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## Comparison of Data for Z-OF4949-III-OMe 3

## ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$

Figure 1: Pearson's ${ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ for Z-OF4949-III-OMe ( $\mathbf{3 0 0} \mathbf{~ M H z ) ~}$


Figure 2: Our ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ for Z-OF4949-III-OMe (400 MHz)


Table 3 compares our ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ chemical shift for Z-OF4949-III-OMe (3) in deuterated methanol with both Pearson's ${ }^{1}$ and Boger's ${ }^{2}$ listed data.

Table 3 (Z-OF4949-III-OMe, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ )

| Ours (400MHz) |  |  | Pearson (300 MHz) |  | Boger (300MHz) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shift | H, mul., Hz | Attr. | Shift | H, mul., Hz | Shift | H, mul., Hz | Attr. |
| $7.43-7.28$ | $6, \mathrm{~m}$ | Ar | $7.70-7.54$ | $7, \mathrm{~m}$ | $7.40-7.20$ | $7, \mathrm{~m}$ | Ar |
| 7.20 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 8.52 .0$ | Ar | - | - | - | - | - |
| 6.98 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 8.02 .5$ | Ar | 7.36 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 8.01 .9$ | 6.98 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 82$ | Ar |
| 6.85 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 8.02 .5$ | Ar | 7.23 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 8.01 .9$ | 6.93 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 82$ | Ar |
| 6.80 | $1, \mathrm{~d}, 8.0$ | Ar | 7.10 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 8.01 .9$ | 6.82 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 82$ | Ar |
| 6.47 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 8.02 .0$ | Ar | 6.75 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 8.01 .9$ | 6.69 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 82$ | Ar |
| 5.87 | $1, \mathrm{~d}, 2.0$ | H sh | 6.05 | $1, \mathrm{~s}$ | 5.88 | $1, \mathrm{~s}$ | H |
| 5.14 | $1, \mathrm{~d}, 12.5$ | Z | 5.24 | $1, \mathrm{~d}, 12.4$ | 5.08 | $2, \mathrm{~s}$ | Z |
| 5.02 | $1, \mathrm{~d}, 12.5$ | Z | 5.12 | $1, \mathrm{~d}, 12.4$ | - | - | - |
| $4.83-4.70$ | $2, \mathrm{~m}$ | $\alpha$ | 4.90 | $1, \mathrm{~m}$ | 4.80 | $1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $\alpha$ |
| - | - | - | 4.81 | $1, \mathrm{~m}$ | 4.61 | $1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $\alpha$ |
| $4.42-4.37$ | $1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $\alpha$ | 4.56 | $1, \mathrm{~m}$ | 4.50 | $1, \mathrm{~m}$ | $\alpha$ |
| 3.85 | $3, \mathrm{~s}$ | OMe | 3.88 | $3, \mathrm{~s}$ | 3.82 | $3, \mathrm{~s}$ | OMe |
| 3.79 | $3, \mathrm{~s}$ | OMe | 3.80 | $3, \mathrm{~s}$ | 3.66 | $3, \mathrm{~s}$ | OMe |
| 3.35 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 13.03 .5$ | $\beta$ | 3.36 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 13.52 .5$ | 3.31 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 134$ | $\beta$ |
| 3.01 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 14.06 .5$ | $\beta$ | 2.97 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 13.53 .1$ | 3.10 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 136$ | $\beta$ |
| 2.83 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 14.01 .5$ | $\beta$ | 2.76 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 14.03 .3$ | 2.84 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 136$ | $\beta$ |
| $2.69-2.61$ | $2, \mathrm{~m}$ | $\beta$ | $2.97(?)$ | $2, \mathrm{~m}$ | 2.83 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 135$ | $\beta$ |
| 2.53 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 15.58 .0$ | $\beta$ | 2.45 | $1, \mathrm{dd}, 14.03 .3$ | - |  | - |

Z-OF4949-III-OMe $\mathbf{3}$ has 34 protons, five of which are NHs that exchange in deuterated methanol, so in total, 29 protons. The symmetrical ring in the macrocycle has no possibility of free rotation and all the protons and carbon atoms are therefore inequivalent. Pearson's spectrum (Fig. 1) and our spectrum (Fig. 2) show the correct number of protons via integration; Boger reported 27 protons in total. The tabulated data reported by $\operatorname{Boger}^{2}$ (Table 3) do not match the spectrum provided in that publication's supporting information, and Boger has acknowledged in a personal communication that the reproduced spectrum for Z-OF4949-III-OMe (compound 129) in the SI for that paper must be the wrong spectrum. Because of the poor solubility of Z-OF4949-III-OMe $\mathbf{3}$ in methanol, some experiments were performed by adding a small amount of deuterated chloroform to aid solubility. This resulted in the multiplet at 4.83-4.70 being split into two double doublets: $4.75\left(1 \mathrm{H}, J_{\mathrm{AB}} 12.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, J_{\mathrm{AX}} 3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$ and $4.81\left(1 \mathrm{H}, J_{\mathrm{AB}}\right.$ $8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, J_{\mathrm{AX}} 5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$. Some experiments were performed in deuterated chloroform, but without acidic protons. To promote proton/deuterium exchange, the sample of $\mathbf{3}$ was sonicated in the presence of deuterated methanol (the compound is not soluble in water) and then the solvent was removed by
evaporation. Usually small quantities of methanol were observed in the spectra prepared under these conditions. We observed that changes in the concentration of the sample and the composition of the solvent have dramatic effects on the appearance of the NMR spectra. This may explain the minor differences between the chemical shifts observed in our spectra and those previously reported. Evans noted that the presence of traces of acid in the NMR sample can affect the appearance of the spectrum of OF4949-III itself. ${ }^{3}$

## ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR experiments

Table 4 shows the chemical shift for the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right)$ from Pearson, ${ }^{1}$ our data for a Pendant experiment ( 100 MHz , mixed solvent $3 \%$ circa $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ), for a CPD experiment in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$, for a CPD experiment performed in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ in which a catalytic amount of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}$ was added and a ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$.

Table 4: ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$, Z-OF4949-III-OMe

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pearson } \\ & \left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Our (mix, Pendant) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Our }\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD},\right. \\ \mathrm{CPD}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Our }\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}+\right. \\ \left.\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Our } \\ \left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Assign. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 174.4 | 174.4 | 173.0 | 173.0 | 173.1 | C |
| 173.0 | 172.9 | 171.5 | 171.5 | 171.7 | C |
| 171.9 | 171.9 | 170.5 | 170.5 | 169.7 | C |
| 171.3 | 171.3 | 169.8 | 169.8 | 169.4 | C |
| 157.3 | 157.3 | 155.9 | 155.8 | 155.8 | C |
| 155.3 | 155.3 | 153.8 | 153.8 | 153.7 | C |
| 150.6 | 150.6 | 149.1 | 149.1 | 149.1 | C |
| 149.3 | 149.3 | 147.8 | 147.8 | 147.6 | C |
| 138.1 | 138.2 | 136.8 | 136.7 | 136.3 | C |
| 135.2 | 135.2 | 133.8 | 133.8 | 133.2 | C |
| 133.2 | 133.2 | 131.7 | 131.7 | 132.1 | CH |
| 131.6 | 131.6 | 130.2 | 130.2 | 130.3 | CH |
| 130.4? | - | - | - | - | - |
| 130.2? | - | - | - | - | - |
| 129.7 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 129.5 | 129.5 | 128.1 | 128.0 | $128.4 \times 2$ | CH |
| 129.3 | $\begin{gathered} 129.3 \\ \text { (not real?) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 127.9 \\ \text { (not real?) } \end{gathered}$ | 127.9 | 128.0 | CH |
| 129.1 | $\begin{gathered} 129.12 \\ (\mathrm{CH}+\mathrm{C}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 127.7 \\ (\mathrm{CH}+\mathrm{C}) \end{gathered}$ | 127.7 | $127.8 \times 2$ | CH |
| 127.9 | 129.08 | 127.6 | 127.6 | 127.1 C | - |
| 124.9 | 124.9 | 123.4 | 123.4 | 123.5 | CH |
| 123.4 | 123.4 | 122.0 | 122.0 | 122.7 | CH |
| 122.9 | 122.9 | 121.5 | 121.5 | 121.7 | CH |
| 117.3 | 117.3 | 115.8 | 115.8 | 115.6 | CH |
| 113.1 | 113.1 | 111.6 | 111.6 | 111.4 | CH |
| 67.6 | 67.6 | 66.2 | 66.2 | 66.7 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Z}$ |
| 56.6 | 56.6 | 55.1 | 55.1 | 55.8 | $\mathrm{OCH}_{3} \mathrm{Ar}$ |
| 55.1 | 55.1 | 53.7 | 53.7 | 53.6 | CH $\alpha$ |
| 54.9 | 54.8 | 53.4 | 53.4 | 53.5 | CH $\alpha$ |
| - | 53.0 | 51.5 | - | 52.5 | $\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ Est |
| - | 50.0 | 48.6 | 48.6 | 48.3 | CH $\alpha$ |
| 42.1? | - | - | $48.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right)$ | - | - |
| 40.1 | 40.1 | 38.7 | 38.7 | 39.2 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \beta$ |
| 39.4 | 39.4 | 37.9 | 37.9 | 38.6 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \beta$ |
| 38.2 | 38.2 | 36.8 | 36.8 | 37.3 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \beta$ |
| 35.9? | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 3: ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ for Z-OF4949-III-OMe (Pearson's, ours)


Figure 4: Our ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ for Z-OF4949-III-OMe + bicarbonate


The signals for the Pendant experiment ( $3 \% \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) are slightly shifted from the CPD experiment (in just $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ), but correspond. We suspect the signal at 129.3 (in the Pendant) and 127.9 (CPD) is a signal related to an impurity. The molecule requires 21 signals in the aromatic region: 10 signals for aromatic CH carbons and 11 quaternary carbons. From the pendant experiment we can see one quaternary fewer ( 10 instead of 11 ) and one CH more ( 11 instead of 10 ). Figure 5 shows the signal at 129.3 (Pendant), which corresponds to the signal at 127.9 (CPD) which is very weak and is on the odd side (together with CH and $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ). Looking at the pendant experiment we notice the signal at
129.12 is much smaller than the nearby signal at 129.08 . When we compare the corresponding signals in the CPD experiment, 127.7 is as intense as nearby signal at CH at 127.6. The signal at 129.08 (127.6 in the CPD ) is one of the signals for two aromatic CHs from the symmetric Z protecting group. This observation can be rationalized by considering the presence of a quaternary carbon obscured by the signal at 129.12 (Pendant) or 127.7 (CPD), respectively. The quaternary carbon will increase its signal in the CPD and decrease in the pendant, where it would appear on the even side of the spectrum. In this way the number of signals becomes correct. Given the analysis of the data above, it should be mentioned that the same signal at 129.3 , which we believe is an impurity, was also reported by Pearson. ${ }^{1}$

## Figure 5: expansion of Pendant and CPD


ppm (t1)


## NMR Structure Assignment for Z-OF4949-III-OMe 3 in CDCl $_{3}$

Figure 6: Z-OF4949-III-OMe (3)


In the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR of Z-OF4949-III-OMe, a striking, but expected, ${ }^{1,2}$ value for the chemical shift of $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ (Figure 6) was observed, at 5.82 ppm (in deuterated chloroform) and 5.87 ppm (in deuterated methanol). Before attempting the NMR structure determination for $\mathbf{3}$, a molecular structure was generated using "Maestro" software and a conformational search using the "Montecarlo" method (MMFF/THCG pair) was performed to find a low energy conformation, which was then validated by calculation of the expected chemical shift of $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$.

The settings chosen were the following:

Solvent
Maximum iterations

Number of steps
Method
Energy window for saving structures
chloroform
500

1000
torsional sampling
$50.0 \mathrm{KJ} / \mathrm{mol}$

In most of the minimized structure, a similar motif for the ring was observed with the major changes related only to the external groups (Z-group, OMe, Asn and COOMe). We then compared the lowest energy structure (Figure 7a, sticks and Figure 7b, space filling) for the macrocycle with an arbitrarily chosen minimized open structure, with $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ far away from any source of magnetic perturbation (Figure 8), chosen as zero.

Figure 7a: Z-OF4949-III-OMe (sticks)


Figure 7b: Z-OF4949-III-OMe (space filling)


## Figure 8: Precursor to Z-OF4949-III-OMe (3.16)



Performing a change-induced in chemical shift calculation for $H_{\text {sh }}$, using Hunter's approach, ${ }^{4}$ we found a value of -0.93 ppm , which is in agreement with the experimental data. The calculated distance between $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ and the close sphere of protons, are consistent with the NOE data obtained.

## COSY experiment in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$

Due to improved solubility, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ was chosen as solvent for the initial NMR experiments. The sample for the COSY experiment was prepared dissolving the non recrystallised material (3) in deuterated methanol, in order to exchange the acidic NHs , and then evaporation of the solvent and subsequent dissolution of the solid in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$. Traces of methanol had the effect of completely splitting the three sets of signals for the two overlapping $\alpha$ protons. Under these conditions it was possible to clearly identify the $\alpha-\beta$ proton sets coupled together (see Figure 9 ).

Figure 9: COSY $\alpha-\beta$ correlation


With the COSY experiment it was also possible to identify both the symmetrical and unsymmetrical aromatic system (see Figure 10).

Figure 10: COSY unsymmetrical aromatic system

| Cradiated |  | Couple with |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| spm |  |  |  |
| signal | ppm | signal | 6.47 |

Concerning the symmetrical aromatic system, and basing our assumption on data from literature, ${ }^{5}$ it is reasonable to assign the higher field signals as protons $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{g}}$, in the ortho position of O-Ar. The $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$, (meta to the $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{Ar}$ ) are therefore the signals at lower field (see Figure 11).

## Figure 11: COSY symmetrical aromatic system



## HMQC experiment in $\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}$

The HMQC experiment, run on the same sample used for the COSY experiment, determines the C-H connectivity in the molecule (see Table 5).

Table 5: HMQC in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$

| $\mathrm{HMQC}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$ no acidic proton $)$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| carbon | proton | description |
| 132.1 | 7.09 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ |
| 130.3 | 7.24 | Hi |
| $128.4 \times 2$ |  |  |
| 128.1 | 7.30 | Z 5 H |
| $127.8 \times 2$ |  |  |
| 123.5 | 6.47 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$ |
| 122.7 | 6.99 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{g}}$ |
| 121.7 | 6.82 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}$ |
| 115.6 | 5.80 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ |
| 111.4 | 6.70 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| 66.7 | $5.10,4.99$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Z}$ |
| 55.9 | 3.86 | $\left(\mathrm{ArOMe}^{2}\right)$ |
| 53.6 | 4.48 | $\alpha_{\mathrm{c}}$ |
| 53.5 | 4.78 | $\alpha_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 52.5 | 3.74 | $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}\right)$ |
| 48.3 | 4.61 | $\alpha_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 39.3 | $2.54-2.45,2.40$ | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 38.5 | $2.54-2.45,3.28$ | $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 37.3 | $2.93,2.73$ | $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ |

## HMBC experiment in $\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}$

In order to try to obtain more information from the HMBC experiment, compound $\mathbf{3}$ was dissolved in deuterated chloroform only, in order to see all the protons present in the molecule. Figure 12 shows the connectivity between carbons and protons at two bond distance (C-X-H) and three bond distance (C-X-$\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{H})$ in the unsymmetrical aromatic system.

## Figure 12: HMBC unsymmetrical aromatic system



| Proton |  | Coupled Carbon |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| signal | ppm | signal | ppm |
| $\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ | 3.88 | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{j}}$ | 147.7 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 123.5 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ | 5.82 | COMe | 147.7 |
|  |  | COAr | 149.1 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{e}}$ | 111.4 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$ | 6.50 | $\mathrm{C}_{\text {sh }}$ | 115.6 |
|  |  | COMe | 147.7 |
|  |  | CR | 127.1 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}$ | 6.72 | COMe | 147.7 |
|  |  | COAr | 149.1 |

Figure 13 shows the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ long distance correlations in the symmetrical aromatic system.
Figure 13: HMBC symmetrical aromatic system


| Proton |  | Coupled Carbon |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| signal | ppm | signal | ppm |
|  |  | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{f}}$ | 121.8 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{g}}$ | 7.00 | CR | 133.2 |
|  |  | COAr | 153.7 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | 7.24 | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | 132.1 |

Figure 14 shows the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ long distance relationships in the ester and carbamate protecting group.

## Figure 14: HMBC protecting groups



| Proton |  | Coupled Carbon |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| signal | ppm | signal | ppm |
| $\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ | 3.76 | $-\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{O}) \mathrm{O}$ | 171.8 |
|  |  | $o-\mathrm{CHs}$ | 127.8 |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Z}$ | 5.12 | $i p s o-\mathrm{C}$ | 136.3 |
|  |  | $O C(O) \mathrm{N}$ | 155.8 |

Use of pure chloroform as solvent resulted in little change in the chemical shifts observed in the overall spectrum for both carbon and proton. The signals for the protons $\alpha_{b}$ and $\alpha_{c}$ collapsed to a broad signal at 4.55 ppm , together with the change in the multiplicity at the $\alpha$ protons, which now couple with the NHs. Unfortunately no C-H long range correlation to the peptide chain was observed. With the information obtained from the HMBC experiment, we were able to determine the quaternary carbons of the aromatic rings and assign some of the carbonyl groups in the structure.

## NOESY experiment in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$

Only the most significant signals are reported here. The sample was dissolved in chloroform and no deuterium exchanged was carried out. The multiplet at $2.35-2.60 \mathrm{ppm}$ is generated from the overlapping of 3 protons: two $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ and one of the two $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$. From the spectrum, it is possible to assign the right shoulder (rs) of the signal to the two $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ and the left shoulder (1s) to $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$. This data was also confirmed from the COSY experiment. Irradiation of the multiplet at $2.35-2.60 \mathrm{ppm}$ gave an enhancement to the geminal protons $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ and $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ and to the signal at 4.55 ( $\alpha_{\mathrm{b}}$ and $\alpha_{\mathrm{c}}$ ). The irradiation of the signal at $4.55 \mathrm{ppm}\left(\alpha_{\mathrm{b}}\right.$ and $\left.\alpha_{\mathrm{c}}\right)$ gave enhancement not just to the right shoulder of the multiplet at 2.35-2.60, related to $\alpha_{\mathrm{b}}$ (Figure 15), but also to the protons spatially related to $\alpha_{\mathrm{c}}$ (see Figure 18). The irradiation of the right shoulder had no NOE effect on any of the aromatic signals, so the $\beta_{b} s$ must belong to the asparagine, distant from both aromatic rings. For reasons of clarity, the figure below shows the enhancement related only to the $\alpha_{\mathrm{b}} \beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ system.

## Figure 15: NOESY $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}-\alpha_{\mathrm{b}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathrm{b}}$ system (asparagine)



| Irradiated | Signal | NOE | Strength | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2.35-$ |  | $2.35-2.60$ | s | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| $2.60(\mathrm{rs})$ | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ | 4.55 | m | $\alpha_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 4.55 | $\alpha_{\mathrm{b}} / \alpha_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $2.35-2.60$ | m | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |

The irradiation of the left shoulder (ls) of the signal at 2.35-2.60 ( $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ ) gave a NOE enhancement of the methyl ester protecting group. This allowed us to assign the $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ as belonging to the symmetrical tyrosine (the one bearing the methyl ester protecting group). A weak enhancement of $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ and a strong enhancement of $H_{h}$ led to the conclusion that $\beta_{a}$ at 2.35-2.60 is on the same side as the two aromatics $H_{h}, H_{f}$ and opposite to $H_{i}$. The observation was confirmed from the irradiation of $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ at 3.27 which enhanced $H_{i}$ strongly and $H_{g}$ weakly. Because irradiation of $\beta_{a}$ at 2.35-2.60 gave a medium NOE of $\alpha_{a}$ at 4.79-4.90 and irradiation of $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ at 3.27 ppm gave a strong enhancement to the same proton, it was
possible to define the spatial arrangement of the two $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ and the close aromatic system, given that the amino acid is of S-configuration. This identifies $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ at 2.35-2.60 as the prochiral R proton, and so is labelled $\beta_{a R} ; \beta_{a}$ at 3.27 is then $\beta_{a S}$ (see Figure 16).

Figure 16: NOESY $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ symmetrical tyrosine


| Irradiated | Signal | NOE | Strength | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3.27 | s | $\beta_{\mathrm{aS}}$ |
| $2.35-$ |  | $4.79-4.90$ | m | $\alpha_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 2.60 (ls) | $\beta_{\mathrm{aR}}$ | 6.82 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}$ |
|  |  | 7.08 | m | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ |
|  |  | 7.24 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ |
|  |  | $2.35-2.60$ | s | $\beta_{\mathrm{aR}}$ |
|  |  | $4.79-4.90$ | s | $\alpha_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 3.27 | $\beta_{\mathrm{aS}}$ | 7.00 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{g}}$ |
|  |  | 7.08 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ |
|  |  | 7.24 | s | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ |

Irradiation of $\beta_{c}$ at 2.78 (Figure 17) gave a NOE enhancement to the geminal proton $\beta_{c}$ (2.96), the $\alpha_{c}$ (4.55) and also the aromatics $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$. With $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$ in particular, the enhancement was stronger. Irradiation of $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ at 2.96 enhanced the geminal proton $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ (2.78), $\alpha_{\mathrm{c}}$ (4.55), and again the two aromatics $H_{\text {sh }}$ and $H_{d}$. The relative strength of the enhancements was reversed relative to those observed with $\beta_{c}$ at 2.78. This gives the impression that the plane of the aromatic ring is almost orthogonal to the plane that bisects the two protons $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$. The proton $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$ is closer to $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ at 2.96 and $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ is closer to $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ at 2.78.

## Figure 17: NOESY $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ unsymmetrical tyrosine



| Irradiated | Signal | NOE | Strength | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2.96 | s | $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ |
| 2.78 | $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ | 4.55 | s | $\alpha_{b} \alpha_{\mathrm{c}}$ |
|  |  | 5.82 | s | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ |
|  |  | 6.50 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$ |
|  |  | 2.78 | s | $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ |
| 2.96 | $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ | 4.55 | s | $\alpha_{\mathrm{c}}$ |
|  |  | 5.82 | m | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ |
|  |  | 6.50 | s | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$ |

With the irradiation of the signal at $4.55\left(\alpha_{b} \alpha_{c}\right)$, it was not possible to confirm the spatial arrangement of the protons in the unsymmetrical aromatic system, because only few signals can be assignd with certainty to $\alpha_{b}$ or to $\alpha_{c}$. The NOE effect observed on $\beta_{c}$ at 2.78 is just slightly stronger than the one for $\beta_{c}$ at 2.96 , suggesting that $\alpha_{c}$ is almost halfway from the two $\beta_{c}$ (Figure 18), which is in agreement with the observation made before (Figure 17).

Figure 18: NOESY - irradiation of $\alpha_{c} / \alpha_{b}$

|  | Irradiated | Signal | NOE | Strength | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2.35-2.60$ | m | $\beta_{b} \beta_{b}$ |  |  |  |

A very weak but interesting enhancement of $\alpha_{a}$, which may be rationalized by a long range effect between the two alpha protons $\alpha_{a}$ and $\alpha_{c}$, which point, in our model, in the same direction. Irradiation of the proton $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ (5.82) shows its central position in the molecule very clearly, giving an NOE with almost all the protons facing the cavity of the molecule (see Figure 19).

## Figure 19: NOESY $\mathbf{C D C l}_{3}$ - irradiation of $\mathbf{H}_{\text {sh }}$



| Irradiated | Signal | NOE | Strength | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2.78 | S |  |
|  |  | 2.96 | m | $\beta_{c}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ | 4.55 | m | $\alpha_{b} \alpha_{c}$ |
|  |  | 5.68 | m | NH |
| 5.82 |  | 6.50 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {d }}$ |
|  |  | 6.82 | s | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}$ |
|  |  | 7.00 | m | $\mathrm{Hg}_{\mathrm{g}}$ |
|  |  | 7.08 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ |
|  |  | 7.24 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ |
|  |  | 7.26-7.36 | w | Ar(Z) |

Irradiation of $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$, at 6.50 ppm , once again gave an indication of the relative position of the two $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ protons, showing a stronger NOE with 2.96 and weaker one with 2.78 , in a complementary fashion to $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ (see Figure 20).

## Figure 20: $\mathrm{NOESY} \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ irradiation of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{d}}$



The two NH protons at 5.95 and 6.42 ppm gave a NOE effect just between each other; this reasonably identifies them as the $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{O}) \mathrm{NH}_{2}$ of the asparagine residue.

With the help of the computer model and the data already in our possession, we analyzed the NOESY spectrum, confirming some of the data and finally achieving what we think is the most complete assignment (Figure 21) for the fully protected precursor of OF4949-III 3, which is shown below.

Figure 21: $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ assignment


| ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ | ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ | Assign. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.26-7.36 | 128.4 | Z |
|  | 128.0 | W |
|  | 127.8 | v |
| 7.24 | 130.3 | i |
| 7.08 | 132.1 | h |
| 7.00 | 122.7 | g |
| 6.82 | 121.8 | f |
| 6.72 | 111.4 | e |
| 6.50 | 123.5 | d |
| 5.82 | 115.6 | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ |
| 5.12 | 66.7 | u |
| 5.02 |  |  |
| 4.79-4.90 | 53.5 | $\alpha_{a}$ |
| 4.55 | 53.6 | $\alpha_{\text {c }}$ |
|  | 48.3 | $\alpha_{\text {b }}$ |
| 3.88 | 55.8 | p |
| 3.76 | 52.5 | q |
| 3.27 | 38.6 | $\beta_{\mathrm{aS}}$ |
| 2.96 | 37.3 | $\beta_{\mathrm{cs}}$ |
| 2.78 | 37.3 | $\beta_{\mathrm{cR}}$ |
| 2.35-2.60 1s | 38.6 | $\beta_{\mathrm{aR}}$ |
| 2.35-2.60 rs | 39.2 | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}} \beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| - | 173.1 | X |
| - | 171.7 | r |
| - | 169.7 | $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ |
| - | 169.4 | $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ |
| - | 155.8 | S |
| - | 153.7 | n |
| - | 149.1 | k |
| - | 147.6 | j |
| - | 136.3 | y |
| - | 133.2 | 0 |
|  | 127.1 | m |

## NOESY study in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ (following $\mathbf{H} / \mathrm{D}$ exchange)

The sample was dissolved in deuterated methanol, evaporated and dissolved in deuterated chloroform. All the signals for the NH were lost. The signals for $\alpha_{\mathrm{b}}$ and $\alpha_{\mathrm{c}}$ were separated into two different signals at $4.38\left(\alpha_{c}\right)$ and $4.55\left(\alpha_{b}\right)$. The only important issue was the confirmation of the spatial arrangement in the unsymmetrical tyrosine. The irradiation of $2.93\left(\beta_{\mathrm{cs}}\right)$ enhanced $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}(6.50)$ and irradiation of 2.78 $\left(\beta_{\mathrm{cR}}\right)$ enhanced $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{sh}}(5.81)$.

## NMR Structure Assignment for Z-OF4949-III-OMe 3 in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathbf{O D}$

## HMQC experiment in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$

Table 6 lists the chemical shifts from the HMQC experiment in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$. In addition to an assignment of the C-H connectivity in the molecule, this experiment allowed us to define the different signals for each of the $\alpha$ and $\beta$ protons and the corresponding carbons.

Table 6: HMQC in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$

| HMQC CD ${ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| carbon | proton | description |
| 131.7 | 7.19 | Ar |
| 130.2 | 7.43-7.28 | Ar |
| 128.1 (x 2) | 7.43-7.28 | Ar Z |
| $127.7(\mathrm{CH}+\mathrm{C})$ |  |  |
| 127.6 (x 2) |  |  |
| 123.4 | 6.47 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$ |
| 122.0 | 6.98 | Ar |
| 121.5 | 6.85 | Ar |
| 115.8 | 5.87 | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ |
| 111.6 | 6.80 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| 66.2 | 5.14, 5.01 | $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Z}$ |
| 55.1 | 3.86 | (ArOMe) |
| 53.7 | 4.70-4.83 | $\alpha_{c}$ |
| 53.4 | 4.38 | $\alpha_{\text {a }}$ |
| 51.5 | 3.79 | $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Me}\right)$ |
| 48.6 | 4.70-4.83 | $\alpha_{b}$ |
| 38.7 | 2.65, 2.52 | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 37.9 | 3.35, 2.65 | $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 36.8 | 3.01, 2.83 | $\beta_{c}$ |

## HMBC experiment in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$

Figure 22 shows the HMBC experiment in deuterated methanol for 3 . As was previously shown before with the experiment in chloroform, the only information we can get is related just to the aromatic system. None of the carbons or protons in the peptide chain gives signals distinguishable from the background noise. Although less information was obtained in this experiment, in comparison with the one performed in chloroform, the data obtained were consistent. Figure 22 shows the connectivity in the unsymmetrical aromatic ring. The experiment allowed us to assign the quaternary carbon in the unsymmetrical aromatic ring.

Figure 22: HMBC in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ - unsymmetrical aromatic system


Figure 23 shows the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ long distant correlation in the symmetrical aromatic system. Again the information obtained was less than the experiment in chloroform, but still consistent with the latter. As before, the experiment allowed us to assign the quaternary carbon in the symmetrical aromatic ring.

Figure 23: HMBC in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ - symmetrical aromatic system


| Proton |  | Coupled Carbon |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| signal | ppm | signal | ppm |
|  |  | CR | 133.8 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}$ | 6.85 | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{g}}$ | 122.0 |
|  |  | COAr | 153.8 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | 7.19 | COAr | 153.8 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | 7.24 |  |  |

Figure 24: shows the C-H long distance relationships in the ester and carbamate protecting group.

## Figure 24: HMBC in $\mathrm{CD}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathrm{OD}$ - protecting groups



With this information we were able to assign the quaternary carbons of the aromatic rings and some of the carbonyl groups in the structure.

## NOESY experiment in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathbf{O D}$

The figure below shows mainly the results for the irradiation of the alpha and beta protons in the peptide chain. In particular it was possible to assign the spatial arrangement of the cluster a and c .

Figure 25: NOESY $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}-\beta$ and $\alpha$


Once more, the results obtained were consistent with the computer generated structure, even though the conformational search was performed using chloroform as solvent.

Figure 26 shows the results from the irradiation of the aromatic protons.
Figure 26: NOESY $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ - aromatic system


Figure 27 shows the assignment in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$.
Figure 27: $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ assignment


| ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ | ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ | Assign. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.28-7.43 | 128.1 | Z |
|  | 127.7 | w (m) |
|  | 127.6 | v |
| 7.28-7.43 | 130.2 | i |
| 7.20 | 131.7 | h |
| 6.98 | 122.0 | g |
| 6.85 | 121.5 | f |
| 6.80 | 111.6 | e |
| 6.47 | 123.4 | d |
| 5.87 | 115.8 | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ |
| 5.14 | 66.2 | u |
| 5.02 |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline 4.70-4.83 \\ (4.78) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 48.6 | $\alpha_{b}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 4.70-4.83 \\ (4.73) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 53.7 | $\alpha_{a}$ |
| 4.37-4.42 | 53.4 | $\alpha_{c}$ |
| 3.85 | 55.1 | p |
| 3.79 | 51.5 | q |
| 3.35 | 37.9 | $\beta_{\mathrm{aS}}$ |
| 3.01 | 36.8 | $\beta_{\mathrm{cS}}$ |
| 2.83 |  | $\beta_{\mathrm{cR}}$ |
| 2.69-2.61 | 38.7 | $\beta_{\mathrm{aR}}$ |
|  | 37.9 | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 2.53 | 38.7 | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| - | 173.0 | X |
| - | 171.5 | r |
| - | 170.5 | $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ |
| - | 169.8 | $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ |
| - | 155.9 | S |
| - | 153.8 | n |
| - | 149.1 | k |
| - | 147.8 | j |
| - | 136.8 | y |
| - | 133.8 | 0 |
| - | 127.7 | m (w) |

Table 7: Comparison of assignments in chloroform and methanol

| Assignment in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ |  |  | Assignment in $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ | ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ | Assign. | Shift | ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ | Assign. |
| 7.26-7.36 | 128.4 | Z | 7.28-7.43 | 128.1 | Z |
|  | 128.0 | w |  | 127.7 | w (m) |
|  | 127.8 | V |  | 127.6 | V |
| 7.24 | 130.3 | 1 | 7.28-7.43 | 130.2 | i |
| 7.08 | 132.1 | h | 7.20 | 131.7 | h |
| 7.00 | 122.7 | g | 6.98 | 122.0 | g |
| 6.82 | 121.8 | f | 6.85 | 121.5 | f |
| 6.72 | 111.4 | e | 6.80 | 111.6 | e |
| 6.50 | 123.5 | d | 6.47 | 123.4 | d |
| 5.82 | 115.6 | sh | 5.87 | 115.8 | sh |
| 5.12 | 66.7 | u | 5.14 | 66.2 | u |
| 5.02 |  |  | 5.02 |  |  |
| 4.79-4.90 | 53.5 | $\alpha_{a}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4.70-4.83 \\ (4.78) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 48.6 | $\alpha_{\text {b }}$ |
| 4.55 | 53.6 | $\alpha_{c}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.70-4.83 \\ (4.73) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 53.7 | $\alpha_{\text {a }}$ |
|  | 48.3 | $\alpha_{\text {b }}$ | 4.37-4.42 | 53.4 | $\alpha_{c}$ |
| 3.88 | 55.8 | p | 3.85 | 55.1 | p |
| 3.76 | 52.5 | q | 3.79 | 51.5 | q |
| 3.27 | 38.6 | $\beta_{\mathrm{aS}}$ | 3.35 | 37.9 | $\beta_{\mathrm{aS}}$ |
| 2.96 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 37.3 \\ & 37.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\beta_{\mathrm{cS}}$ | 3.01 | 36.8 | $\beta_{\mathrm{cS}}$ |
| 2.78 |  | $\beta_{\mathrm{cR}}$ | 2.83 |  | $\beta_{\mathrm{cR}}$ |
| $2.35-2.60 \mathrm{ls}$ | 38.6 | $\beta_{\mathrm{aR}}$ | 2.69-2.61 | 38.7 | $\beta_{\mathrm{aR}}$ |
| $2.35-2.60 \mathrm{rs}$ | 39.2 | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}} \beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |  | 37.9 | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| - | 173.1 | x | 2.53 | 38.7 | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| - | 171.7 | r | - | 173.0 | x |
| - | 169.7 | $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ | - | 171.5 | r |
| - | 169.4 | $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ | - | 170.5 | $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ |
| - | 155.8 | S | - | 169.8 | $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}$ |
| - | 153.7 | n | - | 155.9 | S |
| - | 149.1 | k | - | 153.8 | n |
| - | 147.6 | j | - | 149.1 | k |
| - | 136.3 | y | - | 147.8 | j |
| - | 133.2 | o | - | 136.8 | y |
|  | 127.1 | m | - | 133.8 | 0 |
|  |  |  | - | 127.7 | m (w) |

## Comparison of Data for OF4949-III 1

Table 8 shows the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR data for OF4949-III found by Evans ${ }^{3}$ and us.
Table 8: OF4949-III ${ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{H}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$

Evans $500 \mathrm{MHz} \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { shift } & H, m u l, ~ J & \text { Descr. } & \text { shift } & \text { H, mul., J } & \text { Descr. }\end{array}$

| 7.34 | 1, dd, 8.3, 1.7 | Ar | 7.37 | 1, dd, 8.5, 2.0 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 7.14 | 1, dd, 8.5, 2.0 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ |
| 7.11 | 1, dd, 8.3, 1.7 | ‘' | 6.97 | 1, dd, 8.0, 2.5 | $\mathrm{Hg}_{\mathrm{g}}$ |
| 6.94 | 2, d, 8.2 | '' | 6.96 | 1, d, 8.5 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| 6.79 | 1, dd, 8.3, 2.4 | ' | 6.82 | 1, dd, 8.0, 2.5 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}$ |
| 6.72 | 1, d, 8.1 | ‘, | 6.75 | 1, dd, 8.0, 2.0 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$ |
| 5.74 | 1, s | sh | 5.77 | 1, d, 2.0 | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ |
| 4.69 | 1, dd, 10.0, 3.9 | Asn $\alpha$ | 4.73 | 1, dd, 10.0, 4.0 | $\alpha_{\text {b }}$ |
| 4.31 | 1, dd, 12.4, 3.4 | $\alpha$ | 4.36 | 1, dd, 12.5, 3.5 | $\alpha_{\text {a }}$ |
| 4.03 | 1, d, 3.9 | $\alpha$ | 4.14 | 1, dd, 6.0, 2.0 | $\alpha_{c}$ |
| 3.79 | 3, s | OMe | 3.82 | 3, s | OMe |
| 3.26 | 1, dd, 13.2, 3.3 | $\beta$ | 3.29 | 1, dd, 13.0, 3.5 | $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 2.99 | 1, d, 14.9 | $\beta$ | 3.05 | 1, dd, 15.0, 2.0 | $\beta_{c}$ |
| 2.91 | 1, dd, 15.0, 5.8 | $\beta$ | 2.97 | 1, dd, 15.5, 6.0 | $\beta_{c}$ |
| 2.72 | 1, dd, 15.4, 3.9 | Asn $\beta$ | 2.76 | 1, dd, 15.5, 4.0 | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 2.51 | 1, t, 12.8 | $\beta$ | 2.55 | 1, t, 13.0 | $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 2.46 | $\begin{gathered} 1, \mathrm{dd}, 15.3 \\ 10.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\beta$ | 2.48 | $\begin{gathered} 1, \mathrm{dd}, 15.5 \\ 10.0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| Tot | 19 H | - |  | 19 H |  |

Figure 28 shows a comparison of our ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ spectrum in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and a simulated spectrum using the data tabulated from Evans fed into the NMR simulation software from MestRe-C (beta 3.9.9.0; Frequency 500 MHz , Number of points 32768 , Threshold 0.000001 , Line width 0.5 ).

Figure 28: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ of OF4949-III 1 (Evans' simulated spectrum, and our spectrum)


## OF4949-III 1: NMR Assignment

Table 9 shows the results of the HMQC experiment on the final product OF4949-III $\mathbf{1}$ as a zwitterion in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. Again it was used to assigne the three different $\alpha \beta$ systems as well as the C-H connectivity.

Table 9: OF4949-III HMQC experiment

| HMQC |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| proton | carbon | description |
| 7.37 | 130.7 | Ar |
| 7.14 | 131.9 | Ar |
| $6.95-6.98$ | 122.2 | Ar |
|  | 112.3 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| 6.82 | 121.4 | Ar |
| 6.75 | 124.3 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{d}}$ |
| 5.77 | 115.1 | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ |
| 4.73 | 49.1 | $\alpha_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 4.36 | 56.8 | $\alpha_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 4.14 | 52.4 | $\alpha_{\mathrm{c}}$ |
| 3.82 | 55.8 | $\mathrm{OMe}_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 3.29 | 38.8 | $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 3.05 | 35.2 | $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ |
| 2.97 | 35.2 | $\beta_{\mathrm{c}}$ |
| 2.76 | 38.7 | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 2.55 | 38.8 | $\beta_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 2.48 | 38.7 | $\beta_{\mathrm{b}}$ |

## OF4949-III NOESY experiment

Figure 29 shows the irradiation of the protons in the peptidic chain and the related enhancement. The picture here used is adapted from that used for the Z-OF4949-III-OMe. It should be only considered as pictorial help; no computer modelling with minimized energy conformations was performed.

## Figure 29: NOESY of OF4949-III - peptidic protons



The NOE data fit the computer generated structure, despite the fact that the calculations were carried out on the protected derivative, and in chloroform as solvent. In particular we were able to define the spatial arrangement around the stereogenic centers a and c. Irradiation of the methoxy group probably
generates an enhancement of the signal for $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}$, but because the signals for the latter overlap with $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{g}}$ (which could be close enough to generate the NMR response), no further information about the preferred arrangement of the methoxy group could be obtained.

Figure 30 shows the irradiation of the aromatic signals in the molecule and the enhancements generated. The figure is the same used for the Z-OF4949-III-OMe. When a certain assignment was not possible, no arrows were reported in the picture. In particular the signals at $6.95-6.98$ were not easy to interpret because of the overlap between $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{g}}$.

Figure 30: NOESY of OF4949-III - aromatic protons


| Irradiated | Signal | NOE | Strength | Signal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3.05 | m | $\beta_{\mathrm{cR}}$ |
| 5.77 | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ | 6.82 | m | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}$ |
|  |  | 6.95-6.98 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
|  |  | 2.97 | m | $\beta_{\mathrm{cS}}$ |
| 6.75 | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {d }}$ | 5.77 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ |
|  |  | 6.95-6.98 | S | $\mathrm{Hg}_{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
|  |  | 5.77 | W | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ |
| 6.82 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}$ | 6.95-6.98 | w | $\mathrm{Hg}_{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{H}_{\text {e }}$ |
|  |  | 7.14 | m | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ |
|  |  | 3.82 | m | OMe |
| 6.95-6.98 | $\mathrm{Hg}_{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}$ | 5.77 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {sh }}$ |
|  |  | 7.37 | m | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ |
|  |  | 2.55 | m | $\beta_{\mathrm{aR}}$ |
| 7.14 | H | 4.73 | m | $\alpha_{\text {b }}$ |
| 7.14 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ | 6.82 | m | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{f}}$ |
|  |  | 7.37 | w | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ |
|  |  | 3.29 | m | $\beta_{\mathrm{aS}}$ |
| 7.37 |  | 4.36 | m | $\alpha_{\text {a }}$ |
| 7.37 | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | 6.95-6.98 | s | $\mathrm{Hg}_{\mathrm{g}} \mathrm{H}_{\text {e }}$ |
|  |  | 7.14 | W | $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}$ |
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Spectrum 1, 3, Pendant, $100 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$


Spectrum 2, 3, COSY, $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$


Spectrum 3, 3, $\mathrm{HMQC}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$


Spectrum 4, 3, $\mathrm{HMBC}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$


Spectrum 5, 3, NOESY, $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$


Spectrum 6, 3, $\mathrm{HMBC}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$


Spectrum 7, OF4949-III 1, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, 500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$


Spectrum 8, OF4949-III 1, ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}, 125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$


Spectrum 9, OF4949-III 1, HMQC, $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$


Spectrum 10, OF4949-III 1, NOESY, $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$
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