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#### Abstract

The fruit extract of Melaleuca quinquenervia yielded a total of 19 compounds, including two novel spiro-biflavonoid enantiomers ( $\mathbf{l} \mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{l b}$ ) and a chalcone derivative (3). Their structures were determined through spectroscopic analysis. The enantiomers of the racemic mixture of compound 1 were successfully resolved into $(+)-1$ and $(-)-1$ using chiral-phase HPLC. Single-crystal X-ray diffraction analysis was also used to confirm the structure of $\mathbf{1}$. The enantiomeric configurations of $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2}$ were determined through a comparison of the calculated and experimental electronic circular dichroism spectra. Compounds 2 (melanervin), $\mathbf{1 4}$ (methyl betulinate), 15 (3-O-acetylbetulinic acid), and $\mathbf{1 6}$ (pyracrenic acid) were found to be highly cytotoxic, with compound 16 showing superior growth inhibition of nonsmall cell lung cancer cells (A549 cells) (IC $\mathrm{IC}_{50} 2.8 \pm 0.1 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) compared to cisplatin ( $\mathrm{IC}_{50} 3.3 \pm 0.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ), a positive control chemotherapeutic drug. Both compound 16 and cisplatin were significantly more cytotoxic toward A549 lung cancer cells compared to nontumorigenic Vero E6 cells.


## 1. INTRODUCTION

Melaleuca is a large evergreen tree that belongs to the Myrtaceae family and has around 280 species distributed across eastern Australia, Papua New Guinea, and New Caledonia. ${ }^{1}$ Melaleuca leucadendron is cultivated for its ornamental value. ${ }^{1}$ Various parts of these plants are used in traditional medicine. For example, leaves of M. leucadendron have been used for treating gout, respiratory ailments, inflammation, and dermatitis. ${ }^{2,3}$ Additionally, the leaves of Melaleuca alternifolia have been used for treating psoriasis, ${ }^{4}$ and the essential oil is used for skin and microbial infections. ${ }^{5}$ The plant contains many phytochemicals such as hydrolyzable tannins, ${ }^{6}$ polyphenols, ${ }^{6}$ flavonoids, ${ }^{7}$ triterpenes, ${ }^{8,9}$ and stilbenes. ${ }^{7}$ Some phytochemicals have exhibited various biological activities, such as antiviral, ${ }^{10}$ antifungal, ${ }^{11}$ anti-inflammatory, ${ }^{12}$ antioxidant, ${ }^{13}$ and antihistamine properties. ${ }^{7}$
Melaleuca quinquenervia (Cav.) S. T. Blake, commonly known as the "Cajeput tree", is an evergreen plant that is tough and adaptable. It is originally from Australia but has been introduced
to many other parts of the world, including Hawai' i , where it is often used to protect against strong winds. The leaves of $M$. quinquenervia have been used in Thai folk medicine to treat microbial infections, gastrointestinal disorders, and skin lesions. ${ }^{14}$ Previous phytochemical studies have identified flavanones, monoterpene glucosides, polyphenols with antioxidant potential, and compounds with antihyperglycemic activities in M. quinquenervia. ${ }^{15,16}$ This report focuses on the bioassay-guided fractionation and structure elucidation of an ethyl acetate extract from M. quinquenervia fruits. The extract showed inhibitory effects on the growth of the A549 cell line

[^0]
with an $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value of $35.8 \pm 2.0 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$, as demonstrated by the sulforhodamine B (SRB) cytotoxic assay. ${ }^{29}$

## 2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Bioassay-guided fractionation of the ethyl acetate extract from M. quinquenervia fruits resulted in the isolation of two new flavanones ( $\mathbf{1 a}$ and $\mathbf{1 b}$ ), one new chalcone (3), along with 16 known compounds including ( $2 S, 11 R$ ) melanervin ( $2 a$ ), , ${ }^{17,18}$ $(2 R, 11 S)$ melanervin ( $\mathbf{2 b}$ ), ${ }^{17,18}$ pinocembrin (4), ${ }^{19}$ strobopinin (5), ${ }^{20}$ cryptostrobin (6), ${ }^{21}$ cis-piceatannol (7), ${ }^{22}$ piceatannol (8), ${ }^{22}$ ( $1,1^{\prime}$-biphenyl)-2, $2^{\prime}, 4,4^{\prime}, 5$-pentol, $3,3^{\prime}, 5^{\prime}$-trimethoxy (9), ${ }^{23} 3,4,3^{\prime}$-tri-O-methylellagic acid (10), ${ }^{24} 3$-methoxy-5-methyl-1,2-benzenediol (11), ${ }^{25}$ 2-methoxy-1,3,5-benzenetriol (12), ${ }^{26}$ lupenone (13), ${ }^{27}$ methyl betulinate (14), ${ }^{28}$ 3-Oacetylbetulinic acid (15), ${ }^{28}$ pyracrenic acid (16), ${ }^{29}$ and oleanolic acid acetate (17). ${ }^{30}$ The structures were determined by analyzing spectroscopic data such as UV, NMR, infrared (IR), and MS and comparing them to literature values.
Compound $\mathbf{1}$ was isolated as a colorless solid that gave an [M $+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$ion at $m / z 549.1506$ in its HRESIMS spectrum, which corresponds to a molecular formula of $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{8}$ with 19 degrees of unsaturation. The IR spectrum displayed the presence of hydroxy ( $3243 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ), carbonyl $\left(1613 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)$, and aromatic ring (1545, 1339, and $1258 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) functionalities. Analysis of its ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectral $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ data (Table 1) revealed the presence of a set of ABX-type protons [ $\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 5.46$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=12.0,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-2), 2.97(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=17.1,12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$,

Table 1. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz ) Spectroscopic Data of Compounds 1-3 ( $\delta$ in ppm, $J$ in Hz )

| position | $1^{a}$ | $2^{a}$ | $3^{b}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 5.46 (dd, 12.0, 3.8) | 5.20 (dd, 13.2, 2.7) | $\begin{aligned} & 7.78 \\ & (\mathrm{~d}, 16.0) \end{aligned}$ |
| 3 | $\begin{gathered} 2.97 \text { (dd, 17.1, 12.0), } \\ 2.89(\mathrm{dd}, 17.1,3.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.22(\mathrm{dd}, 17.1,13.2) \\ 2.84(\mathrm{dd}, 17.1,2.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.29 \\ (\mathrm{~d}, 16.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| 11 | 4.73 (s) | 6.21 (s) |  |
| 16 | 5.30 (s) | 6.12 (s) |  |
| 19 | 7.07 (m) | 7.33 (m) |  |
| 20 | 7.30 (m) | 7.31 (m) |  |
| 21 | 7.28 (m) | 7.35 (m) |  |
| 22 | 7.30 (m) | 7.31 (m) |  |
| 23 | 7.07 (m) | 7.33 (m) |  |
| 25 | 7.14 (m) | 7.05 (m) |  |
| 26 | 7.30 (m) | 7.13 (m) |  |
| 27 | 7.28 (m) | 7.15 (m) |  |
| 28 | 7.30 (m) | 7.13 (m) |  |
| 29 | 7.14 (m) | 7.05 (m) |  |
| $2^{\prime}$ |  |  | 7.68 (m) |
| $3^{\prime}$ |  |  | 7.44 (m) |
| $4^{\prime}$ |  |  | 7.42 (m) |
| $5^{\prime}$ |  |  | 7.44 (m) |
| $6^{\prime}$ |  |  | 7.68 (m) |
| $5 \prime$ |  |  | 6.12 (s) |
| 5-OH | 12.04 (s) | 12.41 (s) |  |
| $6-\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | 2.22 (s) | 2.10 (s) |  |
| $14-\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | 1.49 (s) | 2.04 (s) |  |
| $15-\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ | 3.90 (s) | 3.76 (s) |  |
| 2 " -OH |  |  | 14.17 (s) |
| $3{ }^{\prime \prime}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ |  |  | 1.97 (s) |
| $4 \prime$-OH |  |  | 9.50 (br s) |
| $6^{\prime \prime}-\mathrm{OH}$ |  |  | 10.12 (br s) |

$\mathrm{H}-3 \alpha), 2.89(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}, J=17.1,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-3 \beta)$ ], one H-bonded hydroxy proton $\left[\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 12.04(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 5-\mathrm{OH})\right.$ ], two methyl singlets [ $\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 2.22\left(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 6-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right), 1.49\left(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 14-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$ ], one methoxy proton $\left[\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 3.90\left(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, 15-\mathrm{OCH}_{3}\right)\right.$ ], one olefinic proton $\left[\delta_{\mathrm{H}}\right.$ $5.30(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-16)]$, one methine signal $\left[\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 4.73(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{H}-11)\right]$, and two sets of phenyl groups [ $\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 7.30(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-20 / 28), 7.28$ ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-21 / 27$ ), 7.14 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-25 / 29$ ), 7.07 ( $2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{H}-19 /$ 23)]. The ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ (Table 2) and HMQC correlations showed signals of 31 carbon signals that can be classified as three carbonyls ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 196.6,193.1,164.7$ ), 11 quaternary carbons (four $\mathrm{sp}^{2}$ oxygenated carbons at $\delta_{\mathrm{C}}$ 185.6,

Table 2. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 100 MHz ) Spectroscopic Data of Compounds 1-3 ( $\delta$ in ppm)

| position | $1^{a}$ | $2^{a}$ | $3^{\text {b }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  | 192.4 |
| 2 | 79.0 | 80.4 | 141.4 |
| 3 | 43.8 | 42.5 | 128.0 |
| 4 | 196.6 | 196.3 |  |
| 5 | 159.9 | 161.0 |  |
| 6 | 106.2 | 107.7 |  |
| 7 | 154.8 | 162.9 |  |
| 8 | 106.3 | 107.2 |  |
| 9 | 155.5 | 156.2 |  |
| 10 | 105.1 | 103.2 |  |
| 11 | 42.2 | 35.1 |  |
| 12 | 78.5 | 106.0 |  |
| 13 | 164.7 | 152.5 |  |
| 14 | 65.0 | 105.3 |  |
| 15 | 185.6 | 158.0 |  |
| 16 | 102.9 | 93.7 |  |
| 17 | 193.1 | 152.9 |  |
| 18 | 138.4 | 139.7 |  |
| 19 | 128.5 | 128.8 |  |
| 20 | 127.4 | 128.6 |  |
| 21 | 128.8 | 129.4 |  |
| 22 | 127.4 | 128.6 |  |
| 23 | 128.5 | 128.8 |  |
| 24 | 138.3 | 136.5 |  |
| 25 | 125.4 | 126.7 |  |
| 26 | 128.8 | 126.8 |  |
| 27 | 127.6 | 126.3 |  |
| 28 | 128.8 | 126.8 |  |
| 29 | 125.4 | 126.7 |  |
| $1^{\prime}$ |  |  | 135.8 |
| $2^{\prime}$ |  |  | 128.2 |
| $3^{\prime}$ |  |  | 128.9 |
| $4^{\prime}$ |  |  | 129.9 |
| $5^{\prime}$ |  |  | 128.9 |
| $6^{\prime}$ |  |  | 128.2 |
| $1^{\prime \prime}$ |  |  | 104.6 |
| $2^{\prime \prime}$ |  |  | 164.9 |
| 3 " |  |  | 102.8 |
| $4 \prime$ |  |  | 162.6 |
| $5 \prime$ |  |  | 94.4 |
| $6^{\prime \prime}$ |  |  | 159.6 |
| $6-\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | 7.3 | 7.7 |  |
| $14-\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ | 24.6 | 8.3 |  |
| $15-\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ | 59.4 | 55.7 |  |
| 3 "- $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ |  |  | 6.6 |

[^1]
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$4 \quad R_{1}=R_{2}=H$
$5 \quad \mathrm{R}_{1}=\mathrm{CH}_{3}=\mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{H}$
$6 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{CH}_{3}$
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$11 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\mathrm{CH}_{3}, \mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{OCH}_{3}, \mathrm{R}_{3}=\mathrm{OH}$
$12 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{R}_{3}=\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$


7


8

$\mathrm{R}_{1}=$ carbonyl, $\mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{CH}_{3}$
$\mathrm{R}_{1}=\mathrm{OH}=\mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{COOCH}_{3}$
$15 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\mathrm{OAc}, \mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{COOH}$
$16 \mathrm{R}_{1}=$


17


Figure 1. Structures of compounds 1-17 isolated from M. quinquenervia fruits.
159.9, 155.5, 154.8, five $\mathrm{sp}^{2}$ carbons at $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 138.4,138.3,106.3$, 106.2, 105.1, and two sp ${ }^{3}$ carbons at $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 78.5,65.0$ ), 12 methines (one olefinic at $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 102.9$ and two $\mathrm{sp}^{3}$ at $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 79.0,42.2$ ), one methylene ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 43.8$ ), and three methyls (one sp ${ }^{3}$ oxygenated at $\left.\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 59.4\right)$. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ COSY correlations of $\mathrm{H}-2$ through $\mathrm{H}_{2}-3$, as well as the HMBC correlations (Figure 2) from H-2 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 5.46$ )


Figure 2. Key ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ COSY and HMBC correlations of compounds $\mathbf{1}$ and 3.
to C-3 $\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 43.8\right), \mathrm{C}-4\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 196.6\right), \mathrm{C}-9\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 155.5\right)$, and C-25/C29 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 125.4$ ); from $5-\mathrm{OH}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 12.04\right)$ to C-5 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 159.9$ ), C-6 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 106.2$ ), and C-10 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 105.1$ ); and from $6-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 2.22\right)$ to C-5, C-6, and C-7 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 154.8$ ), indicated the presence of a phenyl group and methyl group at $\mathrm{C}-2\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 79.0\right)$ and $\mathrm{C}-6$, respectively. These signals resemble those of strobopinin, ${ }^{20}$ a flavanone previously isolated from Leptospermum scoparium. A 4-hydroxy-3-methoxy-4-methylcyclopent-2-en-1-one moiety was constructed from the HMBC correlations from H-16 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 5.30$ ) to C-12 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 78.5$ ), C-14 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 65.0$ ), C-15 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 185.6$ ), and C-17 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}}$ 193.1); from $15-\mathrm{OCH}_{3}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 3.90\right)$ to $\mathrm{C}-15$; and from $14-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{H}}\right.$
1.49) to $\mathrm{C}-12, \mathrm{C}-14$, and $\mathrm{C}-15$. Furthermore, the HMBC correlations from $\mathrm{H}-11\left(\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 4.73\right)$ with C-7, C-8 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 106.3$ ), C-9, $\mathrm{C}-12, \mathrm{C}-13\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 164.7\right), \mathrm{C}-14, \mathrm{C}-17$, and C-19/C-23 ( $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 128.5$ ) connected the other phenyl group and 4-hydroxy-3-methoxy-4-methylcyclopent-2-en-1-one subunit at C-11 and C-12, respectively. As mentioned above, these data accounted for 18 out of 19 degrees of unsaturation, requiring the presence of an additional ring. This finding implied that the oxygen and carbonyl groups at C-13 should be connected to form a $\delta$ lactone. The relative configuration of $\mathbf{1}$ was established by the analysis of the NOESY data. The NOE correlations of $\mathrm{H}-11$ to $14-\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ suggested that these protons were cofacial. The optical rotation of 1 was zero, and there were no Cotton effects in its electronic circular dichroism (ECD) spectrum, suggesting that 1 was a racemic mixture. Compound 1 was subjected to chiralphase HPLC (Lux cellulose-1 column, Phenomenex) which afforded the two enantiomers $(-)-\mathbf{1}\left[t_{\mathrm{R}} 13.8 \mathrm{~min},[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}-19.6(c\right.$ $\left.\left.0.1, \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)\right]$ and $(+)-1\left[t_{\mathrm{R}} 16.9 \mathrm{~min},[\alpha]_{\mathrm{D}}+20.2\right.$ (c 0.1 , $\left.\left.\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}\right)\right]$. A single crystal was obtained, and the structure of $\mathbf{1}$ was confirmed by single-crystal X-ray diffraction (Figure 3). The ECD curve of (+)-1 (1b) showed positive Cotton effects at 257 and 232 nm , whereas ( - )-1 (1a) had opposite Cotton effects at the aforementioned wavelengths (Figure 4). Two putative structures of compound $\mathbf{1}$ (Figure 1) were optimized using the M06-2X/6-31+G* level in methanol and the ECD spectra for $(2 S, 11 R, 12 R, 14 S)-1$ and $(2 R, 11 S, 12 S, 14 R)$ - $\mathbf{1}$ were calculated at the M06-2X/def2-TZVPP level in methanol (Figure 5). Of these, the experimental ECD spectrum of $(+) \mathbf{- 1}(\mathbf{1 b})$ was similar to that of the computed ECD spectrum of $(+)-(2 S, 11 R, 12 R, 14 S)-1$ (Figure 5). Accordingly, the structures of compounds $\mathbf{1 a}$ and $\mathbf{1 b}$ were proposed as


Figure 3. ORTEP drawings of spiroquinquenerin $\left(\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{8} \cdot \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$; displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the $50 \%$ probability level at 298 K ; methanol solvent molecule is not shown. Left: unlabeled and uncluttered view; right: labeled view.


Figure 4. Experimental ECD spectra of $\mathbf{1 a}$ and $\mathbf{1 b}$.


Figure 5. Calculated ECD spectra of 1.
$(-)-(2 R, 11 S, 12 S, 14 R)$-spiroquinquenerin (1a) and $(+)-(2 S, 11 R, 12 R, 14 S)$-spiroquinquenerin (1b).

Compound 2 was initially obtained as a racemic mixture and was later separated into its pure enantiomers, $\mathbf{2 a}$ and $\mathbf{2 b}$, using chiral-phase HPLC. The HRESIMS spectra of $\mathbf{2 a}$ and $\mathbf{2 b}$ gave an $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ion at $m / z 513.1902$ and 513.1910, respectively, indicating a molecular formula of $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{O}_{7}$ (calcd for $\left.\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{O}_{7}, m / z 513.1913\right) .{ }^{17,18}$ To determine the absolute configuration, we made a comparison between experimental and
predicted ECD spectra. The experimental ECD curve for 2a closely aligned with the predicted ECD curve of $(2 S, 11 R)$, exhibiting positive and negative Cotton effects at 230 and 300 nm , respectively. These findings support the absolute configurations of C-2 and C-11 being $2 S$ and $11 R$, respectively. In contrast, 2b displayed opposite Cotton effects at the same wavelengths (Figure S20).

Compound 3, a dark yellow powder, gave the molecular formula $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{O}_{4}$ from the molecular ion peak at $m / z 271.0962$
$[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$in the Q-TOFMS spectrum. The UV and IR spectra displayed the same pattern as those of chalcone core structures. ${ }^{21}$ The ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (acetone- $d_{6}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}$ ) (Table 2) spectrum and HSQC correlations showed resonances of 16 carbon signals comprising one methyl, eight methines (two olefinics at $\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 141.4,128.0$ ), and seven quaternary $\mathrm{sp}^{2}$ carbons (one carbonyl at $\delta_{\mathrm{C}}$ 192.4). In the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra (Tables 1 and 2), the resonances for a trans- $\alpha, \beta$-unsaturated ketone $\left[\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 8.28(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}, J=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-3) / \delta_{\mathrm{C}} 128.0,7.78(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}\right.$, $J=16.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-2) / \delta_{\mathrm{C}} 141.4$, and $\left.\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 192.4\right]$, a monosubstituted benzene ring $\left[\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 7.68-7.42(5 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})\right.$ ], indicated that 3 has a chalcone skeleton. The location of the methyl group $\left[\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 1.97\right.$ $(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$ ] at position 3 was deduced by HMBC correlations (Figure 2) from $2^{\prime \prime}-\mathrm{OH}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 14.17\right)$ to $\mathrm{C}-1^{\prime \prime}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 104.6\right), \mathrm{C}-2^{\prime \prime}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}}\right.$ 164.9), and $\mathrm{C}-3^{\prime \prime}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 102.8\right)$ and from $3^{\prime \prime}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ to $\mathrm{C}-2^{\prime \prime}, \mathrm{C}-3^{\prime \prime}$, and $\mathrm{C}-4^{\prime \prime}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 162.6\right)$. A singlet aromatic proton $\left[\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 6.12(1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, s) $\left./ \delta_{\mathrm{C}} 94.4\right]$ was determined to be located at $\mathrm{C}-5^{\prime \prime}$ by the HMBC correlation of $\mathrm{H}-5^{\prime \prime}$ with $\mathrm{C}-1^{\prime \prime}$ and $\mathrm{C}-3^{\prime \prime}$. Furthermore, the HMBC spectrum exhibited interactions of $\mathrm{H}-3\left(\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 8.28\right)$ with $\mathrm{C}-1^{\prime}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 135.8\right)$ and $\mathrm{C}-2^{\prime} / \mathrm{C}-6^{\prime}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{C}} 128.2\right)$ and correlation of $\mathrm{H}-$ 2 with $\mathrm{C}-1^{\prime}$ and $\mathrm{C}-1^{\prime \prime}$ confirming the attachment of a monosubstituted benzene ring at $\mathrm{C}-3$. On the basis of these spectroscopic studies, the structure of 3 was defined as quinquenerin $B$.

Bioassay-guided fractionation was utilized to guide the chromatographic separation process. All fractions and isolated compounds, except for compound $\mathbf{1}$, were evaluated for their cytotoxicity using a SRB assay in human nonsmall lung cancer A549 cells (Table 3). Cisplatin was used as a positive control and exhibited an $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value of $3.3 \pm 0.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ in the A549 cells. Fractions $C-F$ generated during chromatographic separation showed considerable cytotoxic activity. Their $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values ranged from 12.5 to $65.9 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$. Among these fractions, C, D, E, and F showed noteworthy cytotoxicity toward the A549 cells, with

Table 3. Cytotoxicity of Compounds 2-17 against A549 Cells Was Determined by an SRB Cytotoxicity Assay ${ }^{a}$

| compounds | $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value $(\mu \mathrm{M})$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $13.5 \pm 0.3$ |
| $\mathbf{2 a}$ | $77.4 \pm 2.9$ |
| $\mathbf{2 b}$ | $46.6 \pm 1.1$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $131.1 \pm 3.7$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $169.2 \pm 2.1$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $285.8 \pm 4.2$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | $166.5 \pm 2.0$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | $215.7 \pm 6.1$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | $85.2 \pm 4.0$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | $97.0 \pm 3.6$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $184.0 \pm 3.9$ |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathrm{IC}_{50}>$ highest test concentration $^{b}$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $367.9 \pm 10.2$ |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathrm{IC}_{50}>$ highest test concentration $^{b}$ |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $11.0 \pm 0.5$ |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $11.1 \pm 0.6$ |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $2.8 \pm 0.1$ |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $143.3 \pm 1.7$ |
| cisplatin | $3.3 \pm 0.0$ |

[^2]$\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values of $22.4,17.1,12.5$, and $65.9 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$, respectively. In contrast, fractions A and B were devoid of cytotoxicity, even at the highest concentration $(100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL})$ tested (Figure 6). The isolated compounds ( $\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1 4}, \mathbf{1 5}$, and 16) were cytotoxic to nonsmall cell lung cancer (A549) cells with $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values of $13.5 \pm$ $0.3,11.0 \pm 0.5,11.0 \pm 0.6$, and $2.8 \pm 0.1 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively (Table 3). Pyracrenic acid (16) was 2.6 -fold more cytotoxic toward A549 lung cancer cells compared to nontumorigenic Vero E6 cells (selectivity index, SI $=2.6$ ) (Figure 7). These results are encouraging, as pyracrenic acid (16) showed a level of selectivity similar to that of the chemotherapeutic drug cisplatin ( $\mathrm{SI}=3.0$ ). In contrast, melanervin (2), methyl betulinate (14), and 3-Oacetylbetulinic acid (15) were almost equally cytotoxic toward A549 and Vero E6 (SI = 1.0-1.3). Pyracrenic acid (16), which is $3 \beta$-O-trans-caffeoylbetulinic acid, was found to be more cytotoxic toward A549 cells than 3-O-acetylbetulinic acid (15). These findings suggest that the isolated compounds have the potential to be developed further to improve their selectivity as lead compounds for anticancer drug discovery. ${ }^{47}$

## 3. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, 19 compounds with varying structures were isolated from the fruits of M. quinquenervia. By analyzing the calculated and experimental CD data for compounds $\mathbf{1 a}, \mathbf{1 b}, \mathbf{2 a}$, and $\mathbf{2 b}$, we can determine the absolute configurations of enantiomers $\mathbf{1}$ and 2, respectively. Due to insufficient sample quantity, compounds 1, 1a, and $\mathbf{1 b}$ were not tested for cytotoxicity. It was noted that the naturally occurring racemate had a greater cytotoxic activity than each of the two pure isolated enantiomers of compound 2 . The two enantiomers might target different molecular pathways in A549 cells, resulting in a synergistic effect.

## 4. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

4.1. General Experimental Procedures. Optical rotations were recorded in $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ on a Rudolph Research AUTOPOL IV multiwavelength polarimeter (Rudolph Research Analytical, Hackettstown, NJ, USA). Ultraviolet spectra were measured with a Shimadzu PharmaSpec-1800 UV-visible spectrophotometer (Shimadzu Scientific Instruments, Columbia, MD, USA). The ECD spectra were obtained on a JASCO J-815 spectropolarimeter (JASCO Inc., Tokyo, Japan). IR radiation spectra were measured on a Thermo Scientific Nicolet iS 10 FTIR spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). X-ray data were collected at 298 K using a Bruker D8 VENTURE four circle $\kappa$-geometry diffractometer equipped with an Incoatec $\mathrm{I} \mu \mathrm{S} 3.0$ microfocus sealed tube ( $\mathrm{Cu} \mathrm{K} \alpha$ radiation; $\lambda$ $=1.54178 \AA$ ) with a multilayer mirror monochromator and a Photon III M14 area detector. NMR spectra, including bidimensional, were collected on a Bruker AVANCE DRX400 NMR spectrometer (Bruker, Billerica, MA, USA) at 400 $\mathrm{MHz}\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right)$ and $100 \mathrm{MHz}\left({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\right)$, and the data were processed using MestReNova version 14.2.1-27684 software with $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ( $\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 7.23, \delta_{\mathrm{C}} 77.16$ ) or $\mathrm{MeOD}\left(\delta_{\mathrm{H}} 3.31, \delta_{\mathrm{C}} 49.0\right)$ as solvents. High-resolution electrospray ionization mass spectra were recorded on an Agilent 6530 LC-qTOF high mass accuracy mass spectrometer (Santa Clara, CA, USA) in positive ion mode. Silica gel (230-400 mesh, 480-800 mesh, Sorbent Technologies, Atlanta, GA, USA) and Sephadex LH-20 (GE Healthcare, Piscataway, NJ, USA) were used for column chromatography. Preparative HPLC was performed on a Thermo Scientific Ultimate 3000 system equipped with a


Figure 6. Cytotoxicity of $M$. quinquenervia: the EtOAc extract and chromatographic fractions were evaluated. Compounds 2, 14, 15, and 16 had highly cytotoxic effects with lower $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values.


Figure 7. (A) $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values of compounds $\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1 4}, \mathbf{1 5}, \mathbf{1 6}$, and cisplatin toward A549 cells. Data was obtained using a cytotoxicity assay based on the protein-binding dye, SRB. Cells were treated with increasing concentrations of test samples for 72 h . (B) The comparative cytotoxicity of compounds $\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1 4}, \mathbf{1 5}, \mathbf{1 6}$, and cisplatin toward nonsmall cell lung cancer (A549) and Vero E6 (nontumorigenic) cells was analyzed. The SI values are shown in boxes above the bars. Results are shown as the mean $\pm$ standard deviation values of three independent experiments. ns $=$ not significant, $* p<0.05$, $* * p$ $<0.01$, and $* * * p<0.001$ between two groups indicated.
photodiode array detector, using a reversed-phase $\mathrm{C}_{18}$ chiral column ( $250 \times 10 \mathrm{~mm}, 5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, cellulose-1), with a flow rate of 2 $\mathrm{mL} / \mathrm{min}$.
4.2. Plant Material. The fresh fruits of M. quinquenervia were collected from Hilo, Hawai'i Island (Big Island), Hawaii, USA, in April 2022 and were identified by L. C. Chang. A voucher specimen (no. MQF01) was deposited at the Natural Product Chemistry Laboratory, Daniel K. Inouye College of Pharmacy, University of Hawai'i at Hilo.
4.3. Extraction and Isolation. The dried fruits of $M$. quinquenervia ( 1.4 kg ) were extracted with EtOAc (3 L) at room temperature ( 3 days $\times$ thrice) and concentrated under reduced pressure to give an EtOAc extract ( 120.6 g ). The extract was further separated by CC eluting with the gradient solvent systems of hexanes-EtOAc ( $1: 0$ to $0: 1, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ ) and EtOAc$\mathrm{MeOH}(1: 0$ to $0: 1, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ ) to afford six fractions (A-F). Fractions $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ were active in the SRB cytotoxic assay ( $\mathrm{IC}_{50} 17.7-65.9 \mu \mathrm{~g} /$ mL ), while fractions A and B were inactive and were not investigated further. Fraction C $(12.6 \mathrm{~g})$ was washed with MeOH to yield 15 ( 1.7 g ) and 17 ( 53.7 mg ). Fraction D ( 6.2 g ) was further separated by Sephadex LH-20 CC with $100 \%$ MeOH to afford four subfractions ( $\mathrm{Da}-\mathrm{Dd}$ ). Purification of Dd
$(456.2 \mathrm{mg})$ by silica gel CC eluting with EtOAc-hexane (2:8, v/ v) gave $4(5.8 \mathrm{mg}), 5(12.8 \mathrm{mg}), 2(17.1 \mathrm{mg})$, and D1. Compound 2 was further purified by preparative chiral HPLC (acetonitrile $-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 80: 20$, flow rate $2 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ ) to furnish $2 \mathrm{a}\left(t_{\mathrm{R}}\right.$ $20.3,5.1 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and $\mathbf{2 b}\left(t_{\mathrm{R}} 22.1,4.9 \mathrm{mg}\right.$ ). Subfraction D1 (193.4 mg ) was subjected to silica gel CC using EtOAc-DCM (1:49, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v})$ to yield $\mathbf{1}(1.4 \mathrm{mg}), 5(6.6 \mathrm{mg})$, and $\mathbf{6}(9.3 \mathrm{mg})$. Compound 1 was further purified by preparative chiral HPLC (acetonitrile$\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 60: 40$, flow rate $2 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ ) to furnish $1 \mathrm{a}\left(t_{\mathrm{R}} 13.8,0.4 \mathrm{mg}\right)$ and $\mathbf{1 b}\left(t_{\mathrm{R}} 16.9,0.3 \mathrm{mg}\right)$. Fraction $\mathrm{E}(4.8 \mathrm{~g})$ was purified by Sephadex LH-20 CC ( $100 \% \mathrm{MeOH}$ ) and followed by silica gel CC eluting with EtOAc-hexane (3:7, v/v) to $3(2.1 \mathrm{mg}), 9(1.6$ $\mathrm{mg})$, $\mathbf{1 1}(11.3 \mathrm{mg}), \mathbf{1 3}(4.6 \mathrm{mg})$, and $16(284.4 \mathrm{mg})$. Fraction F $(6.1 \mathrm{~g})$ was further purified on a Sephadex LH-20 CC ( $100 \%$ MeOH ) and followed by silica gel CC eluting with $\mathrm{MeOH}-$ DCM (1:9, v/v) to yield $7(8.2 \mathrm{mg}), 8(257.4 \mathrm{mg}), 10(2.7 \mathrm{mg})$, $12(8.1 \mathrm{mg})$, and $14(11.6 \mathrm{mg})$.
4.3.1. (-)-Spiroquinquenerin (1a). Colorless amorphous solid; UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }}(\log \varepsilon): 220(3.81), 274(2.94) \mathrm{nm} ; \mathrm{CD}$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right) \lambda_{\text {max }}(\Delta \varepsilon): 250(-0.24), 225(-0.018) \mathrm{nm} ;$ IR (neat) $\nu_{\text {max }}: 3246,2962,1613,1545,1262,1018,795 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; see Table 1 for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100\right.$

MHz ); HRESIMS $m / z$ : 549.1506 [ $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$(calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NaO}_{8}, 549.1525$ ).
4.3.2. (+)-Spiroquinquenerin (1b). Colorless amorphous solid; UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }}(\log \varepsilon): 224$ (3.87), 279 (3.25) nm; CD $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right) \lambda_{\text {max }}(\Delta \varepsilon): 257(0.37), 232(-0.01) \mathrm{nm}$; IR (neat) $\nu_{\text {max }}: 3243,2948,1607,1551,1258,1012,794 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; see Table 1 for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100\right.$ MHz ); HRESIMS $m / z$ : $549.1500[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$(calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{NaO}_{8}, 549.1525$ ).
4.3.3. (2S, 11R) Melanervin (2a). Light yellow solid; mp 153$154{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; see Table 1 for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$; HRESIMS $m / z: 513.1902[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{O}_{7}, 513.1913$ ).
4.3.4. (2R,11S) Melanervin (2b). Light yellow solid; mp 148$149{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; see Table 1 for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}$ ); HRESIMS $m / z: 513.1910[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{O}_{7}, 513.1913$ ).
4.3.5. Quinquenerin $B$ (3). Dark yellow powder; mp 177$178{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; UV (MeOH) $\lambda_{\text {max }}(\log \varepsilon): 240(3.21), 275(2.82) \mathrm{nm} ;$ IR (neat) $\nu_{\max }: 3253,1614,1557,1447,1339,1097,972 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; see Table 1 for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (acetone- $d_{6}, 400 \mathrm{MHz}$ ) and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (acetone- $d_{6}, 100 \mathrm{MHz}$ ); HREIMS $m / z: 271.0962[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ (calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{O}_{4}, 271.0970$ ).
4.4. Cell Lines. A549 human lung carcinoma epithelial cells (CCL-185) and Vero E6 (CRL-1586, African green monkey kidney cells) were procured from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC, Manassas, Virginia, USA). Cells were cultured in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium supplemented with heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum (FBS, 10\%) and antibiotics (penicillin $1000 \mathrm{IU} / \mathrm{mL}$ and streptomycin $1000 \mu \mathrm{~g} /$ mL ) at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a humidified incubator with $5 \% \mathrm{CO}_{2}$.
4.5. SRB Cytotoxicity Assay. Cytotoxic activity was measured by an in vitro SRB assay as previously described. ${ }^{31}$ A549 cells ( 6000 cells/well) or Vero E6 cells ( 8000 cells/well) were seeded in a 96 -well plate for 24 h , followed by incubation for 72 h in the presence of test sample at increasing concentrations ( $1.25-50 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) or $0.5 \%$ DMSO (control). Cisplatin, at concentrations of $0.5-20 \mu \mathrm{M}$, was used as a positive control compound. After the incubation, cells were fixed with 50 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ of $10 \%$ trichloroacetic acid for 60 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Next, the plate was washed repeatedly with water, dried, and stained with 100 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ of $0.4 \% \mathrm{SRB}$ in $1 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ acetic acid solution for 30 min . The plate was washed repeatedly with $1 \%$ acetic acid to remove the excess unbound dye and allowed to dry at room temperature. The protein-bound dye was solubilized in $200 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of 10 mM Tris buffer ( pH 10.0 ), and the optical density was recorded at 515 nm . Experiments were performed in triplicate. Percent cell death was calculated with the following equation

$$
\% \text { Cell death }=\frac{\left(\mathrm{OD}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{OD}_{0}\right)-\left(\mathrm{OD}_{\mathrm{S}}-\mathrm{OD}_{0}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{OD}_{\mathrm{C}}-\mathrm{OD}_{0}\right)} \times 100
$$

$\mathrm{OD}_{0}=$ optical density of cells before adding test sample/ standard ( 0 day). This serves as the background reading. $\mathrm{OD}_{\mathrm{C}}=$ optical density of cells in the control well at 72 h in the absence of test sample. $\mathrm{OD}_{\mathrm{S}}=$ optical density of cells after 72 h of incubation with test sample/standard compound.
The median inhibitory concentration ( $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ ) at which $50 \%$ cell death was observed was calculated by plotting \% cell death against test sample concentration, after which nonlinear curve fit analysis was applied using the graphing and curve fitting software, GraphPad Prism. The SI was calculated using the
following equation: $\mathrm{SI}=\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ Vero E 6 cells $/ \mathrm{IC}_{50}$ A549 cells. ${ }^{32-46}$
4.6. Statistical Analysis. All data were presented as the mean $\pm$ standard error of the mean and were obtained from three separate experiments. Statistical analyses were performed by Student's $t$-test or ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparisons test; ${ }^{*} p<0.05,{ }^{* *} p<0.01$, and ${ }^{* * *} p<0.001$ denote statistical significance. $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values of A549 cells were calculated by nonlinear curve fit analysis using Prism software (GraphPad 10.0.2, San Diego, USA) with $R^{2}>0.9$ and $P>0.5$ (runs test) as parameters of goodness of fit.
4.7. Computational Methods. For ECD prediction, conformers were searched using the experimental-torsion basic knowledge distance geometry (ETKDG) ${ }^{48}$ conformer generator from RDkit with the Merck molecular force field. ${ }^{49}$ Low-energy conformers within $5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ of the lowest-energy conformer were then optimized in Gaussian $09^{50}$ at the M06-2 $\mathrm{X}^{51} / 6$ $31+\mathrm{G}^{* 52}$ level with a polarizable continuum model ${ }^{53}$ of methanol. Conformers were categorized into clusters based on their distance matrix deviations (DMD), ${ }^{55}$ ignoring hydrogen and carbon atoms indistinguishable to rotation (for example, carbon atoms in the phenyl groups and hydrogen atoms in the methyl groups). Each cluster consisted of all conformers with DMD values within a threshold of $0.0015 \AA$, and these are considered as effectively the same species. Fifty-seven distinct clusters of conformers, verified by Visual Molecular Dynamics, ${ }^{56}$ were identified and their electronic excitation energies and rotational strengths were calculated with time-dependent density functional theory ${ }^{54}$ at the M06-2X/def2-TZVPP ${ }^{52}$ level. The final ECD spectra were generated from the Boltzmann-weighted average of the 57 distinct conformer's ECD spectra using a sigma of $1 / 3099.6 \mathrm{~nm}^{-1}$ and were verified against the experimental spectrum of spiro-biflavonoid enantiomers ( $\mathbf{1 a}$ and $\mathbf{1 b}$ ).
4.8. Single-Crystal X-ray Structure Determination of Spiroquinquenerin (1). Crystals of spiroquinquenerin were obtained from methanol. A block-like specimen of approximate dimensions $0.05,0.075$, and 0.10 mm was mounted on a MiTeGen MicroMount. X-ray data were collected at 298 K using a Bruker D8 VENTURE four circle $\kappa$-geometry diffractometer equipped with an Incoatec $\mathrm{I} \mu \mathrm{S} 3.0$ microfocus sealed tube ( $\mathrm{Cu} \mathrm{K} \alpha$ radiation; $\lambda=1.54178 \AA$ ) with a multilayer mirror monochromator and a Photon III M14 area detector. A total of 2940 frames were collected and integrated with the Bruker SAINT software package by using a narrow-frame algorithm. The integration of the data using a triclinic unit cell yielded a total of 30,273 reflections to a maximum $\theta$ angle of $70.10^{\circ}$ ( $0.82 \AA$ resolution), of which 5117 were independent (average redundancy 5.92, completeness $=98.8 \% ; R_{\text {int }}=3.06 \%$; $\left.R_{\text {sig }}=2.01 \%\right)$. Data were corrected for absorption effects using the multiscan method (SADABS); $T_{\min }=0.6928 ; T_{\max }=0.7533$. The final unit cell constants are based upon the refinement of the $X Y Z$-centroids of 9925 reflections above $20 \sigma$ (I) with $6.113<2 \theta$ $<140.1^{\circ}$. Crystal data for spiroquinquenerin: $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{O}_{8}$. $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH} ; M=558.56$; triclinic space group $P \overline{1} ; a=9.5298(2)$ $\AA \AA ; b=9.9515(2)(2) \AA ; c=14.9005(3) \AA ; \alpha=94.6530(10)^{\circ} ; \beta=$ $102.4380(10)^{\circ} ; \gamma=97.7540(10)^{\circ} ; V=1358.42(5) \AA^{3} ; Z=2\left(Z^{\prime}\right.$ $=1) ; \rho=1.366 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3} ; \mu=0.829 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1} ; T=298 \mathrm{~K}$. The structure was solved using SHELXT, part of the Bruker software package APEX4; non-H atoms were refined anisotropically; H atoms were refined at idealized positions, riding on the neighboring atoms with relative isotropic displacement parameters. The final full-matrix least-squares refinement on
$F^{2}$ with 389 variables converged at $R_{1}=5.45 \%$ for the observed data and $\mathrm{w} R_{2}=14.52 \%$ for all data; the goodness of fit $(S)$ was 1.075. The final Fourier difference synthesis was featureless; the largest peak was $0.614 \mathrm{e} / \AA^{3}$ (at a chemically implausible position) and the largest hole was $-0.346 \mathrm{e} / \AA^{3}$.
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[^1]:    ${ }^{a}$ Recorded in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3} .{ }^{b}$ Recorded in acetone- $d_{6}$.

[^2]:    ${ }^{a}$ The $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values were calculated by treating the cells with isolated compounds or cisplatin for 72 h . The results of three independent experiments are shown as mean $\pm$ standard deviation values. ${ }^{b}$ The $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value falls beyond the concentration range tested.

