid functionality. Previously, azumamide A and azumamide E have been prepared by multistep chemical syntheses, but only azumamide E was tested against recombinant HDAC isoforms 1–9. Furthermore, in vitro profiling with recombinant HDACs has witnessed important new developments since the publication of those results. We therefore found it relevant to explore the properties of these macrocycles in more detail by preparing the complete selection of natural products (5–9), and profiling their activities against the full panel of recombinant human Zn2+-dependent HDAC enzymes, HDAC1–11.

As total syntheses of azumamides B–D had not been reported previously, this work would also allow unequivocal validation of the proposed structures.

For syntheses of the azumamides, we envisaged two significant challenges: first, efficient stereoselective synthesis
of the disubstituted β-amino acid, and second, the macrocyclization step, which is known to be difficult for small cyclic peptides in general and furthermore proved challenging in previously reported syntheses of azumamide analogues.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Building Block Synthesis

For our synthesis of the β-amino acid building block, we chose a diastereoselective Ellman-type Mannich reaction to set the stereochemistry, as also previously reported by Ganesan and co-workers. However, to avoid having this important transformation at a late stage in our synthetic route, we decided to optimize this reaction between a propionate ester and a simple imine as shown in eq 1.

![Figure 1](image1.png)

R¹ and R² are defined in Table 1.

This should give an intermediate with the correct stereochemistry (2S,3R), which could be readily elaborated to give the desired β-amino acid by robust organic synthetic transformations (vide infra). Mannich reactions between ester enolates and chiral sulfinylimines have been studied extensively and using previously reported conditions as our starting point we conducted an optimization study as outlined in Table 1. The tert-butyl ester showed superior selectivity (entry 5) compared to the less bulky methyl, ethyl, allyl, and PMB esters (entries 1–4), and furthermore, the methyl ester did not proceed to completion in our hands. Somewhat surprisingly, however, the major diastereoisomer in entry 5 proved to have (2S,3S) configuration as determined by X-ray crystallography upon desilylation (Figure 2).

This indicates that the pathway leading to our major isomer did not proceed through the six-membered Zimmerman–Traxler-type transition state, which has been proposed to be responsible for the diastereoselectivity with similar substrates. By using HMPA as an additive instead of a Lewis acid, this reaction has previously been shown to proceed through a different transition state, and indeed we saw the same product distribution when using HMPA and TiCl(OPr)₃ as additives with our substrates (entries 5 and 6). This indicates that the six-membered transition state, where coordination of titanium is crucial, is highly unlikely to play a significant role in the formation of our major isomer. This is not in agreement with the diastereoselectivities observed with the substrates reported by Ganesan and co-workers. Thus, to address whether the steric bulk of the trisopropylsilyl ether was responsible for interrupting the six-membered transition state, we performed the reaction with different means of protecting the alcohol (entries 7–9). No significant effect was observed, however, indicating instead that the steric bulk of the tert-butyl ester caused the predominance of a different transition state when using our substrates. This is also in agreement with the original study by Tang and Ellman where the level of selectivity decreased for 2,3-disubstituted β-amino acids when the bulk of the ester increased from methyl to tert-butyl.

Because we were interested in taking advantage of solid-phase synthesis methods to prepare the linear tetrapeptide azumamide precursors with a minimum of chromatographic purification steps, we were keen on keeping the acid-labile tert-butyl ester protecting group, which would allow easy protecting group manipulation to give an Fmoc-protected β-amino acid building block. Hence, instead of substituting this protecting group, we decided to optimize the Mannich reaction conditions to deliver the desired stereochemistry. First, we changed the stereochemistry of the sulfinylimine to the R-enzyme, which eventually furnished the enantiomer of entries 5–9 (2R,3R) as the major isomer (entry 10). We then hypothesized that the configuration of the 2-position would be sensitive to the E/Z configuration of the enolate. Using Ireland’s conditions for forming the enolate in the presence of HMPA, we achieved >80% Z-isomer, which gratifyingly afforded the (2S,3R) product as major isomer (entry 11). Under the developed conditions, we prepared compound 12, which was further elaborated to give Fmoc-protected β-amino acid 16 in 15% overall yield with just four column chromatographic purification steps from compound 10 (Scheme 1).

### Table 1. Optimization of Stereochemical Outcome of the Mannich Reaction Shown in Equation 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>auxiliary</th>
<th>R¹</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>additive</th>
<th>enolate</th>
<th>dr</th>
<th>major isomer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>OSi(Pr)₃</td>
<td>TiCl(OPr)₃</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>47:39:10:4</td>
<td>ND¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>OSi(Pr)₃</td>
<td>TiCl(OPr)₃</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>49:29:11:11</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>allyl</td>
<td>OSi(Pr)₃</td>
<td>TiCl(OPr)₃</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>46:34:10:10</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PMB</td>
<td>OSi(Pr)₃</td>
<td>TiCl(OPr)₃</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>46:33:11:10</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Bu</td>
<td>OSi(Pr)₃</td>
<td>TiCl(OPr)₃</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>60:26:8:6</td>
<td>(2S,3S)⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Bu</td>
<td>OSi(Pr)₃</td>
<td>HMPA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>71:15:14:0</td>
<td>(2S,3S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Bu</td>
<td>OMe</td>
<td>TiCl(OPr)₃</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>70:18:12:0</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Bu</td>
<td>OPMB</td>
<td>TiCl(OPr)₃</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>77:13:10:0</td>
<td>(2S,3S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Bu</td>
<td>OSi(Et)</td>
<td>TiCl(OPr)₃</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>75:21:4:0</td>
<td>(2S,3S)⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Bu</td>
<td>OSi(Pr)₃</td>
<td>HMPA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>77:18:5:0</td>
<td>(2R,3R)⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Bu</td>
<td>OSi(Pr)₃</td>
<td>HMPA¹</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>64:25:8:2</td>
<td>(2S,3S)⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Major configuration of the enolate as determined by NMR and by trapping with BuMe₂SiCl. ²Diastereomeric ratio determined by ¹H NMR. ³ND = not determined. ⁴Determined by X-ray crystallography on its desilylated homologue. ⁵Determined spectroscopically by comparison with its enantiomer from entries 5 and 9. ⁶HMPA (5.4 equiv) was added prior to the substrate to obtain the (Z)-enolate (>80%). ⁷Determined by comparison of spectroscopic data of the fully elaborated Boc-protected β-amino acid with previously reported data. ⁸
peptide by syringe pump to a solution of Hüning’s base and HATU, as described by Ganesan and co-workers,13 was tested. Judging from LC–MS analyses of the reaction mixtures, we could not observe any significant differences between the cyclization yields obtained with the different methods. Although all the couplings proceeded satisfactorily, with full conversion of linear peptides and minor amounts of the corresponding dimers as the only observed byproducts, the resulting overall isolated yields were relatively low (∼10%). We ascribe this to difficulties during purification of the macrocyclic products by preparative reversed-phase HPLC caused by poor water solubility, as we were able to recover more material by purifying the macrocycles by column chromatography. Unfortunately, however, this did not provide the final compounds in satisfyingly high purity for the bioassays, and thus the final compounds were all subjected to preparative reversed-phase HPLC purification although this resulted in a loss of material. Carbodiimide-mediated amidation of the side chain was attempted for conversion of 7 to 6 and 23 to 8, but the reaction was slow and gave varying yields (6 vs 8, Scheme 2). Instead, HATU-mediated coupling was attempted for conversion of 9 to 5, and this proved faster and gave an acceptable yield (5). Spectral data of all the natural products 5–9 were in excellent agreement with those originally reported for the azumamides isolated from natural sources,5 thus corroborating the original structural assignment (Figures S2–S6 in Supporting Information). Finally, the two epimeric β-amino acid building blocks were applied in analogous syntheses of β3-epi-azumamide E (26) and β5-epi-azumamide E (29) as shown in Scheme 3.

**HDAC Screening.** As an initial test of the HDAC inhibitory potency of all seven compounds, we first screened against the full panel of recombinant human HDACs at two compound concentrations (50 μM and 5 μM). Protocols for HDAC1–9 were adapted from Bradner et al.,18 using the fluorogenic Ac-LeuGlyLys(Ac)-AMC substrate for HDAC1–3 and 6 while using the Ac-LeuGlyLys(fa)-AMC substrate for HDAC4, 5, and 7–9. For HDAC10 we used the tetrapeptide Ac-ArgThr-Lys(Ac)Lys(Ac)-AMC, which was recently reported to perform well with this enzyme.31 Finally, for HDAC11, we also used Ac-LeuGlyLys(Ac)-AMC as substrate.32

The site-specifically epimerized compounds exhibited no activity as previously reported for an analogue having both stereocenters inverted. It was not surprising that 26 was inactive, but it is noteworthy that the subtle change of inverting the stereochemistry of a single methyl group in 29 had such a detrimental effect across the entire selection of enzymes (Figure 3). Furthermore, none of the compounds 5–9 were able to inhibit class IIa HDAC activity against a trifluoroacetylated substrate (Figure 3).

**Inhibitor K<sub>i</sub> Values.** Next, we performed dose–response experiments for all compound–HDAC combinations that gave above 50% inhibition in the initial assay (Figure S7 and Table S2 in Supporting Information). The obtained IC<sub>50</sub> values were converted to K<sub>i</sub> values by use of the Cheng–Prusoff equation [K<sub>i</sub> = IC<sub>50</sub>/(1 + [S]/K<sub>m</sub>)] with the assumption of a standard fast-on–fast-off mechanism of inhibition. Reported K<sub>i</sub> values were applied for the calculations except HDAC10, where we determined the K<sub>m</sub> for the used substrate to be 1.5 ± 0.2 μM (Figure 4).

Low potencies were recorded against HDACs 6 and 8, which is in accordance with previous data for azumamide E (Table 2),6 however, compounds 7 and 9 were both potent inhibitors of HDACs 10 and 11. Although they are classified together...
(class IIb), HDACs 6 and 10 clearly interact very differently with these inhibitors.

Generally, we found the compounds with a carboxylic acid Zn²⁺-binding group (7 and 9) to be more potent than the
carboxamides (5, 6, and 8), which is in contrast to the originally reported HDAC inhibition data obtained for the natural products against an HDAC-containing cell extract. However, the data presented herein agree with subsequent work from Ganesan and co-workers on azumamide A (5) and azumamide E (9). We thus show that this applies to all the azumamides, which also confirms that a carboxylate Zn\(^{2+}\)-binding group renders HDAC inhibitors significantly more potent than a corresponding carboxamide, as would be expected from literature precendents. Furthermore, compound 7 was more potent than 9 against HDACs 1–3, 6, 10, and 11, which is also in contrast to the original evaluation that found azuE (9) more potent than azuC (7) against crude enzymes from K562 cell extract. The tyrosine-containing compound (7) exhibited ∼2-fold higher potency against HDACs 1, 3, 6, 10, and 11, whereas the phenylalanine-containing azumamide E (9) was only more potent against HDAC8, albeit at micromolar Ki values.

Finally, the inhibition of HDAC11 by azumamides C (7) and E (9) is, to the best of our knowledge, the first demonstration of potent cyclic peptide inhibitors of this isozyme. Notably, these binding affinities were achieved without the presence of a strong Zn\(^{2+}\) chelator, such as hydroxamic acid.

### CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we report total syntheses of all five azumamides, including for the first time azumamide B–D, which corroborate the originally proposed structures. Our synthetic route furthermore enabled preparation of site-specifically edited analogues for exploration of structure–activity relationships (SAR). The HDAC profiling results show that the β-amino acid residue, present in all the azumamides, is sensitive to even slight modifications. In addition, the original HDAC testing using cell extract indicated that azumamide E was the most potent against HDACs 1–3, 6, 10, and 11, which is also in contrast to the original report that found azuE (9) more potent than azuC (7) against crude enzymes from K562 cell extract. The tyrosine-containing compound (7) exhibited ∼2-fold higher potency against HDACs 1, 3, 6, 10, and 11, whereas the phenylalanine-containing azumamide E (9) was only more potent against HDAC8, albeit at micromolar Ki values.

**Table 2. Potencies of Azumamides against Zn\(^{2+}\)-Dependent Histone Deacetylases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>compd</th>
<th>class I</th>
<th>class IIa</th>
<th>class IIb</th>
<th>class IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HDAC1</td>
<td>HDAC2</td>
<td>HDAC3</td>
<td>HDAC8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (azuA)</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (azuB)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (azuC)</td>
<td>32 ± 1</td>
<td>40 ± 20</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (azuD)</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (azuE)</td>
<td>67 ± 7</td>
<td>50 ± 30</td>
<td>25 ± 5</td>
<td>4400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 (β3-epi-azuE)</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (β2-epi-azuE)</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (SAHA)</td>
<td>8 ± 1.5</td>
<td>7 ± 1.5</td>
<td>12 ± 4</td>
<td>700 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (FK-228)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)IC\(_{50}\) values were determined from at least two individual dose–response experiments performed in duplicate (Figure S7 in Supporting Information), and Ki values were calculated from the Cheng–Prusoff equation. \(^{b}\)Fusion protein of GST-tagged HDAC3 with deacetylase activation domain NCoR1. \(^{c}\)Percent inhibition at 50 μM inhibitor concentration. \(^{d}\)IA = inactive (<50% inhibition at 50 μM [inhibitor], Figure 3). \(^{e}\)NT = not tested. \(^{f}\)Data from Bradner et al.18

---

**Figure 3.** Single-dose HDAC inhibitory screening. Assays were performed at 50 μM (shown) and 5 μM (not shown) peptide concentrations. We chose <50% inhibition at 50 μM as our cutoff to sort out inactive compounds before performing full dose–response experiments. All compound–enzyme combinations that were discarded at this stage were tested in at least two individual assays performed in duplicate. Error bars represent the standard deviation. (*\) Fusion protein of GST-tagged HDAC3 with the deacetylase activation domain (DAD) of nuclear receptor corepressor (NCoR1).

**Figure 4.** Michaelis–Menten plot for HDAC10.
potent of the series, but the comprehensive profiling presented herein shows that azumamide C is in fact ~2-fold more potent than azumamide E against the majority of the isozymes.

By taking advantage of the modular methodologies described in this article and building on the gained SAR information, we are currently investigating collections of azumamide analogues in search of more potent and selective ligands based on this promising scaffold.

**Experimental Section**

**General.** All chemicals and solvents were analytical-grade and were used without further purification. Vacuum liquid chromatography (VLC) was performed on silica gel 60 (particle size 0.05–0.04 mm). UPLC–MS analyses were performed on a Phenomenex Kinex column (1.7 μm, 50 × 2.1 mm) by use of a Waters Acquity ultra-high-performance liquid chromatography system. A gradient with eluent I (0.1% HCOOH in water) and eluent II (0.1% HCOOH in acetonitrile) rising linearly from 0% to 95% IV during 5.5 min was used, and stirring was continued for 1 h before conversion was finished. The residue was dissolved in MeCN–H2O and purified by preparative HPLC to give azumamide A (8.4 mg, 12% overall; [α]220 = +60° (c = 0.2, MeOH); previously reported [α]220 = +80° (c = 0.1, MeOH). H1 NMR (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 8.18 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 3H), 7.95 (m, 2H), 7.20 (m, 7H), 7.48 (br s, 1H), 5.48 (m, 1H), 5.37 (m, 1H), 4.33 (d, J = 9.0, 7.0 Hz, 1H), 3.81 (dd, J = 10.4 Hz and 8.4 Hz, 1H), 3.10 (m, 2H), 2.72 (m, 1H), 2.57 (dt, J = 14.1, 6.9 Hz, 1H), 2.41 (m, 2H), 2.27 (m, 4H), 1.30 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 3H), 1.23 (d, J = 7.3 Hz, 3H), 0.96 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 3H), 0.94 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H). HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z calcd for C18H22N4O7H1 + 349.1629; found 349.1622 [M + H]+. HPLC gradient C, tR = 11.62 min (~95%).

**Azumamide A.** (Z)-6-[(2R,5R,8R,11R,12S)-8-Benzyl-2-isopropyl-5,12-dimethyl-3,6,9,13-tetraoxo-4,7,10-tetraazaacyclotridecan-11-yl]hex-4-enamide (5). To a solution of the above azumamide E (0.045 mmol) in DMF (3.0 mL) were added HATU (34 mg, 0.09 mmol, 2 equiv), iPr2NEt (43 μL, 0.25 mmol, 5.5 equiv), and, after 5 min, NH2–dioxane (0.9 mmL, 0.45 mmol, 10 equiv). After 1 h, NH2–dioxane (0.45 mL, 0.23 mmol, 5 equiv) was added. UPLC–MS analysis showed 50% conversion after 3 h, and HATU (34 mg, 0.09 mmol, 2 equiv) and NH2–dioxane (0.45 mL, 0.23 mmol, 5 equiv) were added, and stirring was continued for 1 h before conversion was finished. The residue was dissolved in MeCN–H2O and purified by preparative HPLC to give azumamide C (4.8 mg, 12% overall; [α]220 = +60° (c = 0.2, MeOH); previously reported [α]220 = +80° (c = 0.1, MeOH). H1 NMR (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 8.18 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 3H), 7.95 (m, 2H), 7.20 (m, 7H), 7.48 (br s, 1H), 5.48 (m, 1H), 5.37 (m, 1H), 4.33 (d, J = 9.0, 7.0 Hz, 1H), 3.81 (dd, J = 10.4 Hz and 8.4 Hz, 1H), 3.10 (m, 2H), 2.72 (m, 1H), 2.57 (dt, J = 14.1, 6.9 Hz, 1H), 2.41 (m, 2H), 2.27 (m, 4H), 1.30 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 3H), 1.23 (d, J = 7.3 Hz, 3H), 0.96 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 3H), 0.94 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 3H). HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z calcd for C27H38N4O7H+ 512.2039; found 512.2037 [M + H]+. HPLC gradient C, tR = 11.62 min (~95%).

**Azumamide B.** (Z)-6-[(2R,5R,8R,11R,12S)-8-(4-Hydroxybenzyl)-2-isopropyl-5,12-dimethyl-3,6,9,13-tetraoxo-4,7,10-tetraazaacyclotridecan-11-yl]hex-4-enamide (6). An aqueous solution of LiOH (0.5 M, 55 μL, 2.0 mmol, 2.5 equiv) was added to the cyclic peptide 18 (6.1 mg) in THF–H2O (1:1, 2 mL) at 0 °C. After 30 min the ice bath was removed. Additional portions of LiOH solution (55 μL, 2.0 mmol, 2.5 equiv) were added after 2, 4, and 6 h, and stirring was continued for an additional 19 h to ensure full conversion. Then water (0.5 mL) was added and the organic solvent was removed in vacuo. The aqueous phase was acidified with 1 M HCl and extracted with EtOAc (5 mL) and CH2Cl2 (40 mL). The organic phase was dried (Na2SO4), filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to afford the crude azumamide C, which was used without further purification. To a solution of crude azumamide C (5.8 mg, 10.9 μmol) in DMF (2 mL) were added HOBT (44 mg, 0.33 μmol, 3 equiv), DIC (5.1 μL, 34 μmol, 3 equiv), and iPr2NEt (7.6 μL, 44 μmol, 4 equiv). After 10 min, NH2–dioxane (0.5 M, 0.11 mL, 55 μmol, 5 equiv) was added. After 1.5 h, DIC (5 μL, 34 μmol, 3 equiv) was added, followed by NH2–dioxane (0.5 M, 0.11 mL, 55 μmol, 5 equiv). After the mixture was stirred for 16 h, additional DIC (2 equiv) and NH2–dioxane (5 equiv) were added, and this procedure was repeated once more after 18 h. Finally, CH2Cl2 (1 mL) was added, followed by DIC (3 equiv) and NH2–dioxane (10 equiv), and after 2 days of stirring at room temperature, the reaction mixture was concentrated, dissolved in MeCN–H2O (2:1), and purified by preparative HPLC to give azumamide B (6) (3.6 mg, 62%, two steps) as a white solid. [α]220 = +65° (c = 0.15, MeOH); previously reported [α]220 = +80° (c = 0.1, MeOH). H1 NMR (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 8.13 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 1H), 8.00 (d, J = 8.9 Hz, 1H), 7.85 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 7.61 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.01 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 3H), 6.67 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 3H), 5.49 (m, 1H), 5.37 (dd, J = 18.0 and 7.3 Hz, 2H), 4.29 (pentet, J = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 4.15 (m, 1H), 4.05 (m, 1H), 3.60 (m, 1H), 3.13 (dd, J = 13.7, 10.1 Hz, 1H), 3.00 (dd, J = 13.8, 6.3 Hz, 1H), 2.70 (m, 2H), 3.36 (dd, J = 22, 21.5, 5.7 Hz, 1H, 1H), 1.29 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 3H), 1.27 (d, J = 7.4 Hz, 3H), 0.95 (d, J = 5.7 Hz, 3H), 0.93 (d, J = 6.0 Hz, 3H). HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z calcd for C21H25N2O4H+ 330.2978; found 330.2973 [M + H]+. HPLC gradient C, tR = 10.31 min (~95%).

**Journal of Medicinal Chemistry**
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Azumamide C, (Z)-6{(2R,5R,8R,11R,12S)-8-(4-Hydroxybenzyl)-2-isopropyl-5,12-dimethyl-3,6,9,13-tetra-azaclorodiacene-11-yl}hex-4-enoic Acid (7). LiOH (49 mg, 2.0 mmol, 33 equiv) in water (5.0 mL) was added to a stirred solution of the impure cyclic peptide 18 (61 mg) in THF (5.0 mL). The solution was stirred for 16 h and concentrated in vacuo. The resulting residue was dissolved in THF–H₂O (1:1, 10 mL) by adding a few drops of TFA, and then purification by preparative HPLC afforded azumamide C (7) (2.2 mg, 9% overall) as a white solid. [α]D +99° (c = 0.14, MeOH); previously reported [α]D +21° (c = 0.1, MeOH). 1H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.08 (d, J = 7.7 Hz, 1H), 7.99 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 1H), 7.84 (s, 1H), 7.62 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 7.01 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 6.67 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 5.48 (s, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 3.53 (m, J = 7.0 Hz, 1H), 4.29 (pentet, J = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 4.16 (m, 1H), 4.08 (m, 1H), 3.59 (m, 1H), 3.25 (dd, J = 13.6, 10.4 Hz, 1H), 3.11 (dd, J = 13.6, 6.1 Hz, 1H), 2.72 (m, 1H), 2.68 (m, 1H), 2.39 (d, J = 1.7 Hz, 6H), 2.39 (m, 6H), 1.28 (d, J = 7.4 Hz, 3H), 1.27 (d, J = 7.4 Hz, 3H), 0.94 (m, 6H). HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z calc for C₂₅H₃₅N₅O₅H⁺ 515.2869; found 515.2869 [M + H⁺]. HPLC gradient C, tR = 11.04 min (>95%).

Azumamide D, (Z)-6{(2R,5R,8R,11R,12S)-8-Benzyl-2,5,12-trimethyl-3,6,9,13-tetra-azaclorodiacene-11-yl}hex-4-enoic Acid (8). LiOH (53 mg, 2.21 mmol) in water (5.0 mL) was added to a stirred solution of the impure cyclic peptide 22 (22 mg, approximately 0.044 mmol) in THF (3 mL). After 1 h, the organic solvent was removed in vacuo and the water (0.5 mL) was added to the aqueous phase, which was then acidified with 1 M HCl (2 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (4 × 20 mL). The organic phases were dried (MgSO₄), filtered, and concentrated to give the crude acid 23, which was used without further purification. To a solution of the crude acid 23 (≈23 μmol) in CH₂Cl₂–DMF (8:1, 2.3 mL) were added HOBt (10 mg, 66 μmol, 3 equiv), DIC (10 μL, 66 μmol, 3 equiv), and rPDNET (15 μL, 88 μmol, 4 equiv). After 5 min, NH₂–dioxane (0.5 M, 0.22 mL, 110 μmol, 5 equiv) was added. After 1 h, NH₂–dioxane (0.5 M, 0.22 mL, 110 μmol, 5 equiv) was added. After the mixture was stirred for 18 h, additional DMF (0.5 mL) was added, followed by NH₂–MeOH (2.0 M, 0.11 mL, 230 μmol, 10 equiv). After an additional 5 h, DIC (7 μL, 46 μmol, 2 equiv) was added. The next day NH₂–MeOH (2.0 M, 0.06 mL, 111 μmol, 5 equiv) was added and the mixture was stirred for 10 days. Finally, DIC (3.4 μL, 23 μmol, 1 equiv) was added, followed by NH₂–MeOH (2.0 M, 0.055 mL, 210 μmol, 5 equiv), and after 2 days the mixture was concentrated, dissolved in MeCN–H₂O (2:1), and purified by preparative HPLC to afford azumamide D (8) (1.2 mg, 4% overall) as a white solid. [α]D +32° (c = 0.08, MeOH); previously reported [α]D +25° (c = 0.1, MeOH). 1H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) δ 8.03 (d, J = 7.8 Hz, 1H), 8.01 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.94 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 7.58 (s, 1H), 7.32 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.25–7.14 (m, 5H, 6.75 s (1H), 5.47 (m, 1H), 5.39 (m, 1H), 4.35 (m, 1H), 4.19 (m, 1H) 4.17–4.11 (m, 2H), 3.09 (m, 2H), 2.69 (m, 1H), 2.62 (m, 1H), 2.41 (m, 1H), 2.28 (m, 1H), 1.47 (d, J = 7.4 Hz, 3H), 1.28 (d, J = 7.4 Hz, 3H), 1.22 (d, J = 7.3 Hz, 3H). HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z calc for C₂₅H₃₅N₅O₅H⁺ 531.2819; found 531.2815 [M + H⁺]. HPLC gradient C, tR = 11.04 min (>95%).

In Vitro Histone Deacetylase Inhibition Assays. For inhibition of recruit–human corepressor (HC) complexes, dose–response experiments with internal controls were performed in black low-binding Nunc 96-well microtiter plates. Dilution series (3-fold dilution, 10 concentrations) were prepared in HDAC assay buffer from 5–10 mM DMSO stock solutions. The appropriate dilution of inhibitor (10 μL of Sx the desired final concentration) was added to each well followed by HDAC assay buffer (25 μL) containing substrate [Ac-Leu-Gly-Lys(Tfa)-AMC, 40 μM for HDAC1–3 and 80 μM for HDAC6 and 11; Ac-Leu-Gly-Lys(Tf2)-AMC, 40 μM for HDAC4, 240 μM for HDAC5, 80 μM for HDAC7, 400 μM for HDAC8, and 160 μM for HDAC9; Ac-Ar-Arg-Lys(Tf2)-Lys-AMC, 100 μM for HDAC10]. Finally, a solution of the appropriate HDAC (15 μL) was added and the plate was incubated at 37 °C for 30 min [HDAC1, 150 ng/well; HDAC2, 100 ng/well; HDAC3, 10 ng/well; HDAC4, 2 ng/well; HDAC5, 40 ng/well; HDAC6, 60 ng/well; HDAC7, 2 ng/well; HDAC8, 5 ng/well; HDAC9, 40 ng/well; HDAC10, 500 ng/well; HDAC11, 500 ng/well]. Then trypsin (50 μL, 0.4 mg/mL) was added and the assay development was allowed to proceed for 15–30 min at room temperature, before the plate was read on a Perkin-Elmer Enspire plate reader with excitation at 360 nm and detecting emission at 460 nm. Each assay was performed in duplicate. The data were analyzed by nonlinear regression with GraphPad Prism to a one-site mechanism of inhibition.
Two tables showing cyclication experiments performed on a simplified model peptide and IC_{50} values from dose–response experiments; seven figures showing comparison of ^{1}H and ^{13}C chemical shifts for S18 with previously reported values, ^{1}H NMR data comparisons for azumamides A–E, and dose–response curves for determination of IC_{50} values for “active” inhibitors; two schemes illustrating synthesis of β^3-epi building block (S6) and β^3-epi building block (S11); additional text with full experimental details and compound characterization data; and ^{1}H and ^{13}C NMR spectra. A CIF file for the X-ray crystal structures is available (CCDC 933151). This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.
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