Supporting Information

Neobraclactones A–C, three unprecedented chaise

longue-shaped xanthones from Garcinia bracteata

Sheng-Li Niu,^{a,b†} Da-Hong Li,^{a†} Yue-Tong Wang,^c Kai-Bo Wang,^a Bin Lin,^d Yong-Kui Jing,^c Hui-Ming Hua,^a Jiao Bai^{*a} and Zhan-Lin Li^{*a}

 ^a Key Laboratory of Structure-Based Drug Design & Discovery, Ministry of Education; School of Traditional Chinese Materia Medica, Shenyang Pharmaceutical University, Shenyang 110016, P. R. China.
^b Key laboratory of Zoonosis, Shengyang Agricultural University, Shenyang 110866, P. R. China
^c School of Life Science and Biopharmaceutics, Shenyang Pharmaceutical University, Shenyang 110016, P. R. China
^d School of Pharmaceutical Engineering, Shenyang Pharmaceutical University, Shenyang 110016, P. R. China

Corresponding Author

- * E-mail: lzl1030@hotmail.com
- * E-mail: baijiao@hotmail.com
- [⊥] These authors contributed equally to this work.

Contents

Computational methods of ECD of compound 1 3
Figure S1. B3LYP/6-31+G**optimized lowest energy 3D conformer of 1
Figure S2–S15. The HRMS, UV, IR, ¹ H NMR, expanded ¹ H NMR, ¹³ C NMR, HSQC,
HMBC, NOESY, ECD spectra of neobraclactone A (1)4–10
Figure S16. The Rh ₂ (OCOCF ₃) ₄ induced ECD spectrum of neobraclactone A (1) in CDCl ₃ 11
Figure S17. The bulkiness rule for secondary alcohols applied11
Figure S18–S29. The HRMS, UV, IR, ¹ H NMR, expanded ¹ H NMR, ¹³ C NMR, HSQC,
HMBC and NOESY spectra of neobraclactone B (2)12–17
Figure S30. The comparison of ¹ H NMR spectra of compounds 1 and 218
Figure S31. The comparison of ¹³ C NMR spectra of compounds 1 and 218
Figure S32–S40. The HRMS, UV, ¹ H NMR, expanded ¹ H NMR, ¹³ C NMR, HSQC, HMBC,
NOESY spectra of neobraclactone C (3)19–23

Computational methods of ECD of compound 1

The CONFLEX^[1, 2] searches based on molecular mechanics with MMFF94S force fields were performed for (6*R*, 7*R*, 8*R*, 17*R*, 22*S*)-**1** and its enantiomer (6*S*, 7*S*, 8*S*, 17*S*, 22*R*)-**1**, which gave 8 stable conformers. Selected conformers of (6*R*, 7*R*, 8*R*, 17*R*, 22*S*)-**1** and (6*S*, 7*S*, 8*S*, 17*S*, 22*R*)-**1** with the lowest energy were further optimized by the density functional theory method at the B3LYP/6-31+G** level in Gaussian 03 program package,^[3] which was further checked by frequency calculation and resulted in no imaginary frequencies. The ECD of the conformer of **1** was then calculated by the TDDFT method at the B3LYP/6-31+G** level, and at the B3LYP/6-311++G**//B3LYP/6-31+G** levels with the PCM model in methanol solution. The calculated ECD curve was generated using SpecDis 1.51^[4] with σ = 0.16 ev, and UV shift -5 nm.

References

[1] Goto, H.; Osawa, E.; J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1989, 111, 8950-8951.

[2] Goto, H.; Osawa, E.; J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1993, 2, 187–198.

[3]. Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb,M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Montgomery, Jr., J. A.; Vreven, T.; Kudin, K. N.;Burant, J. C.; Millam, J. M.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Barone, V.;Mennucci, B.; Cossi, M.; Scalmani, G.; Rega, N.; Petersson, G. A.;Nakatsuji, H.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.;Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Klene, M.; Li,X.; Knox, J. E.; Hratchian, H. P.; Cross, J. B.; Bakken, V.; Adamo, C.;Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, R. E.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, A. J.;Cammi, R.; Pomelli, C.; Ochterski, J. W.; Ayala, P. Y.; Morokuma, K.;Voth, G. A.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, J. J.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Dapprich,S.; Daniels, A. D.; Strain, M. C.; Farkas, O.; Malick, D. K.; Rabuck, A. D.;Raghavachari, K.; Foresman, J. B.; Ortiz, J. V.; Cui, Q.; Baboul, A. G.;Clifford, S.; Cioslowski, J.; Stefanov, B. B.; Liu, G.; Liashenko, A.; Piskorz,P.; Komaromi, I.; Martin, R. L.; Fox, D. J.; Keith, T.; Al-Laham, M. A.;Peng, C. Y.; Nanayakkara, A.; Challacombe, M.; Gill, P. M. W.; Johnson, B.; Chen, W.; Wong, M. W.; Gonzalez, C.; Pople, J. A. *Gaussian 03*, revision D.01; Gaussian, Inc.: Wallingford, CT, 2005.

[4]. Bruhn, T.; Hemberger, Y.; Schaumlöffel, A.; Bringmann, G. Spec Dis, version 1.51, University of Würzburg, Germany, 2010.



Figure S1. B3LYP/6-31+G** optimized lowest energy 3D conformer of 1



Figure S2. The HR-ESIMS spectrum of neobraclactone A (1)



Figure S3. The UV spectrum of neobraclactone A (1) in CH₃OH







Figure S5. The 1 H NMR spectrum of neobraclactone A (1) in CDCl₃



Figure S7. The expanded ¹H NMR spectrum of neobraclactone A (1) in CDCl₃



Figure S9. The ${}^{1}H$ - ${}^{1}H$ COSY spectrum of neobraclactone A (1) in CDCl₃



Figure S11. The HMBC spectrum of neobraclactone A (1) in CDCl₃





Figure S14. The expanded NOESY spectrum of neobraclactone A (1) in CDCl₃



Figure S15. ECD spectrum of neobraclactone A (1)



Figure S16. The Rh₂(OCOCF₃)₄ induced ECD spectrum of neobraclactone A (1)



Figure S17. The bulkiness rule for secondary alcohols applied



Figure S18. The HR-ESIMS spectrum of neobraclactone B (2)



Figure S19. The UV spectrum of neobraclactone B (2)



Figure S20. The IR spectrum of neobraclactone B (2)



Figure S21. The ¹H NMR spectrum of neobraclactone B (2) in CDCl₃



Figure S22. The 13 C NMR spectrum of neobraclactone B (2) in CDCl₃



Figure S23. The ¹H-¹H COSY spectrum of neobraclactone B (2) in CDCl₃



Figure S25. The HMBC spectrum of neobraclactone B (2) in CDCl₃





Figure S26. The expanded HMBC spectrum of neobraclactone B (2) in $CDCI_3$



Figure S27. The expanded HMBC spectrum of neobraclactone B (2) in CDCl₃



Figure S29. The expanded NOESY spectrum of neobraclactone B (2) in CDCl₃



Figure S30. The comparison of the ¹H NMR spectra of compounds 1 (blue) and 2 (red)

in CDCl_3



Figure S31. The comparison of the ¹³C NMR spectra of compounds 1 (blue) and 2 (red)

in $CDCl_3$



Figure S32. The HR-ESIMS spectrum of neobraclactone C (3) in CDCl₃



Figure S33. The UV spectrum of neobraclactone C (3) in CDCl₃





Figure S37. The HSQC spectrum of neobraclactone C (3) in CDCl₃



Figure S39. The NOESY spectrum of neobraclactone C (3) in CDCl₃



Figure S40. The expanded NOESY spectrum of neobraclactone C (3) in $CDCl_3$