

NIH Public Access

Author Manuscript

Bioorg Med Chem. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 November 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Bioorg Med Chem. 2013 November 1; 21(21): 6831–6843. doi:10.1016/j.bmc.2013.07.028.

Synthesis and biological evaluation of indole-based, anti-cancer agents inspired by the vascular disrupting agent 2-(3′ hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″-trimethoxybenzoyl)-6 methoxyindole (OXi8006)

Matthew T. MacDonough^a, Tracy E. Strecker^a, Ernest Hamel^b, John J. Hall^a, David J. **Chaplin**^c , **Mary Lynn Trawick**a, and **Kevin G. Pinney**a,*

aDepartment of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Baylor University, One Bear Place #97348, Waco, Texas, 76798-7348, USA

bScreening Technologies Branch, Developmental Therapeutics Program, Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis, National Cancer Institute, Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research, National Institutes of Health, Frederick, Maryland, 21702, USA

^cOxigene Inc., 701 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 210, South San Francisco, California, 94080, USA

Abstract

The discovery of a 2-aryl-3-aroyl indole-based small-molecule inhibitor of tubulin assembly (referred to as **OXi8006**) inspired the design, synthesis, and biological evaluation of a series of diversely functionalized analogues. In the majority of examples, the pendant 2-aryl ring contained a 3-hydroxy-4-methoxy substitution pattern, and the fused aryl ring featured a 6-methoxy group. Most of the variability was in the 3-aroyl moiety, which was modified to incorporate methoxy (**33–36**), nitro (**25–27**), halogen (**28–29**), trifluoromethyl (**30**), or trifluoromethoxy (**31–32**) functionalities. In two analogues (**34** and **36**), the methoxy substitution pattern in the fused aryl ring varied, while in another derivative (**35**) the phenolic moiety was translocated from the pendant 2-aryl ring to position-7 of the fused aryl ring. Each of the compounds were evaluated for their cytotoxicity (*in vitro*) against the SK-OV-3 (ovarian), NCI-H460 (lung), and DU-145 (prostate) human cancer cell lines and for their ability to inhibit tubulin assembly. Four of the compounds (30, 31, 35, 36) proved to be potent inhibitors of tubulin assembly ($IC_{50} < 5 \mu M$), and three of these compounds (**31, 35, 36**) were strongly cytotoxic against the three cancer cell lines. The most active compound (**36**) in this series, which incorporated a methoxy group at position-7, was comparable in terms of inhibition of tubulin assembly and cytotoxicity to the lead compound **OXi8006**.

Supplementary Data.

^{© 2013} Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

^{*}Corresponding Author. Tel: +1-254-710-4117 Fax +1-254-710-4272. Kevin_Pinney@baylor.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Characterization data (${}^{1}H$ NMR, ${}^{13}C$ NMR, ${}^{19}F$ NMR, HPLC, and HRMS) for final compounds and X-ray crystallography for compound **10** are available free of charge via the internet at [http://pubs.acs.org.](http://pubs.acs.org)

Keywords

Vascular disrupting agent (VDA); inhibitor of tubulin assembly; functionalized indole; combretastatin

1. Introduction

The exploration and assessment of the tumor microenvironment and its physiology have revealed a number of prospective molecular targets for selective therapeutic intervention by small-molecule anti-cancer agents. A well-established target is the dynamic tubulinmicrotubule protein system. Microtubules are structurally characterized as biopolymers composed of αβ-tubulin heterodimers.1–5 The dynamic assembly and disassembly of microtubules is linked to a variety of cellular functions, including cell shape, intracellular motility, cellular division, and apoptosis.^{1–5} More recently, certain small-molecule inhibitors of tubulin assembly have been identified as vascular disrupting agents (VDAs).⁶ These compounds selectively disrupt tumor vasculature by interfering with the tubulin-microtubule protein system of the endothelial cells lining tumor microvessels, which sets in motion a cascade of cell signaling events leading to morphology changes (rounding up) of these endothelial cells. This results in the occlusion of the vessels, which limits tumor blood flow. This in turn restricts the oxygen and nutrients vital for tumor survival. The vascular network feeding tumors is distinct from normal tissue vasculature and incorporates branching that is often unsystematic and convoluted.^{7–9} In addition, increased rates of tumor cell proliferation coupled with underdeveloped endothelium, in contrast to normal tissue vasculature, has established tumor vasculature as a selective therapeutic target for anti-cancer agents.⁹ This approach has led to the development of a class of therapeutics referred to as vascular targeting agents (VTAs). This class is further subdivided into two discrete sub-classes centered upon distinct mechanism(s) of action: vascular disrupting agents (VDAs) and angiogenesis inhibiting agents (AIAs).¹⁰ VDAs damage existing tumor vasculature while AIAs impede new tumor vessel formation.^{10–12} VDAs can be further divided into two distinct groups: biologics and small-molecules. One strategy focuses on the development of indole-based small-molecule VDAs that bind at the colchicine site, named after the natural product originally described as binding at the site (Figure 1)¹³ and whose interaction with tubulin led to the original isolation of the protein.¹⁴ Synthetic and biological studies with indole-based, colchicine site VDAs were originally prompted by the discovery of the potent natural products combretastatin A-4 (**CA4**) and combretastatin A-1 (**CA1**) that were isolated from the African bush willow tree, *Combretum caffrum*, by Pettit and co-workers (Figure 1).15–16 **CA4** emerged as a benchmark VDA, and its corresponding prodrug salt **CA4P** (Zybrestat[™]) was the first small-molecule tubulin binding VDA to enter clinical trials.^{17–19} Although no VDA is yet in routine clinical use, several small-molecule VDAs interacting at the colchicine site are in clinical trials. $17-21$

VDAs derived from the combretastatin family demonstrate potent antiproliferative activity in various human cancer cell lines *in vitro* through the inhibition of tubulin polymerization.22–31 These findings led us and others to explore indole-based compounds for potential VDA and antitubulin activities by incorporating into their design structural similarities to the combretastatin series. Our work led to the potent compound 2-(3′ hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″-trimethoxybenzoyl)-6-methoxyindole (referred to as $OXi8006$, ^{21, 32–34} and Flynn³⁵ has subsequently pursued this compound (through a separate synthetic route) and structurally similar, highly active compounds. Because **OXi8006** potently inhibits tubulin assembly $(IC_{50} = 1.1 \mu M)$ and cell growth (for example, $GI₅₀ = 3.45$ nM against SK-OV-3 cells), we initiated further structural studies. As an initial finding, a water-soluble, disodium phosphate prodrug salt, **OXi8007**, demonstrated distinct

in vivo VDA activity in a study employing a SCID mouse model bearing an orthotopic PC-3 (prostate) tumor as imaged by color Doppler ultrasound.³⁶

Herein, we report the synthesis and biological evaluation of a series of functionalized analogues of **OXi8006** in an effort to further explore the molecular space inherent to 2 aryl-3-aroyl indole-based anti-cancer agents. Our finding32,21,33,34 that **OXi8006** is a potent tubulin binding agent combined with the work of $Hseih³⁷$ with **BPR0L075** (Figure 1) provided preliminary structural parallels defining distinct associations between the stilbene aryl rings of **CA4** and the aryl and aroyl rings of **OXi8006** and **BPR0L075**. These correlations were further expanded by our previous identification of benzo[*b*]thiophene **1** and benzo $[b]$ furan 2 as tubulin interacting compounds^{38–41} and the subsequent studies by Flynn leading to the benzofuran-based **BNC105** (Figure 1), a VDA currently undergoing clinical trials.^{42–44} A narrow but focused literature survey of inhibitors of tubulin assembly that incorporate the indole molecular template confirms the importance of the 3-(3′, 4′, 5′ trimethoxybenzoyl)indole functionality while allowing for structural diversity within the indole core (Figure 2). This is exemplified by structures that include variation in alkoxy substitution (structure **I**, Fig. 2),³⁷ halogen incorporation (structures **I** and **III**),^{37,45} heterocyclic substitution at the 2-position (structure **IV**),⁴⁶ and derivatives of **BPR0L075** (such as compound \mathbf{II}).⁴⁷

The potent inhibition of tubulin assembly and cytotoxicity of **OXi8006** and **BPR0L075**, in addition to the previous studies with benzo[*b*]thiophene and benzo[*b*]furan derivatives, led to the present study, which investigates a small collection of diversely modified 2-aryl-3 aroyl indole-based analogues to gain further insight into the structural features of **OXi8006** that are most important for biological activity (inhibition of tubulin assembly and cytotoxicity).

2. Results and discussion

2.1 Chemistry

The synthetic route to derivatized **OXi8006** analogues **25–36** involved the previously described bromoacetophenone **3** ³⁶ and commercially available bromoacetophenone **4** as key intermediates. 2-Aryl substituted indoles **5–11** were prepared by condensation of bromoacetophenone 3 or 4 with suitable anilines under Bischler-Mohlau conditions^{48,49} (Scheme 1). Further modification of 2-aryl indole **8** by selective demethoxylation in the presence of ionic liquid [TMAH][Al_2Cl_7]⁵⁰ (generated from AlCl₃ and trimethylamine hydrochloride (TMAH)) and microwave irradiation yielded the phenolic 2-aryl indole **9**, which was subsequently protected as its corresponding TBS derivative **10** (Scheme 2). The regioselectivity of the demethylation reaction was confirmed by X-ray crystallographic analysis of TBS indole **10** (see Supplementary data). Treatment of 2-aryl indoles **5–11** with appropriate functionalized benzoyl chloride derivatives resulted in 2-aryl-3-aroyl indole analogues **12–24** through a benzoylation reaction. Final desilylation with TBAF provided the parent 2-aryl-3-aroyl free phenol indole analogues **25–36**.

2.2 Biological Evaluation

The series of 2-aryl-3-aroyl indole analogues (Fig. 3) were evaluated for their cytotoxicity against the SK-OV-3, NCI-H460, and DU-145 human cancer cell lines (Table 1) and for their ability to inhibit tubulin assembly (Table 2). The two most active compounds (**35** and **36**) in the series featured substitution at position-7 in the fused aryl ring. Compound **36** (7 methoxy) was comparable to **OXi8006** in terms of both cytotoxicity (sub-micromolar) and inhibition of tubulin assembly $(IC_{50} = 1.1 \mu M)$, and analogue 35, in which the hydroxyl group was transposed from the pendant 2-aryl ring to position-7 of the fused aryl ring, was

nearly equipotent. Replacement of the 6-methoxy group with a 6-hydroxy moiety (analogue **33**) resulted in a loss of antitubulin activity ($>$ 20 μ M) and a significant decrease in cytotoxicity. All structural modifications in the 3-aroyl moiety that replaced the 3,4,5 trimethoxy motif (inherent to **OXi8006**) with a different functionality resulted in a decrease in cytotoxicity (compared to **OXi8006** and the reference stilbene compound, **CA4**). However, the 3,5-*bis*-trifluoromethyl analogue (**30**) and the 3-trifluoromethoxy derivative (**31**) remained relatively good inhibitors of tubulin assembly (3.1 and 3.7 µM, respectively). Although selective fluorine substitution in **CA4** analogues has been generally welltolerated,⁵¹ this trend did not carry forward to this indole series of compounds. A $3,4,5$ trifluoro analogue (**28**) demonstrated only modest inhibition of tubulin assembly (7.5 µM), while a 3-fluoro derivative (29) was inactive $(> 20 \mu M)$ in this assay. Nitro-bearing analogues (**25–27**) were similarly inactive. These results suggest the importance of the 3,4,5 trimethoxy substitution pattern in the 3-aroyl moiety and appropriate substitution at positions 6 and 7 of the fused aryl ring for maintaining potent cytotoxicity and inhibition of tubulin assembly in this series of compounds.

3. Conclusion

In summary, the results of this study have significantly extended our knowledge of functional group tolerability for 2-aryl-3-aroyl indole analogues. The most promising new analogues (**35, 36**) demonstrated inhibition of tubulin assembly comparable to the reference compounds **OXi8006** and **CA4**, and future studies will evaluate these compounds (as their corresponding water-soluble phosphate prodrug salts) for their potential to function as VDAs.

4. Experimental

4.1 Chemistry

4.1.1 Materials and instrumentation—CH₂Cl₂ and tetrahydrofuran (THF) were used in their anhydrous forms, as obtained from the chemical suppliers. Reactions were performed under an inert atmosphere using nitrogen gas, unless specified otherwise. Thin-layer chromatography (TLC) plates (precoated glass plates with silica gel 60 F254, 0.25 mm thickness) were used to monitor reactions. Purification of intermediates and products was carried out with a flash purification system (Biotage Isolera 1 or 4) using silica gel (200–400 mesh, 60 Å) prepacked columns. Reactions carried out under microwave irradiation were performed with a Biotage Initiator Microwave Synthesizer. Intermediates and products synthesized were characterized on the basis of their ¹H NMR (500 MHz), ¹³C NMR (125) MHz), and ¹⁹F NMR (470 MHz) spectroscopic data using a Varian VNMRS 500 MHz instrument. Spectra were recorded in CDCl₃, (CD₃)₂SO, or (CD₃)₂CO. All of the chemical shifts are expressed in ppm (δ), coupling constants *(J)* are presented in Hz, and peak patterns are reported as broad (br), singlet (s), doublet (d), triplet (t), double doublet (dd), double triplet (dt), triplet of triplets (tt), doublet of doublets of doublets (ddd), and multiplet (m). Purity of the final compounds was further analyzed at 25 °C using an Agilent 1200 HPLC system with a diode-array detector ($\lambda = 190-400$ nm), a Zorbax XDB-C18 HPLC column $(4.6 \text{ mm} - 150 \text{ mm}, 5 \text{ \mu m})$, and a Zorbax reliance cartridge guard-column; solvent A: acetonitrile, solvent B: H₂O; gradient: 10% A / 90% B to 100% A / 0% B over 0 to 40 min; post-time 10 min; flow rate 1.0 mL/min; injection volume 20 µL; monitored at wavelengths of 210, 254, 230, 280, and 360 nm. Mass spectrometry was carried out under positive ESI (electrospray ionization) using a Thermo Scientific LTQ Orbitrap Discovery instrument.

4.1.2. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-6-methoxyindole**

(5)36—To a solution of *m*-anisidine (2.05 mL, 18.4 mmol) dissolved in *N,N*-dimethylaniline

(20 mL) at 170 °C was added dropwise bromoacetophenone **3** (2.0 g, 5.6 mmol) in EtOAc (5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred at 170 \degree C for 12 h. Upon completion of the reaction, the reaction mixture was cooled to room temperature and extracted with EtOAc (3×50) mL). The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash chromatography using a prepacked 25 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 12% A / 88%B (4 CV), 12% A / 88%B \rightarrow 100%A / 0%B (10 CV), 100%A / 0%B (2.6 CV); flow rate: 25 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulted in the desired 2-phenylindole derivative $\bf{5}$ (1.49 g, 3.88 mmol, 69%, $\bf{R_f}$ $= 0.48$ (50:50 hexanes:EtOAc)) as light tan crystals. **¹H NMR** (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.11 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.47 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.16 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.13 (d, *J* = 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.90 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.89 (d, *J* = 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.79 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.64 (dd, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 3.86 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.84 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 1.04 (s, 9H, C(CH₃)₃), 0.21 (s, 6H, Si(CH₃)₂). ¹³C NMR (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 156.3, 150.5, 145.4, 137.4, 136.9, 125.8, 123.7, 120.9, 118.2, 117.8, 112.4, 109.9, 98.6, 94.5, 55.6, 55.4, 25.7, 18.5, −4.6.

4.1.3. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-6-***tert***-**

butyldimethylsilyloxyindole (6)—To a solution of 3-(*tert*-butyldimethylsilyloxy)aniline (2.06 g, 9.21 mmol) in *N,N*-dimethylaniline (20 mL) at 170 °C was added compound **3** (1.00 g, 2.79 mmol) dropwise in EtOAc (5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred at 170 °C for 12 h. Upon completion of the reaction, the reaction mixture was cooled to room temperature and extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 50 \text{ mL})$. The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash chromatography using a prepacked 100 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: $2\%A$ / 98%B (4 CV), $2\%A$ / 98%B \rightarrow 20%A / 80%B (10 CV), $20\%A$ / 80%B (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulted in the desired 2-phenylindole **6** (0.59 g, 1.23 mmol, 44%, R^f = 0.39 (90:10 hexanes:EtOAc)) as a brown solid. **1H NMR** (CDCl3, 500 MHz): δ 8.09 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.37 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.10 *(*d, *J* = 1.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.01 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.82 (s, 1H, ArH), 6.72 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.67 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.54 (s, 1H, ArH), 3.70 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 1.02 (s, 9H, C(C_{H₃)₃), 1.01 (s, 9H, C(C_{H₃)₃), 0.20 (s, 6H, Si(C_{H₃)₂), 0.18 (s, 6H,}}} Si(CH₃)₂). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 150.7, 150.6, 145.4, 137.7, 137.3, 126.0, 124.5, 120.6, 118.5, 118.0, 114.6, 112.4, 101.8, 98.7, 55.4, 25.93, 25.89, 18.6, 18.4, −4.3, −4.5. **HPLC**: 25.45 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for C_2 7H₄₂NO₃Si₂ [M+H]⁺ 484.2698, found 484.2698.

4.1.4. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-4,5,6-**

trimethoxyindole (7)—To a solution of 3,4,5-trimethoxyaniline (0.336 g, 1.84 mmol) in *N,N*-dimethylaniline (20 mL) at 170 °C was added compound **3** (0.20 g, 0.56 mmol) dropwise in EtOAc (5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred at 170 °C for 12 h. Upon completion of the reaction, the reaction mixture was cooled to room temperature and extracted with EtOAc (3×50 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over Na₂SO₄ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / 93%B \rightarrow 60%A / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulted in the desired 2-phenylindole **7** (0.14 g, 0.32 mmol, 58%, $R_f = 0.31$ (70:30 hexanes:EtOAc)) as colorless crystals. ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.06 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.15 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.10 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.90 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.70 (dd, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.66 (d, *J* = 0.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 4.13 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.90 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.88 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.84 $(s, 3H, OCH_3)$, 1.03 $(s, 9H, C(CH_3)$ ₃), 0.19 $(s, 6H, Si(CH_3)$ ². **13²C NMR** (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 151.0, 150.6, 145.6, 145.5, 136.4, 135.8, 133.9, 125.8, 118.3, 117.9, 116.6, 112.5,

96.3, 89.8, 61.6, 60.9, 56.2, 55.2, 25.9, 18.5, −4.6. **HPLC**: 20.17 min., purity at 254 nm 94.2%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for C24H34NO5Si [M+H]+ 444.2201, found 444.2200.

4.1.5. 2-(4′-Methoxyphenyl)-6,7-dimethoxyindole (8)—To a solution of 2,3 dimethoxyaniline (0.92 mL, 6.85 mmol) dissolved in *N,N*-dimethylaniline (10 mL) was added 4-methoxybromoacetophenone **4** (0.79 g, 3.43 mmol). The solution was heated to reflux and stirred at 150 °C for 12 h. Upon completion of the reaction, the reaction mixture was cooled to room temperature and extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 50 \text{ mL})$. The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash chromatography using a prepacked 100 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: $5\%A / 95\%B$ (4 CV), $5\%A / 95\%B \rightarrow 40\%A / 60\%B$ (10 CV), 40%A / 60%B (4 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulted in the desired 6,7-dimethoxy-2-phenylindole $\mathbf{8}$ (0.50 g, 1.76 mmol, 51%, R_f = 0.35 (80:20 hexanes:EtOAc)) as a tan solid. **1H NMR** (CDCl3, 500 MHz): δ 8.61 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.61 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H, ArH), 7.28 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.97 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H, ArH), 6.87 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.66 (d, *J* = 2.1 Hz, 1H, ArH), 4.09 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.97 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.85 (s, 3H, OCH3). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 159.2, 147.1, 138.0, 134.2, 131.3, 126.4, 126.0, 125.3, 115.3, 114.5, 108.5, 98.8, 61.1, 57.4, 55.4. **HPLC**: 15.30 min., purity at 254 nm 90.6%. **HRMS (ESI⁺)**: m/z calculated for C₁₇H₁₈NO₃ [M+H]⁺ 284.1281, found 284.1282.

4.1.6. 2-(4′-Methoxyphenyl)-6-methoxy-7-hydroxyindole (9)—Trimethoxyindole **8** $(0.61 \text{ g}, 2.16 \text{ mmol})$ was dissolved in a solution of $[A]₂C₁$ [TMAH] (6.3 mL, 3.13 mmol, 0.496 M in CH₂Cl₂). The reaction mixture was sealed and subjected to microwave irradiation at 80 \degree C for 1 h. Upon completion of the reaction, the reaction mixture was diluted with NaHCO₃ and extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (3×20 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over Na_2SO_4 and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash chromatography using a prepacked 100 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / 93%B → 60%A / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulted in the desired 6-methoxy-7-hydroxy-2-phenylindole **9** (0.42 g, 1.55 mmol, 71%, R^f = 0.36 (70:30 hexanes:EtOAc)) as a tan solid. **¹H NMR** ((CD₃)₂CO, 500 MHz): δ 10.11 (br s, 1H, N<u>H</u>), 7.85 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H, ArH), 7.66 (s, 1H, OH), 6.98 (m, 3H, ArH), 6.81 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.66 (d, *J* = 2.2 Hz, 1H, ArH), 3.83 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.81 (s, 3H, OCH3). **13C NMR** ((CD3)2CO, 125 MHz): δ 159.9, 142.5, 138.8, 133.1, 128.4, 127.2, 127.1, 126.5, 115.0, 111.3, 108.9, 99.0, 58.3, 55.7. **HPLC**: 13.47 min., purity at 254 nm 85.8%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: m/z calculated for $C_{16}H_{16}NO_3$ [M+H]⁺ 270.1125, found 270.1129.

4.1.7. 2-(4′-Methoxyphenyl)-6-methoxy-7-*tert***-butyldimethylsilyloxyindole (10)**

—To a solution of free phenol indole 9 (0.08 g, 0.28 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (5 mL) at 0 °C was added Et₃N (0.04 mL, 0.31 mmol) and DMAP (0.01 g, 0.11 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred for 10 min, and TBSCl (0.05 g, 0.31 mmol) was added gradually. The solution was allowed to warm to room temperature over 12 h. Upon completion of the reaction, water (10 mL) was added, and the reaction mixture was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (3×50 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over Na₂SO₄ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash chromatography using a prepacked 25 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: $2\%A/98\%B$ (4 CV), $2\%A/98\%B \rightarrow 20\%A/80\%B$ (10 CV), 20%A / 80%B (5.2 CV); flow rate: 35 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulted in the TBS indole product 10 (0.05 g, 0.02 mmol, 45%, $R_f = 0.64$ (70:30) hexanes:EtOAc)) as a light tan solid. ¹**H NMR** (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.03 (br s, 1H, N<u>H</u>), 7.53 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H, ArH), 7.13 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.98 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H, ArH),

6.80 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 1H, Ar<u>H</u>), 6.61 (d, $J = 2.2$ Hz, 1H, Ar<u>H</u>), 3.86 (s, 6H, OCH₃), 1.11 (s, 9H, C(CH₃)₃), 0.24 (s, 6H, Si(CH₃)₂). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 159.3, 145.2, 137.5, 131.2, 130.2, 126.2, 125.9, 125.6, 114.6, 112.9, 108.5, 99.0, 57.0, 55.5, 26.3, 18.8, −4.2. **HPLC**: 21.73 min., purity at 254 nm 93.7%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for $C_{22}H_{30}NO_3Si$ [M+H]⁺ 384.1989, found 384.1990.

4.1.8. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-6,7-dimethoxyindole**

(11)—To a solution of 2,3-dimethoxyaniline (2.19 mL, 16.3 mmol) dissolved in *N,N*dimethylaniline (20 mL) was added bromoacetophenone **3** (2.93 g, 8.16 mmol). The solution was heated to reflux and stirred at 150 °C for 12 h. Upon completion of the reaction, the reaction mixture was cooled to room temperature and extracted with EtOAc $(3 \times 50 \text{ mL})$. The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 5% A / 95% B (4 CV), 5% A / 95% B \rightarrow 40%A / 60%B (10 CV), 40%A / 60%B (2 CV); flow rate: 50 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulted in the desired 6,7-dimethoxy-2-phenylindole **11** (1.43 g, 3.47 mmol, 43%, $R_f = 0.40$ (80:20 hexanes:EtOAc)) as a tan solid. **¹H NMR** (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.63 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.33 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.28 (d, *J* = 2.2 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.26 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.2 Hz 1H, ArH), 6.92 (dd, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 1.4 Hz, 2H, ArH), 6.71 (d, *J* = 2.2 Hz, 1H, ArH), 4.15 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 4.01 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.88 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 1.15 (s, 9H, C(CH₃)₃), 0.31 (s, 6H, Si(CH3)2). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 150.7, 147.1, 145.4, 137.9, 134.2, 131.2, 126.0, 125.7, 118.4, 118.1, 115.2, 112.3, 108.7, 99.0, 60.9, 57.3, 55.4, 25.8, 18.5, −4.5. **HPLC**: 21.28 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for $C_{23}H_{32}NO_4Si$ [M+H]⁺ 414.2095, found 414.2095.

4.1.9. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsiloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,**

5″dinitrobenzoyl)-6-methoxyindole (13)—To a solution of compound **5** (0.50 g, 1.30 mmol) in *o*-dichlorobenzene (20 mL) was added 3,5-dinitrobenzoylchloride (0.45 g, 1.90 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 160 °C for 12 h. The *o*-dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / 93%B \rightarrow 60%A / 40%B (11 CV), 60%A / 40%B (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBS-indole **13** as a pale yellow powder (0.40 g, 0.69 mmol, 53%, $R_f = 0.59$ (70:30 hexanes:EtOAc)). ¹**H NMR** (CDCl3, 500 MHz): δ 8.85 (t, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 8.62 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 2H, ArH), 8.60 (br s, 1H, NH) 8.15 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.00 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.95 (d, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.87 (dd, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.61 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, Ar<u>H</u>), 6.56 (d, *J* = 2.5 Hz, 1H, Ar<u>H</u>), 3.90 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.70 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 0.89 (s, 9H, C(CH₃)₃), 0.00 (s, 6H, Si(CH₃)₂). ¹³**C NMR** (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 187.3, 158.1, 152.1, 147.8, 145.3, 145.1, 143.1, 136.5, 129.1, 123.5, 123.4, 122.7, 122.4, 122.3, 120.1, 112.8, 112.5, 111.8, 95.0, 55.9, 55.5, 25.6, 18.4, −4.8. **HPLC**: 20.28 min., purity at 254 nm 93.1%. **HRMS** (ESI⁺): m/z calculated for $C_{29}H_{32}N_3O_8Si$ [M+H]⁺ 578.1953, found 578.1950.

4.1.10. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsiloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(4″-nitrobenzoyl)-6 methoxyindole (14)—**To a solution of compound **5** (0.20 g, 0.52 mmol) in *o*dichlorobenzene (10 mL) was added 3-nitrobenzoylchloride (0.15 g, 0.78 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 160 °C for 12 h. The *o*-dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 100 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / 93%B \rightarrow 60%A / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (8.8 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBSindole **14** as a yellow powder $(0.14 \text{ g}, 0.28 \text{ mmol}, 51\%, R_f = 0.36 \text{ (70:30)}$

hexanes:EtOAc)). **¹H NMR** (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.37 (br s, 1H, N<u>H</u>), 8.06 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.97 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2H, ArH) 7.69 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2H, ArH), 6.97 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.93 (d, *J* = 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.75 (m, 2H, ArH), 6.58 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H, Ar_H), 3.89 (s, 3H, OC_{H₃), 3.71 (s, 3H, OC_{H₃), 0.97 (s, 9H, C(C_{H₃)₃), 0.07 (s, 6H,}}} Si(CH₃)₂). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 190.9, 157.8, 152.1, 148.9, 145.6, 145.2, 144.4, 136.5, 130.3, 124.1, 123.7, 123.0, 122.69, 122.67, 121.7, 113.0, 112.3, 111.7, 94.9, 55.9, 55.6, 25.8, 18.6, −4.6. **HPLC**: 20.23 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for $C_{29}H_{33}N_2O_6Si$ [M+H]⁺ 533.2102, found 533.2100.

4.1.11. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsiloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″-nitrobenzoyl)-6 methoxyindole (15)—**To a solution of compound **5** (0.10 g, 0.26 mmol) in *o*dichlorobenzene (10 mL) was added 3-nitrobenzoylchloride (0.07 g, 0.39 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 160 °C for 12 h. The *o*-dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 25 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 12%A / 88%B (4 CV), 12%A / 88%B → 100%A / 0%B (10 CV), 100%A / 0%B (2.8 CV); flow rate: 25 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBS-indole **15** as pale yellow crystals $(0.13 \text{ g}, 0.25 \text{ mmol}, 94\%, R_f = 0.63 \text{ (}50:50 \text{ m})$ hexanes:EtOAc)). **¹H NMR** (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 9.15 (br s, 1H, N<u>H</u>), 8.30 (t, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 8.06 (ddd, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1.0 Hz, 1H, ArH) 8.03 *(d J* = 9.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.88 (dt, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.29 (t, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.92 (dd, *J* = 7.0 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.91 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.78 (dd, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.66 (d, *J* = 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.50 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 3.82 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.65 (s, 3H, OCH3), 0.91 (s, 9H, C(CH3)3), 0.00 (s, 6H, Si(CH3)2). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 190.4, 157.6, 151.7, 147.4, 144.9, 144.6, 141.3, 136.6, 135.0, 128.9, 125.4, 124.7, 124.1, 123.4, 122.7, 122.3, 122.0, 112.4, 112.3, 111.6, 94.9, 55.7, 55.4, 25.7, 18.4, −4.7. **HPLC**: 20.13 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for C29H33N2O6Si [M $+H$ ⁺ 533.2102, found 533.2100.

4.1.12. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsiloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″ trifluorobenzoyl)-6-methoxyindole (16)—**To a solution of compound **5** (0.61 g, 1.59 mmol) in *o*-dichlorobenzene (10 mL) was added 3,4,5-trifluorobenzoylchloride (3.12 mL, 2.38 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 160 °C for 12 h. The *o*dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 100 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / 97%B \rightarrow 60%A / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (5.5 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBS-indole **16** as a white powder $(0.70 \text{ g}, 1.29 \text{ mmol}, 81\%, R_f = 0.48 \text{ (}50:50 \text{ m}^2\text{ m}^2\text{$ hexanes:EtOAc)). 1H NMR (CDCl3, 500 MHz): δ 8.44 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.95 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.25 (m, 2H, ArH) 6.94 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.91 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.83 (dd, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.79 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.70 (d, *J* $= 8.5$ Hz, 1H, Ar<u>H</u>), 3.87 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.78 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 0.97 (s, 9H, C(CH₃)₃), 0.09 (s, 6H, Si(CH₃)₂). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 189.1, 157.7, 152.1, 150.6 (ddd, *J_{C-F}* = 250.0 Hz, 10.0 Hz, 3.1 Hz), 145.4, 143.5, 141.8 (dt, *JC-F* = 255.9 Hz, 15.5 Hz), 136.5, 135.6 (d, *JC-F* = 3.9 Hz), 124.4, 123.2, 122.8, 121.4, 121.6, 114.1 (dd, *JC-F* = 16.9 Hz, 5.1 Hz), 112.3, 112.2, 112.0, 94.8, 55.9, 55.6, 25.7, 18.5, −4.8. **19F NMR** (CDCl3, 470 MHz): δ −134.0 (dd, *J* = 21.2 Hz, 7.5 Hz, 2F, ArF), −155.6 (tt, *J* = 20.2 Hz, 6.6 Hz, 1F, ArF). **HPLC**: 21.32 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI⁺)**: m/z calculated for C₂₉H₃₀F₃NNaO₄Si [M+Na]⁺ 564.1788, found 564.1786.

4.1.13. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsiloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(4″ fluorobenzoyl)-6-methoxyindole (17)—**To a solution of compound **5** (0.10 g, 0.26

mmol) in *o*-dichlorobenzene (10 mL) was added 4-fluorobenzoylchloride (0.05 mL, 0.39 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 160 °C for 12 h. The *o*-dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 25 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 12%A / 88%B (4 CV), 12%A / 88%B → 100%A / 0%B (10 CV), 100%A / 0%B (2 CV); flow rate: 25 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBS-indole 17 as pale yellow crystals $(0.09 \text{ g}, 0.18 \text{ mmol}, 69\%, R_f = 0.73 \text{ (}50:50 \text{ m})$ hexanes:EtOAc)). **1H NMR** (CDCl3, 500 MHz): δ 8.59 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.88 (d, *J* = 9.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.65 (m, 2H, ArH), 6.89 (m, 2H, ArH), 6.82 (m, 4H, ArH), 6.60 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 3.84 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.73 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 0.96 (s, 9H, C(CH₃)₃), 0.08 (s, 6H, Si(CH3)2). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 191.7, 164.8 (d, *JC-F* = 251 Hz), 157.4, 151.7, 145.1, 142.8, 136.4, 136.09, 136.06, 132.2 (d, *JC-F*= 9 Hz), 124.6, 123.4, 123.1, 122.4, 121.6, 114.9 (d, *JC-F* = 22 Hz), 113.0, 111.8, 94.7, 55.8, 55.5, 25.8, 18.6, −4.6. **19F NMR** (CDCl3, 470 MHz): δ −108.1 (m, 1F, ArF). **HPLC**: 20.59 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI⁺):** m/z calculated for C₂₉H₃₃FNO₄Si [M+H]⁺ 506.2157, found 506.2155.

4.1.14. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsiloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,5″-***bis***-**

trifluoromethylbenzoyl)-6-methoxyindole (18)—To a solution of compound **5** (0.20 g, 0.52 mmol) in *o*-dichlorobenzene (15 mL) was added 3,5-*bis*-trifluoromethylbenzoyl chloride (0.14 mL, 0.78 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 160 °C for 12 h. The *o*-dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7% A / 93% B (4 CV), 7% A / 93% B \rightarrow 60%A / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBS-indole 18 as pale orange crystals $(0.26 \text{ g}, 0.42 \text{ mmol}, 81\%, R_f = 0.47)$ (70:30 hexanes:EtOAc)). **¹H NMR** (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.70 (br s, 1H, NH), 8.07 (d, $J =$ 9.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 8.03 (s, 2H, ArH) 7.74 (s, 1H, ArH), 6.96 (dd, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.92 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.85 (dd, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.65 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, Ar<u>H</u>), 6.62 (d, *J* = 2.5 Hz, 1H, Ar<u>H</u>), 3.86 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.71 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 0.91 (s, 9H, C(CH3)3), 0.00 (s, 6H, Si(CH3)2). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 189.5, 157.8, 152.0, 145.3, 144.5, 141.5, 136.6, 131.3 (q, *JC-F* = 33 Hz), 129.7 (m), 124.47 (q, *Jc-f* = 7 Hz), 124.46, 124.0, 123.1 (q, *J_{C-f}* = 275 Hz), 122.9, 122.7, 122.5, 122.2, 112.4, 112.1, 94.9, 55.8, 55.5, 25.6, 18.4, −4.8. **19F NMR** (CDCl3, 470 MHz): δ −62.8 (s, 6F, CF3). **HPLC**: 22.22 min., purity at 254 nm 96.3%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for C31H32F6NO4Si [M +H]+ 624.1999, found 624.1997.

4.1.15. (2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″-**

trifluoromethoxybenzoyl)-6-methoxyindole (19)—To a solution of compound **5** (1.14 g, 2.97 mmol) in *o*-dichlorobenzene (15 mL) was added 3-trifluoromethoxybenzoyl chloride (0.70 mL, 4.45 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 170 °C for 12 h. The *o*-dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark green colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / 93%B \rightarrow 60%A / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBS-indole 19 as a yellow powder $(1.21 \text{ g}, 2.11 \text{ mmol}, 71\%, R_f = 0.43$ $(70:30 \text{ hexanes:EtOAc}))$. **¹H NMR** (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.31 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.96 (d, $J =$ 8.4 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.52 (dt, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 1.3 Hz, 1H, ArH) 7.48 (s, 1H, ArH), 7.17 (t, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.13 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.93 (m, 2H, ArH), 6.81 (m, 2H, ArH), 6.62 $(d, J = 9.0 \text{ Hz}, 1H, ArH), 3.88 \text{ (s, 3H, OCH}_3), 3.73 \text{ (s, 3H, OCH}_3), 0.97 \text{ (s, 9H, C(CH}_3),$ 0.08 (s, 6H, Si(CH3)2). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 191.8, 157.4, 151.6, 148.8, 144.9, 144.1, 142.1, 136.6, 129.2, 128.0, 124.3, 123.6, 123.5, 122.9, 122.2, 122.0, 121.4, 120.4 (q, *J*_{C-F} = 256 Hz), 112.6, 112.0, 111.6, 94.8, 55.7, 55.3, 25.7, 18.4, −4.7. ¹⁹**F NMR** (CDCl₃,

470 MHz): δ −57.8 (s, 3F, OCF3). **HPLC**: 21.53 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for C30H33F3NO5Si [M+H]+ 572.2075, found 572.2071.

4.1.16. (2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsilyloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(4″-**

trifluoromethoxybenzoyl)-6-methoxyindole (20)—To a solution of compound **5** (1.14 g, 2.97 mmol) in *o*-dichlorobenzene (15 mL) was added 4-trifluoromethoxybenzoyl chloride (0.70 mL, 4.45 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 170 °C for 12 h. The *o*-dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark green colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / 93%B \rightarrow 60%A / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (1.1 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBS-indole 20 as a yellow powder $(0.92 \text{ g}, 1.61 \text{ mmol}, 54\%, \text{R}_f =$ 0.43 (70:30 hexanes:EtOAc)). ¹**H NMR** (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.29 (br s, 1H, N<u>H</u>), 8.00 (d, *J* = 8.6 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.64 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 2H, ArH) 6.97 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2H, ArH), 6.93 (m, 2H, ArH), 6.83 (d, *J* = 2.2 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.73 (dd, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 2.2 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.58 (d, *J* $= 8.4$ Hz, 1H, Ar<u>H</u>), 3.88 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.73 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 0.98 (s, 9H, C(CH₃)₃), 0.10 (s, 6H, Si(C<u>H</u>₃)₂). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 191.9, 157.3, 151.6, 151.0, 144.8, 144.1, 138.4, 136.6, 131.3, 124.2, 123.8, 122.8, 122.2, 121.4, 120.3 (q, *JC-F* = 256 Hz), 119.7, 112.6, 111.9, 111.3, 94.8, 55.6, 55.1, 25.6, 18.4, −4.8. **19F NMR** (CDCl3, 470 MHz): δ −57.7 (s, 3F, OCF3). **HPLC**: 21.61 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for $C_{30}H_{33}F_{3}NO_5Si$ [M+H]⁺ 572.2075, found 572.2075.

4.1.17. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsiloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″ trimethoxybenzoyl)-6-***tert***-butyldimethylsiloxyindole (21)—**To a solution of compound **6** (0.19 g, 0.39 mmol) in *o*-dichlorobenzene (20 mL) was added 3,4,5 trimethoxybenzoyl chloride (0.13 g, 0.58 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 160 °C for 12 h. The *o*-dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / $93\%B \to 60\%A$ / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in di-TBS-indole **21** as a pale yellow powder (0.04 g, 0.59 mmol, 20%, R_f = 0.33 (70:30 hexanes:EtOAc)). ¹**H NMR** (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.31 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.90 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.99 (s, 2H, ArH) 6.94 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.89 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.82 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.76 (d, *J* = 2.5 Hz, 1H, Ar<u>H</u>), 6.70 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 3.79 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.75 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.69 $(s, 6H, OCH_3)$, 1.01 $(s, 9H, C(CH_3)$ ₃), 0.94 $(s, 9H, C(CH_3)$ ₃), 0.22 $(s, 6H, Si(CH_3)$ ₂), 0.04 (s, 6H, Si(CH3)2). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 191.8, 153.0, 152.6, 151.7, 145.2, 142.3, 141.3, 136.5, 134.6, 125.2, 123.9, 122.3, 121.9, 116.7, 112.9, 111.8, 107.4, 105.1, 101.6, 60.9, 56.1, 55.5, 25.9, 25.8, 18.46, 18.45, −4.2, −4.8. **HPLC**: 23.31 min., purity at 254 nm 90.6%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for C37H52NO7Si2 [M+H]+ 678.3277, found 678.3279.

4.1.18. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsiloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″-**

trimethoxybenzoyl)-4,5,6-trimethoxyindole (22)—To a solution of compound 7 (0.05 g, 0.11 mmol) in *o*-dichlorobenzene (10 mL) was added 3,4,5-trimethoxybenzoyl chloride (0.04 g, 0.17 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 160 °C for 12 h. The *o*dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark green colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 25 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 12% A / 88% B (4 CV), 12% A / 88% B \rightarrow 100%A / 0%B (10 CV), 100%A / 0%B (2 CV); flow rate: 25 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBS-indole 22 as a pale yellow powder $(0.03 \text{ g}, 0.05 \text{ mmol}, 46\%, R_f = 0.50$ (50:50 hexanes:EtOAc)). **1H NMR** (CDCl3, 500 MHz): δ 8.25 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.19 (s, 2H,

ArH), 6.99 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.88 (d, *J* = 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.75 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.69 (s, 1H, ArH), 3.90 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.85 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.82 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.76 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.74 (s, 6H, OCH₃), 3.72 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 0.93 (s, 9H, C(CH3)3), 0.04 (s, 6H, Si(CH3)2). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 193.4, 152.9, 152.1, 151.4, 146.4, 145.3, 142.2, 137.8, 136.6, 134.2, 132.4, 124.7, 121.1, 120.5, 116.7, 114.4, 112.3, 107.6, 89.8, 61.4, 61.0, 60.8, 56.4, 56.3, 55.6, 25.8, 18.5, −4.7. **HPLC**: 18.60 min., purity at 254 nm 90.7%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: m/z calculated for $C_{34}H_{44}NO_9Si$ [M+H]⁺ 638.2780, found 638.2780.

4.1.19. 2-(4′-Methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″-trimethoxybenzoyl)-6-methoxy-7-*tert***butyldimethylsilyloxyindole (23)—**To a solution of compound **10** (0.05 g, 0.13 mmol) in *o*-dichlorobenzene (10 mL) was added 3,4,5-trimethoxybenzoyl chloride (0.05 g, 0.20 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 160 °C for 12 h. The *o*-dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark green colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 25 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 10% A / 90% B (4 CV), 10% A / 90% B \rightarrow 80% A / 20% B (10 CV), 80%A / 20%B (2 CV); flow rate: 25 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBS-indole 23 as a yellow powder $(0.06 \text{ g}, 0.10 \text{ mmol}, 76\%, R_f = 0.36 (60.40 \text{ m})$ hexanes:EtOAc)). **1H NMR** (CDCl3, 500 MHz): δ 8.20 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.56 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.26 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2H, ArH) 6.96 (s, 2H, ArH), 6.94 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.78 (d, $J = 8.6$ Hz, 2H, ArH), 3.88 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.80 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.76 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.70 (s, 6H, OCH₃), 1.09 (s, 9H, C(CH₃)₃), 0.26 (s, 6H, Si(CH₃)₂). ¹³**C NMR** (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 192.0, 160.2, 152.6, 146.0, 142.8, 141.3, 134.9, 130.3, 129.99, 129.95, 125.0, 124.8, 114.4, 114.2, 113.4, 109.9, 107.5, 61.0, 56.7, 56.2, 55.5, 26.3, 18.8, −4.1. **HPLC**: 20.21 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS** (**ESI**⁺): m/z calculated for C₃₂H₃₉NNaO₇Si [M +Na]+ 600.2388, found 600.2383.

4.1.20. 2-(3′-*tert***-Butyldimethylsiloxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″-**

trimethoxybenzoyl)-6,7-dimethoxyindole (24)—To a solution of compound **11** (0.25 g, 0.60 mmol) in *o*-dichlorobenzene (10 mL) was added 3,4,5-trimethoxybenzoyl chloride (0.15 g, 0.66 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux at 160 °C for 12 h. The *o*dichlorobenzene was removed by simple distillation, and the resulting dark green colored solid was subjected to flash chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / 93%B \rightarrow 60%A / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (5.2 CV); flow rate: 50 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in TBS-indole 24 as a yellow powder $(0.08 \text{ g}, 0.14 \text{ mmol}, 23\%, R_f = 0.17$ (70:30 hexanes:EtOAc)). **1H NMR** (CDCl3, 500 MHz): δ 8.53 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.71 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.98 (m, 4H, ArH) 6.77 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.73 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 4.06 (s, 3H, OCH₃) 3.96 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.79 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.76 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.69 (s, 6H, OCH₃), 0.94 (s, 9H, C(CH₃)₃), 0.03 (s, 6H, Si(CH₃)₂). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 191.8, 152.6, 151.8, 148.0, 145.2, 142.8, 141.3, 134.6, 134.0, 130.2, 125.2, 125.1, 122.3, 122.2, 116.8, 113.1, 111.8, 110.4, 107.4, 61.3, 60.9, 57.3, 56.1, 55.5, 25.8, 18.5, −4.7. **HPLC**: 19.24 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for $C_{33}H_{41}NNaO_8Si$ [M+Na]⁺ 630.2494, found 630.2491.

4.1.21. 2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,5″-dinitrobenzoyl)-6-

methoxyindole (25)—To a well-stirred solution of compound **13** (0.40 g, 0.69 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0 °C was added tetrabutylammonium fluoride (TBAF) (1.03 mL, 1.03 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over Na₂SO₄ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a

prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), $7\%A/93\%B \rightarrow 60\%A/40\%B$ (10 CV), $60\%A/40\%B$ (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] afforded the desired indole free phenol ligand **25** (0.15 g, 0.33 mmol, 47%, R^f = 0.12 (70:30 hexanes:EtOAc)) as a yellow powder. **1H NMR** $((CD₃)₂SO, 500 MHz): \delta$ 12.21 (br s, 1H, N<u>H</u>), 9.06 (br s, 1H, O<u>H</u>), 8.68 (t, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 8.41 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 2H, ArH) 8.05 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.97 (dd, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.92 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.71 (dd, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.68 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.54 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 3.83 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.65 (s, 3H, OC<u>H</u>₃. ¹³C NMR ((CD₃)₂SO, 125 MHz): δ 186.7, 156.8, 148.2, 147.1, 146.7, 146.1, 142.8, 136.7, 128.5, 123.3, 121.77, 121.75, 121.7, 119.3, 117.2, 112.0, 111.7, 111.1, 95.0, 55.7, 55.3. **HPLC**: 13.87 min., purity at 254 nm 93.4%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for $C_{23}H_{18}N_3O_8$ [M+H]⁺ 464.1088, found 464.1087.

4.1.22. 2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(4″-nitrobenzoyl)-6-methoxyindole

(26)—To a well-stirred solution of compound **14** (0.14 g, 0.27 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0 °C was added TBAF (0.40 mL, 0.40 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: $12\%A / 88\%B$ (3 CV), $12\%A / 88\%B \rightarrow 100\%A / 0\%B$ (11 CV), 100%A / 0%B (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] afforded the desired indole phenol ligand **26** (0.02 g, 0.05 mmol, 19%, R_f 0.23 (50:50) hexanes:EtOAc)) as a yellow powder. ${}^1\text{H}$ NMR ((CD₃)₂SO, 500 MHz): δ 12.04 (br s, 1H, NH), 9.05 (s, 1H, OH), 7.98 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2H, ArH), 7.83 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.61 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2H, ArH), 6.95 (d, *J* = 1.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.85 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.71 (s, 1H, ArH), 6.68 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.63 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 3.81 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.65 (s, 3H, OCH3). **13C NMR** ((CD3)2SO, 125 MHz): δ 190.1, 156.6, 148.3, 148.0, 146.1, 146.0, 145.6, 136.6, 129.8, 123.9, 122.6, 122.0, 121.47, 121.45, 116.8, 111.62, 111.55, 111.4, 94.9, 55.7, 55.3. **HPLC**: 13.19 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI⁺)**: m/z calculated for C₂₃H₁₉N₂O₆ [M+H]⁺ 419.1238, found 419.1237.

4.1.23.2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″-nitrobenzoyl)-6-methoxyindole

(27)—To a well-stirred solution of compound **15** (0.13 g, 0.25 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0 °C was added TBAF (0.38 mL, 0.38 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 15%A / 85%B (4.5 CV), 40%A / 60%B (16 CV), 40%A / $60\%B \rightarrow 100\%A / 0\%B$ (2 CV), 100%A / 0%B (10.5 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] afforded the desired indole phenol ligand **27** (0.10 g, 0.25 mmol, R^f = 0.28 (50:50 hexanes:EtOAc)) quantitatively as a yellow powder. **1H NMR** $((CD₃)₂CO, 500 MHz):$ δ 10.95 (br s, 1H, NH), 8.25 (t, $J = 2.0$ Hz, 1H, ArH), 8.13 (ddd, $J =$ 8.0 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 8.02 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.93 (dt, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 1.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.69 (s, 1H, OH), 7.49 (t, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.06 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.91 (dd, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.81 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.78 (dd, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.73 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 3.86 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.75 (s, 3H, OC_{H₃}). ¹³C NMR ((CD₃)₂CO, 125 MHz): δ 190.5, 158.5, 149.2, 148.5, 147.4, 146.0, 143.1, 138.0, 135.9, 130.1, 125.8, 125.7, 124.8, 123.7, 123.0, 122.9, 117.5, 113.0, 112.7, 112.3, 95.8, 56.5, 56.0. **HPLC**: 12.97 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for $C_{23}H_{19}N_2O_6$ [M+H]⁺ 419.1238, found 419.1236.

4.1.24. 2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″-trifluorobenzoyl)-6 methoxyindole (28)—To a well-stirred solution of compound **16** (0.70 g, 1.29 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0 $^{\circ}$ C was added TBAF (1.94 mL, 1.94 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 12% A / 88%B (4 CV), 12% A / 88%B \rightarrow 100%A / 0%B (10 CV), 100%A / 0%B (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] afforded the desired indole free phenol ligand 28 (0.35 g, 0.41 mmol, 64%, $R_f = 0.18$ (50:50) hexanes:EtOAc)) as a tan powder. **¹H NMR** ((CD₃)₂SO, 500 MHz): δ 12.02 (br s, 1H, N<u>H</u>), 9.12 (br s, 1H, OH), 7.85 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.28 (m, 2H, ArH), 6.94 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.86 (dd, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.80 (d, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.71 (d, *J* $= 2.0$ Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.69 (dd, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 3.81 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.73 (s, 3H, OCH3). **13C NMR** ((CD3)2SO, 125 MHz): δ 188.0, 156.6, 149.5 (ddd, *JC-f =* 247.6 Hz, 10.2 Hz, 3.0 Hz) 148.2, 146.1, 145.5, 140.0 (dt, *JC-f =* 251.4 Hz, 15.5 Hz), 136.71 (d, *JC-f =* 5.6 Hz), 136.65, 124.2, 122.0, 121.4, 121.2, 116.8, 113.5 (dd, *JC-f =* 16.6 Hz, 4.8 Hz), 111.8, 111.5, 110.8, 94.9, 55.8, 55.3. **19F NMR** ((CD3)2SO, 470 MHz): δ −135.5 (dd, *J* = 21.6 Hz, 8.5 Hz, 2F, ArF), −158.6 (tt, *J* = 21.2 Hz, 6.6 Hz, 1F, ArF). **HPLC**: 14.33 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI⁺)**: *m/z* calculated for C₂₃H₁₇F₃NO₄ [M+H]⁺ 428.1104, found 428.1104.

4.1.25. 2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(4″-fluorobenzoyl)-6-methoxyindole (29)—To a well-stirred solution of compound **17** (0.09 g, 0.18 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0 °C was added TBAF (0.30 mL, 0.30 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 35% A / 65% B (5 CV), 35% A / 65% B \rightarrow 50% A / 50% B (17.5 CV), 100%A / 0%B (7 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] afforded the desired indole phenol ligand $29(0.05 \text{ g}, 0.12 \text{ mmol}, 64\%, R_f = 0.31(50:50 \text{ m})$ hexanes:EtOAc)) as a tan powder. 1 **H NMR** ((CD₃)₂CO, 500 MHz): δ 10.78 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.77 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.66 (m, 2H, ArH, 1H, OH) 7.03 (d, *J* = 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.96 (m, 2H, ArH), 6.92 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.84 (dd, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.81 (dd, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, Ar<u>H</u>), 6.78 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 1H, Ar_H), 3.84 (s, 3H, OC_{H₃),} 3.79 (s, 3H, OCH3. **¹³C NMR** ((CD3)2CO, 125 MHz): δ 190.6, 164.3 (d, *JC-f* = 248 Hz), 157.2, 147.9, 146.3, 143.0, 137.00, 136.98, 136.9, 131.8 (d, *JC-f =* 9 Hz), 125.1, 123.0, 121.7, 121.5, 116.0, 114.4 (d, *Jc-f* = 22 Hz), 111.17, 111.15, 94.5, 55.4, 55.9. **19F NMR** ((CD3)2CO, 470 MHz): δ −110.8 (m, 1F, ArF). **HPLC**: 12.91 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI⁺):** m/z calculated for $C_{23}H_{19}FNO_4$ [M+H]⁺ 392.1293, found 392.1291.

4.1.26. 2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,5″-*bis***-trifluoromethylbenzoyl)-6 methoxyindole (30)—**To a well-stirred solution of compound **18** (0.26 g, 0.42 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0 °C was added TBAF (0.63 mL, 0.63 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / 93%B \rightarrow 60%A / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (5.2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] afforded the desired indole free phenol ligand 30 (0.22 g, 0.42 mmol, $R_f = 0.21$ (70:30)

hexanes:EtOAc)) quantitatively as an orange powder. **¹H NMR** ((CD₃)₂SO, 500 MHz): δ 12.10 (br s, 1H, NH), 9.00 (br s, 1H, OH), 7.99 (m, 1H, ArH, 1H, OH), 7.90 (s, 2H, ArH) 6.96 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.89 (dd, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.64 (m, 3H, ArH), 3.82 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.66 (s, 3H, OCH3). **13C NMR** ((CD3)2SO, 125 MHz): δ 188.4, 156.7, 148.2, 146.3, 146.2, 142.2, 136.7, 129.7 (q, *JC-F* = 33 Hz), 128.9 (m), 123.7 (m), 123.5, 123.0 (q, *JC-f =* 272 Hz), 122.0, 121.6, 121.4, 116.9, 111.7, 111.6, 111.0, 94.9, 55.6, 55.3. **19F NMR** ((CD3)2SO, 470 MHz): δ −61.4 (s, 6F, CF3). **HPLC**: 16.17 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for C25H18F6NO4 [M+H]+ 510.1135, found 510.1134.

4.1.27. 2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″-trifluoromethoxybenzoyl)-6 methoxyindole (31)—To a well-stirred solution of compound 19 (1.21 g, 2.11 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0 °C was added TBAF (3.20 mL, 3.20 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over Na₂SO₄ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 12% A / 88%B (4 CV), 12% A / 88%B \rightarrow 100%A / 0%B (10 CV), 100%A / 0%B (4 CV); flow rate: 50 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] afforded the desired indole free phenol ligand 31 (0.67 g, 1.51 mmol, 71%, $R_f = 0.33$ (50:50) hexanes:EtOAc)) as an orange powder. **¹H NMR** ((CD₃)₂CO, 500 MHz): δ 10.89 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.89 (d, *J* = 8.7 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.72 (s, 1H, OH), 7.55 (d, *J = 7*.4 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.47 (s, 1H, ArH), 7.30 (t, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.26 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.04 (d, *J* = 2.2 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.93 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.88 (dd, *J* = 8.7, 2.3 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.78 (dd, *J* = 8.3, 2.0 Hz, 1H, Ar_H), 6.72 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H, Ar_H), 3.84 (s, 3H, OC_{H₃), 3.76 (s, 3H,} OCH3). **13C NMR** ((CD3)2CO, 125 MHz): δ 191.4, 158.1, 149.4 (q, *JC-f =* 2 Hz), 148.9, 147.2, 145.2, 143.8, 137.8, 130.3, 128.9, 125.6, 123.9, 123.7, 122.63, 122.59, 122.2, 121.3 (q, *JC-F* = 254.75 Hz), 116.9, 112.8, 112.3, 112.0, 95.6, 56.2, 55.8. **19F NMR** ((CD3)2CO, 470 MHz): δ −58.5 (s, 6F, OCF3). **HPLC**: 14.71 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for C24H19F3NO5 [M+H]+ 458.1210, found 458.1210.

4.1.28. 2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(4″-trifluoromethoxybenzoyl)-6-

methoxyindole (32)—To a well-stirred solution of compound **20** (0.92 g, 1.60 mmol) in THF (5 mL) at 0 °C was added TBAF (2.5 mL, 2.5 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over Na2SO4 and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 12% A / 88%B (4 CV), 12% A / 88%B \rightarrow 100%A / 0%B (10 CV), 100%A / 0%B (4 CV); flow rate: 50 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] afforded the desired indole free phenol ligand 32 (0.43 g, 0.96 mmol, 60%, $R_f = 0.33$ (50:50) hexanes:EtOAc)) as a yellow powder. **¹H NMR** ((CD₃)₂CO, 500 MHz): δ 10.86 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.91 (d, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.69 (s, 1H, OH), 7.65 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 2H, ArH), 7.10 $(d, J = 8.5 \text{ Hz}, 2\text{H}, ArH), 7.03 (d, J = 2.2 \text{ Hz}, 1\text{H}, ArH), 6.90 (s, 1\text{H}, ArH), 6.87 (dd, J = 8.8 \text{ Hz})$ Hz, 2.2 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.71 (m, 2H, ArH), 3.84 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.77 (s, 3H, OCH3). **13C NMR** ((CD3)2CO, 125 MHz): δ 191.6, 158.1, 151.3 (q, *Jc-f* = 2 Hz), 148.9, 147.2, 145.1, 140.5, 137.8, 132.0, 125.7, 123.7, 122.72, 122.67, 121.7 (q, *JC-F* = 254.75 Hz), 120.7, 116.9, 113.0, 112.3, 111.8, 95.5, 55.1, 55.8. **19F NMR** ((CD3)2CO, 470 MHz): δ −58.5 (s, 6F, OCF3). **HPLC**: 14.80 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for $C_{24}H_{19}F_3NO_5 [M+H]^+$ 458.1210, found 458.1210.

4.1.29. 2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″-trimethoxybenzoyl)-6 hydroxyindole (33)—To a well-stirred solution of compound **21** (0.40 g, 0.59 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0° C was added TBAF (1.00 mL, 1.00 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted using EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 50 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 12% A / 88%B (4 CV), 12% A / 88%B \rightarrow 100%A / 0%B (10 CV), 100%A / 0%B (1.4 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] afforded the desired indole free phenol ligand 33 (0.11 g, 0.25 mmol, 42%, $R_f = 0.03$ (70:30 hexanes:EtOAc)) as a yellow powder. **1H NMR** ((CD₃) $_2$ SO, 500 MHz): δ 11.62 (br s, 1H, NH), 9.19 (br s, 1H, OH), 9.00 (br s, 1H, OH), 7.66 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.82 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH) 6.78 (s, 2H, ArH), 6.74 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 2H, ArH), 6.67 (t, *J* = 2.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.65 (t, *J* = 3.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 3.69 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.61 (s, 6H, OCH3), 3.59 (s, 3H, OCH3). **13C NMR** ((CD3)2SO, 125 MHz): δ 192.0, 155.2, 153.4, 148.5, 147.0, 143.7, 141.8, 138.0, 136.4, 126.5, 123.4, 122.7, 122.0, 116.9, 113.1, 112.3, 111.8, 106.0, 97.4, 60.4, 56.18, 56.17. **HPLC**: 8.95 min., purity at 254 nm 90.7%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for $C_{25}H_{24}NO_{7}$ [M+H]⁺ 450.1547, found 450.1547.

4.1.30. 2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″-trimethoxybenzoyl)-4,5,6 trimethoxyindole (34)—To a well-stirred solution of compound **22** (0.03 g, 0.05 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0 \degree C was added TBAF (0.1 mL, 0.1 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over Na₂SO₄ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 100 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 12% A / 88%B (4 CV), 12% A / 88%B \rightarrow 100%A / 0%B (10 CV), 100%A / 0%B (2 CV); flow rate: 40 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] afforded the desired indole phenol ligand 34 (0.02 g, 0.03 mmol, 60%, $R_f = 0.10$ $(50:50$ hexanes:EtOAc)) as a yellow powder. 1 **H NMR** (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.30 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.15 (s, 2H, ArH), 6.99 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH) 6.89 (dd, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.71 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.68 (s, 1H, ArH), 5.62 (s, 1H, OH), 3.90 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.85 (s, 3H, OCH₃) 3.84 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.82 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.74 (s, 6H, OCH₃), 3.69 (s, 3H, OCH3). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 193.4, 152.8, 152.2, 146.8, 146.5, 145.8, 142.1, 137.8, 137.0, 134.6, 132.4, 125.1, 120.5, 116.1, 113.7, 112.6, 110.9, 107.5, 89.7, 61.4, 61.0, 60.8, 56.4, 56.3, 56.1. **HPLC**: 11.13 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI⁺)**: m/z calculated for $C_{28}H_{30}NO_9$ [M+H]⁺ 524.1915, found 524.1912.

4.1.31. 2-(4′-Methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″-trimethoxybenzoyl)-6-methoxy-7-

hydroxyindole (35)—To a well-stirred solution of compound **23** (0.008 g, 0.014 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0 °C was added TBAF (0.01 mL, 0.01 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over $Na₂SO₄$ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 10 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 7%A / 93%B (4 CV), 7%A / 93%B \rightarrow 60%A / 40%B (10 CV), 60%A / 40%B (5 CV); flow rate: 12 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in free phenol indole **35** as a dark brown powder (0.006 g, 0.013 mmol, 90%, Rf = 0.22 (50:50 hexanes:EtOAc)). **1H NMR** (CDCl3, 500 MHz): δ 8.57 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.52 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 1H, ArH), 7.29 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 2H, ArH) 6.95 (br s, 3H, ArH), 6.74 (d, *J* $= 8.1$ Hz, 2H, Ar<u>H</u>), 5.76 (br s, 1H, O<u>H</u>), 3.97 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.80 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 3.75 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.69 (s, 6H, OCH3). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 192.2, 160.1, 152.6,

143.7, 142.3, 141.3, 134.8, 131.0, 130.4, 125.5, 125.3, 124.5, 114.0, 113.0, 112.8, 108.7, 107.5, 61.0, 57.6, 56.2, 55.4. **HPLC**: 11.67 min., purity at 254 nm 96.9%. **HRMS (ESI+)**: *m/z* calculated for C₂₆H₂₆NO₇ [M+H]⁺ 464.1704, found 464.1704.

4.1.32. 2-(3′-Hydroxy-4′-methoxyphenyl)-3-(3″,4″,5″-trimethoxybenzoyl)-6,7 dimethoxyindole (36)—To a well-stirred solution of compound **24** (0.08 g, 0.14 mmol) in THF (10 mL) at 0 \degree C was added TBAF (0.21 mL, 0.21 mmol, 1 M in THF) dropwise. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min while warming to room temperature. The reaction mixture was quenched with water (10 mL) and extracted with EtOAc (3×10 mL). The combined organic extract was dried over Na₂SO₄ and concentrated under reduced pressure. Purification by flash column chromatography using a prepacked 25 g silica column [solvent A: EtOAc; solvent B: hexanes; gradient: 12% A / 88% B (4 CV), 12% A / 88% B \rightarrow 100%A / 0%B (10 CV), 100%A / 0%B (2 CV); flow rate: 25 mL/min; monitored at 254 and 280 nm] resulting in free phenol indole 36 as a dark brown powder (0.02 g, 0.04 mmol, 27%, R_f = 0.14 (50:50 hexanes:EtOAc)). **1H NMR** (CDCl3, 500 MHz): δ 8.57 (br s, 1H, NH), 7.71 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.972 (d, *J* = 9.0 Hz, 1H, ArH) 6.971 (d, *J* = 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.94 (s, 2H, ArH), 6.79 (dd, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 1H, ArH), 6.64 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 1H, ArH), 5.63 (br s, 1H, OH), 4.06 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.96 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.83 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.79 (s, 3H, OCH3), 3.71 (s, 6H, OCH3). **13C NMR** (CDCl3, 125 MHz): δ 192.0, 152.6, 148.1, 147.2, 145.7, 143.2, 141.1, 135.0, 134.0, 130.2, 125.4, 125.0, 122.0, 116.8, 114.8, 113.4, 110.52, 110.45, 107.3, 61.3, 60.9, 57.4, 56.17, 56.15. **HPLC**: 11.45 min., purity at 254 nm >99%. **HRMS (ESI+):** m/z calculated for $C_{27}H_{27}NNaO_8$ [M+Na]⁺ 516.1629, found 516.1626.

4.2 Biological evaluation

4.2.1. SRB Assay52,53—We assessed inhibition of human cancer cell growth using the National Cancer Institute's standard sulforhodamine B assay, as previously described.⁵² Briefly, cancer cell lines in a 5% fetal bovine serum/RPMI1640 medium, 1% gentamicin solution were plated in 96-well plates and incubated for 24 h. Serial dilutions of the compounds were then added. After 48 h, the cells were fixed with trichloroacetic acid, stained with sulforhodamine B, and read with an automated Biotek plate reader. A growth inhibition of 50% (GI $_{50}$ or the drug concentration causing a 50% reduction in the net protein increase) was calculated from optical density data.

4.2.2. Colchicine Binding Assay—Inhibition of [³H]colchicine binding was determined using 100 µL reaction mixtures containing 1.0 µM tubulin, 5.0 µM $[^3H]$ colchicine (from Perkin-Elmer), 5% (v/v) dimethyl sulfoxide, and potential inhibitors at 1.0 or 5.0 μ M. Reaction mixtures also contained components shown to potently stabilize the colchicine binding activity of tubulin:⁵⁴ 1.0 M monosodium glutamate (adjusted to pH 6.6 with HCl in 2.0 M stock solution), 0.5 mg/mL bovine serum albumin, 0.1 M glucose-1-phosphate, 1.0 mM MgCl₂, and 1.0 mM GTP. Incubation was for 10 min at 37 \degree C, a time point at which the reaction in the control is 40–60% complete. Reactions were stopped by adding 2.0 mL of ice-cold water and placing the samples on ice prior to filtration. Each sample was poured onto a stack of two DEAE-cellulose filters, followed immediately by 6 mL of ice-cold water, and the water was aspirated under reduced vacuum. The filters were washed with additional water and placed into vials containing 5 mL of Biosafe II scintillation cocktail. The samples were counted the next day in a Beckman scintillation counter. Samples with potential inhibitors were compared to controls with no inhibitor to determine percent inhibition.

4.2.3. Inhibition of Tubulin Polymerization—Tubulin assembly experiments were performed with 0.25 mL reaction mixtures (final volume). The mixtures contained 1 mg/mL (10 µM) purified bovine brain tubulin, 0.8 M tubulin monosodium glutamate (adjusted to pH

6.6 with HCl in 2.0 M stock solution), 4% (v/v) dimethyl sulfoxide, 0.4 mM GTP, and varying concentrations of compound. Initially, all components except GTP were preincubated for 15 min at 30 °C in a 0.24 mL volume. After chilling the mixtures on ice, 10 µL of 10 mM GTP was added to each sample. The reaction mixtures were then transferred to cuvettes held at 0 °C in Beckman DU-7400 and DU-7500 spectrophotometers equipped with electronic temperature controllers. The temperature was jumped to 30 $^{\circ}$ C over about 30 s, and polymerization was followed turbidimetrically at 350 nM for 30 min. Each reaction set included a reaction mixture without compound, and the IC_{50} was defined as the concentration of compound that inhibited the extent of assembly versus the control after 20 min at 30 °C. These values were obtained by interpolation between the actual experimental values.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health (grant no. 5R01CA140674 to K.G.P. and M.L.T.) and Oxigene Inc. (grant to K.G.P. and M.L.T.) for their financial support of this project, and to the NSF for funding the Varian 500 MHz NMR spectrometer (grant no. CHE- 0420802). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily reflect the official views of the National Institutes of Health. The authors also thank Dr. James Karban and Dr. Michelle Nemec (Director) for the use of the shared Molecular Biosciences Center at Baylor University, Dr. Alejandro Ramirez (Mass Spectrometry Core Facility, Baylor University), and Dr. Kevin Klausmeyer (X-ray analysis). The authors are grateful to Mr. Robert Harris, Ms. Priscilla Hor, and Ms. Siri Ancha for their valuable contributions to the synthesis of certain analogues.

References and notes

1. Jordan MA, Wilson L. Nat. Rev. Cancer. 2004; 4:253–265. [PubMed: 15057285]

- 2. Lopus, M.; Yenjerle, M.; Wilson, L. In Wiley Encyclopedia of Chemical Biology. Begley, TP., editor. Vol. 3. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.; 2008. p. 153-160.
- 3. Etienne-Manneville S. Curr. Opin. Cell Biol. 2010; 22:104–111. [PubMed: 20031384]
- 4. Wade RH. Mol. Biotechnol. 2009; 43:177–191. [PubMed: 19565362]
- 5. Valiron O, Caudron N, Job D. Cell. Mol. Life Sci. 2001; 58:2069–2084. [PubMed: 11814057]
- 6. Mason RP, Zhao D, Liu L, Trawick ML, Pinney KG. Integr. Biol. 2011; 3:375–387.
- 7. Tozer GM, Kanthou C, Baguley BC. Nat. Rev. Cancer. 2005; 5:423–435. [PubMed: 15928673]
- 8. Hida K, Hida Y, Shindoh M. Cancer Sci. 2008; 99(3):459–466. [PubMed: 18167133]
- 9. Kanthou C, Tozer GM. Exp. Opin. Ther. Targets. 2007; 11(11):1443–1457.
- 10. Siemann DW, Bibby MC, Dark GG, Dicker AP, Eskens FA, Horsman MR, Marme D, Lorusso PM. Clin. Cancer Res. 2005; 11:416–420. [PubMed: 15701823]
- 11. Dougherty, GJ.; Chaplin, DJ. Vascular Disruptive Agents for the Treatment of Cancer. Meyer, T., editor. New York: Springer; 2010. p. 1-27.ch. 1
- 12. Siemann, DWin. Vascular-Targeted Therapies in Oncology. Siemann, D., editor. London, UK: John Wiley & Sons; 2006. p. 1-8.ch. 1
- 13. Patil SA, Patil R, Miller DD. Future Med. Chem. 2012; 4(16):2085–2115. [PubMed: 23157240]
- 14. Weisenberg RC, Borisy GG, Taylor W. Biochemistry. 1968; 7:4466–4477. [PubMed: 5700666]
- 15. Pettit GR, Singh SB, Hamel E, Lin CM, Alberts DS, Garcia-Kendall D. Experientia. 1989; 45(2): 209–211. [PubMed: 2920809]
- 16. Pettit GR, Singh SB, Niven ML, Hamel E, Schmidt JM. J. Nat. Prod. 1987; 50(1):119–131. [PubMed: 3598594]
- 17. Hasani A, Leighl N. Clinical Lung Cancer. 2011; 12(1):18–25. [PubMed: 21273175]

- 18. Dowlati A, Robertson K, Cooney M, Petros WP, Stratford M, Jesberger J, Rafie N, Overmoyer B, Makkar V, Stambler B, Taylor A, Waas J, Lewin JS, McCrae KR, Remick SC. J. Clin. Oncol. 2003; 62(12):3408–3416.
- 19. Rustin GJ, Galbraith SM, Anderson H, Stratford M, Folkes LK, Sena L, Gumbrell L, Price PM. J. Clin. Oncol. 2003; 21(15):2815–2822. [PubMed: 12807934]
- 20. Lee RM, Gewirtz DA. Drug Dev. Res. 2008; 69(6):352–358.
- 21. Pinney, KGin. Vascular-Targeted Therapies in Oncology. Siemann, D., editor. London, UK: John Wiley & Sons; 2006. p. 95-121.ch. 6
- 22. Pettit GR, Singh SB, Boyd MR. J. Med. Chem. 1995; 38:1666–1672. [PubMed: 7752190]
- 23. Oshumi K, Nakagawa R, Fukuda Y. J. Med. Chem. 1998; 41:3022–3032. [PubMed: 9685242]
- 24. McGowan AT, Fox BW. Cancer Chemother. Pharmacol. 1990; 26:79–81. [PubMed: 2322992]
- 25. El-Zayat AAE, Degan D, Drabek S. Anticancer Drugs. 1993; 4:19–25. [PubMed: 8457709]
- 26. Oshumi K, Hatanaka R, Nakagawa R. Anticancer Drug Des. 1999; 14:539–548. [PubMed: 10834274]
- 27. Pettit GR, Minardi MD, Boyd MR, Pettit RK. Anticancer Drug Des. 2000; 15:397–403. [PubMed: 11716432]
- 28. Pettit GR, Lippert JW III. Anticancer Drug Des. 2000; 15:203–216. [PubMed: 11049088]
- 29. Boehle AS, Sipos B, Kliche U, Kalthoff H, Dohrmann P. Ann. Thorac. Surg. 2001; 71:1657–1665. [PubMed: 11383817]
- 30. Pettit GR, Moser BR, Boyd MR. Anticancer Drug Des. 2001; 16:185–193. [PubMed: 12049477]
- 31. Ohno T, Kawano K, Tahara K. Gastroenterology. 2001; 120:2831.
- 32. Pinney KG, Wang F, Hadimani M. US Patent 6849656. 2005
- 33. Hadimani MB, Kessler RJ, Kautz JA, Ghatak A, Shirali R, O'Dell H, Garner CM, Pinney KG. Acta Crystallogr. 2002; C58:330.
- 34. Pinney K, Wang F, Del Pilar Mejia M. From PCT Int. Appl. WO 0119794 A2. 2001
- 35. Flynn BL, Hamel E, Jung MK. J. Med. Chem. 2002; 45:2670–2673. [PubMed: 12036378]
- 36. Hadimani MB, MacDonough MT, Ghatak A, Strecker TE, Lopez R, Sriram M, Nguyen BL, Hall JJ, Kessler RJ, Shirali AR, Liu L, Garner CM, Pettit GR, Hamel H, Chaplin DJ, Mason RP, Trawick ML, Pinney KG. J. Nat. Prod. 2013<http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/np400374w>.
- 37. Liou J-P, Chang Y-C, Kuo F-M, Chang C-W, Tseng H-Y, Wang C-C, Yang Y-N, Chang J-Y, Lee S-J, Hsieh HP. J. Med. Chem. 2004; 47:4247–4257. [PubMed: 15293996]
- 38. Pinney KG, Bounds AD, Dingeman KM, Mocharla VP, Pettit GR, Bai R, Hamel E. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 1999; 9:1081–1086. [PubMed: 10328289]
- 39. Mullica DF, Pinney KG, Mocharla VP, Dingeman KM, Bounds AD, Sappenfield EL. J. Chem. Crystallogr. 1998; 28:289–295.
- 40. Kessler, RJ.; Hadimani, B.; Pinney, KG.; Edvardsen, K. Poster. Bloomington IN: 38th National Organic Symposium Indiana University; 2003 Jun 8–12.
- 41. Kessler, RJ. M.S. Thesis. Waco, TX: Baylor University; 2002. Synthesis and Evaluation of New Inhibitors of Tubulin Polymerization and Their Corresponding Prodrugs as Potential Vascular Targeting Agents.
- 42. Flynn BL, Flynn GP, Hamel E, Jung MK. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 2001; 11:2341–2343. [PubMed: 11527727]
- 43. Flynn BL, Gill GS, Grobelny DW, Chaplin JH, Paul D, Leske AF, Lavranos TC, Chalmers DK, Charman SA, Kostewicz E, Shackleford DM, Morizzi J, Hamel E, Jung MK, Kremmidiotis G. J. Med. Chem. 2011; 54:6014–6027. [PubMed: 21774499]
- 44. Kremmidiotis G, Leske AF, Lavranos TC, Beaumont D, Hall A, O'Callaghan M, Matthews CA, Flynn BL. Mol. Cancer Ther. 2010; 6:1562–1573. [PubMed: 20515948]
- 45. La Regina G, Sarkar T, Bai R, Edler MC, Saletti R, Coluccia A, Piscitelli F, Minelli L, Gatti V, Mazzoccoli C, Palermo V, Mazzoni C, Falcone C, Scovassi AI, Giansanti V, Campiglia P, Porta A, Maresca B, Hamel E, Brancale A, Novellino E, Silvestri R. J. Med. Chem. 2009; 52:7512– 7527. [PubMed: 19601594]

- 46. La Regina, Bai R.; Rensen, WM.; Cesare, ED.; Coluccia, A.; Piscitelli, F.; Famiglini, V.; Reggio, A.; Nalli, M.; Pelliccia, S.; Pozza, ED.; Costa, B.; Granata, I.; Porta, A.; Maresca, B.; Soriani, A.; Iannitto, ML.; Santoni, A.; Li, J.; Cona, MM.; Chen, F.; Ni, Y.; Brancale, A.; Dondio, G.; Vultaggio, S.; Varasi, M.; Mercurio, C.; Martini, C.; Hamel, E.; Lavia, P.; Novellino, E.; Silvestri, R. J. Med. Chem. 2013; 56:123–149. [PubMed: 23214452]
- 47. Ty N, Dupeyre G, Chabot GG, Seguin J, Tillequin F, Scherman D, Michel S, Cachet X. Bioorg. Med. Chem. 2008; 16(15):7494–7503. [PubMed: 18583138]
- 48. Bischler A, Brion H. Chem. Ber. 1892; 25:2860.
- 49. Mohlau H. Chem. Ber. 1881; 14:173.
- 50. Kemperman GJ, Roeters TA, Hilberink PW. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2003:1681–1686.
- 51. Hall JJ, Sriram M, Strecker TE, Tidmore JK, Jelinek CJ, Kumar GDK, Hadimani MB, Pettit GR, Chaplin DJ, Trawick ML, Pinney KG. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 2008; 18:5146–5149. [PubMed: 18710804]
- 52. Monks A, Scudiero D, Skehan P, Shoemaker R, Paul K, Vestica D, Hose C, Langley J, Cronise P, Vaigro-Wolf A. J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 1991; 83:767–766.
- 53. Vichai V, Kirtikara K. Nature Protocols. 2006; 1(3):1112–1116.
- 54. Hamel E, Lin CM. Biochim. Biophys. Acta. 1981; 675:226–231. [PubMed: 6115675]

Figure 1. Selected colchicine site tubulin binding agents.

MacDonough et al. Page 22

Figure 3. Molecular structures of synthesized 2-aryl-3-aroylindole analogues **25–36** .

36: R₁ = 3'-OH, 4'-OCH₃, R₂ = 6,7-di-OCH₃, R₃ = 3",4",5"-tri-OCH₃

Scheme 1.

24: R₁ = 3'-OTBS, 4'-OCH₃, R₂ = 6,7-di-OCH₃, R₃ = 3",4",5"-tri-OCH₃

Synthetic route to OXi8006 analogues from bromoacetophenones 3 and 4.

Table 1

Cytotoxicity against human cancer cell lines SK-OV-3, NCI-H460, and DU-145

 a
Average of n β independent determinations.

b For additional data see refs. 15–16.

Table 2

Inhibition of tubulin polymerization and colchicine binding

 a_n nd = not determined in this study.