Antimicrobial and α-Glucosidase Inhibitory Compounds from the Branches of *Uvaria siamensis*
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Abstract: A new γ-butenoid, (Z)-6-acetylsphaerodol (2), along with seven known compounds, (4E)-7-benzyloxy-6-hydroxy-2,4-heptadien-4-olide (1), (6S)-melodorinol (3), (6S)-acetylmelodorinol (4), (Z)-sphaerodol (5), (Z)-7-acetylsphaerodol (6), dichamanetin (7), and pinocembrin (8), were isolated and structurally elucidated from *Uvaria siamensis* growing in Thailand. Their chemical structures were assigned by extensive spectroscopy (NMR and HREIMS), as well as comparisons with the previous literature. Compounds 1-8 were evaluated for the antimicrobial activity against two multidrug-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* strains, 23Sa1 and SA-ATCC. Compounds 4 and 6 displayed moderate activity with inhibitory zones of 13 and 12 mm against 23Sa1 and SA-ATCC strains, respectively. Compounds 3 and 7 exhibited significant efficacy, displaying IC_{50} values of 157.7 and 94.2 µM, respectively, against α-glucosidase. According to the docking data, compounds 3 and 7 have a greater influence on binding contacts with the α-glucosidase active pocket, thereby affecting the inhibitory activity of the enzyme.
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Bioactivity of the secondary metabolites of *Uvaria siamensis*

1. Introduction

*Uvaria siamensis* (Scheff.) L.L. Zhou, Y.C.F. Su, & R.M.K. Saunders, a member of the Annonaceae family, is commonly found in Asian countries such as Thailand and Vietnam [1-3]. In Thailand, this plant is known as “Lamduan”, and its flower holds significance in Thai traditional medicine for its roles as a tonic, mild cardiotonic stimulant, hematinic, and antipyretic [4]. To date, more than 80 compounds have been identified in this species under the names *U. siamensis* and *M. fruticosum* (recognized as a synonym), including γ-butenolides, chalcones, flavanols, and alkaloids [2, 4-13]. The extracts and compounds obtained from *U. siamensis* exhibited diverse pharmaceutical properties, including cytotoxicity [14-16], antifungal and antioxidant activities [8, 17], anti-inflammatory effects [5, 18], antiplasmodial activity [19], and α-glucosidase inhibitory activity [14, 20, 21]. In this investigation, we present the isolation and structural interpretation of a novel γ-butenoid, (*Z*)-6-acetylsphaerodol (2), together with seven known compounds, (4E)-7-benzyloxy-6-hydroxy-2,4-heptadien-4-olide (1) [13], (6S)-melodorinol (3) [13], (6S)-acetylmelodorinol (4) [13], (Z)-sphaerodiol (5) [22], (Z)-7-acetylsphaerodol (6) [22], dichamanetin (7) [22], and pinocembrin (8) [22] (Figure 1) from the brances of *U. siamensis*. Their structures were determined through spectroscopic evidence (NMR and HRESIMS) and comparison with spectroscopic data from previous literature. Subsequently, compounds 1-8 were assessed for their antibacterial efficacy against both the *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 and MRSA strains, as well as for α-glucosidase inhibition and molecular docking study.

![Chemical structures of 1-8](image)

**Figure 1.** Chemical structures of 1-8

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. General Experimental Procedures

A Bruker Avance III spectrometer operated at 500 MHz for 1H NMR and 125 MHz for 13C NMR, recorded 1D and 2D NMR spectra, with tetramethylsilane as an internal standard. HRESIMS was recorded using a MicrOTOF-Q mass spectrometer. Column chromatography was conducted on a silica gel (40-63 µm, Merck) column. For thin-layer chromatography (TLC), pre-coated silica gel 60 F254 or 60 RP-18 F254S plates (Merck) were used. The TLC spots became visible after treatment with a 10% sulfuric acid solution and subsequent heating.

2.2. Plant Material

Branches of *U. siamensis* were collected in August 2023 from the Kaeng Khoi district, Saraburi province, Thailand. The plant material was identified by Dr. Suttitra Khumkratok (Walai Rukhavej Botanical Research Institute, Thailand) and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dang Van Son (Institute of Tropical Biology, Vietnam). A voucher specimen (VNM-Huy05.24) was deposited at the herbarium of the Institute of Tropical Biology, Vietnam Academy of Science and Technology.
2.3. Extraction and Isolation

The dried branches of *U. siamensis* (15 kg) were ground and then subjected to maceration with EtOAc (30 L × 3, weekly) at room temperature. This process yielded EtOAc extract (132.25 g). This crude extract was subsequently loaded onto normal-phase silica gel column chromatography (CC) using a gradient system and eluted with a mixture of *n*-hexane and EtOAc (2:1–0:1, v/v). The procedure yielded 14 fractions (EA1–EA14), which subsequently were assessed for antimicrobial activity (Table S1). As a result, fractions EA8 and EA9 were selected for further analysis due to their strong activity. The purification process of these two fractions was illustrated in Scheme S1.

(Z)-6-Acetylphaerodol (2). Colorless oil; [α]$_D^{20}$ +125 (c 0.1, MeOH). $^1$H NMR and $^{13}$C NMR data (both in acetone-$d_6$): See Table 1. HRESIMS m/z 199.0638 (calcd. for [C$_9$H$_{10}$O$_3$+H]$^+$, 199.0606).

2.4. Antimicrobial Activity Assay

The antibacterial effects of the EtOAc extract, its fractions, and compounds 1-8 against both *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 and methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) strains were examined using the agar diffusion method. Solutions of the EtOAc extract and its fractions were prepared by dissolving in dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) at a concentration of 10 mg/mL, except for fractions EA10, EA12, and EA13, which were prepared at 2 mg/mL. Compounds 1-8 were diluted in DMSO at a concentration of 1 mg/mL. Bacterial strains were cultured overnight on nutrient agar at 37°C, and then diluted using sterile 0.9% NaCl to achieve bacterial suspensions with an OD$_{600}$ of 0.1. Bacterial suspensions (100 μL) were spread on Mueller-Hinton agar (MHA) plates, and wells were created using sterile tips. Solutions of the EtOAc extract, its fractions, and isolated compounds in DMSO (50 μL each) were added to the created wells. The MHA plates were then placed in an incubator at 37°C for a period of 16-18 hours. Then, the inhibition zones of each well were measured. Positive and negative controls are apramycin (1 mg/mL) and DMSO, respectively.

2.5. Minimum Inhibitory Concentration

Compounds 4 and 6 were dissolved in DMSO and then further diluted in MeOH:HCl (MHA) to establish a range of concentrations from 0, 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 54, 128, and 256 μg/mL for each compound and these concentrations were put in wells of a 24-well plate. Then, 10$^4$ CFU of *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 and methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) were placed on the surface of the wells containing the concentration range of 4 and 6. The plate was placed in an incubator at 37°C for 16-18 hours. The Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) values were found at the lowest concentration of as 4 and 6, effectively inhibiting the growth of both *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 and methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) strains.

2.6. α-Glucosidase Inhibition Assay

The inhibitory activity of 1-8 against yeast α-glucosidase was evaluated according to a procedure previously described in the literature [20].

2.7. Molecular Docking Study

The protein receptor utilized in this study was the 3D structure of α-glucosidase MAL12, acquired from the AlphaFold2 database [24, 25]. The structures of potent compounds 3 and 7 were built using Gaussview 6.0 and then optimized using density functional theory (DFT) with the B3LYP/6–31G* basis set in Gaussian 16 [26]. To investigate the interactions between the inhibitors and α-glucosidase, molecular docking analyses were performed using AutoDock Vina 1.1.2. The docking input files were generated using the AutoDockTools 1.5.6 package. The highest-rated Vina docking score was selected and subsequently analyzed visually using PLIP [27] software and PyMOL.
3. Results and Discussion

The molecular formula of 2, C_{18}H_{20}O_{5}, was established by HRESIMS through a protonated molecular ion peak at m/z 199.0638 [M+H]^+ (calcd. for [C_{18}H_{20}O_{5}+H]^+, 199.0606). ^1H NMR and HSQC spectra of 2 displayed two cis-coupled olefin protons (δ_H 7.75 and 6.37), a doublet olefinic proton (δ_H 5.46, d, J = 8.5 Hz) coupled with an oxymethine proton (δ_H 5.77, dt, J = 8.5, 5.5 Hz), and one diastereotopic methylene group (δ_H 3.73). The ^13C NMR data, consistent with HRESI mass data, exhibited nine carbon signals, including two ester carbons (δ_C 170.3 and 169.7), four olefinic carbons (δ_C 155.5, 145.4, 121.4, and 111.4), two oxygenated carbons (δ_C 71.2 and 64.0), and one methoxy group (δ_C 20.9) (Table 1). All the aforementioned spectroscopic data indicated that 2 was a γ-butenoid compound sharing a similar skeleton to 3-6. HMBC networks of H-2 (δ_H 7.75) and H-3 (δ_H 6.37) to C-1 (δ_C 169.7) defined the γ-lactone ring. ^1H-^1H spin-spin interactions between H-2/H-3 and H-5/H-6/H-7 defined the connectivities through C-1 to C-7. The NMR data of 2 closely resembled those of 6 (Table 1), except for the presence of an acetyl group at C-6. This was indicated by a downfield chemical shift of H-6 (δ_H 5.75, dt, J = 8.0, 5.5 Hz). The double triplet status of this proton also confirmed the absence of 6-OH. Accordingly, the chemical structure of 2 was assigned as depicted in Figure 1.

The main constituents of U. siamensis were considered to be the γ-butenoids 1-7. Many synthetic studies were conducted to validate their absolute configuration [11, 23]. Chakchaisiri et al determined that natural γ-butenoids in U. siamensis should have a 6S configuration, and their specific rotation at a particular concentration serves as evidence to distinguish the stereochemistry [11]. The distinction between the E configuration (in 1) and the Z configuration (in 2-6) was possible through NMR chemical shifts. In the same deuterated solvent, the H-3 proton of an E isomer displayed notably greater deshielding compared to that of a Z isomer. Furthermore, the carbon C-3 experienced an upfield shift of approximately 5 ppm [13]. NOESY network of H-3 and H-5 in 2 supported these previous findings (Figure 2). The positive optical rotation of 2-6 indicated a 6S configuration, while the negative optical rotation of 1 defined its 6R configuration. Compounds 7-8 were determined to have the 2S configuration based on their negative rotation.

Table 1. ^1H (500 MHz, δ_H, multi., J in Hz) and ^13C (125 MHz) NMR data of 2 and 6 in acetone-d_{6}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6-OAc</th>
<th>7-OAc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δ_H</td>
<td>δ_C</td>
<td>δ_H</td>
<td>δ_C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>169.7</td>
<td>6.37 (1H, d, J = 5.5 Hz)</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>6.35 (1H, d, J = 5.5 Hz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.37 (1H, d, J = 5.5 Hz)</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>7.75 (1H, d, J = 5.5 Hz)</td>
<td>7.75 (1H, d, J = 5.5 Hz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.75 (1H, d, J = 5.5 Hz)</td>
<td>145.4</td>
<td>155.5</td>
<td>150.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.46 (1H, d, J = 8.5 Hz)</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>5.47 (1H, d, J = 9.0 Hz)</td>
<td>115.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.46 (1H, d, J = 8.5 Hz)</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>4.90 (1H, m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.71 (1H, dt, J = 8.5, 5.5 Hz)</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>4.08 (1H, dd, J = 11.0, 5.0 Hz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.73 (2H, t, 5.5 Hz)</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>4.15 (1H, dd, J = 11.0, 6.5 Hz)</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-OAc</td>
<td>2.03 (3H, s)</td>
<td>170.3</td>
<td>2.00 (3H, s)</td>
<td>170.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-OAc</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Selected HMBC and NOESY correlations of 2
Fractions EA1-EA14 were assessed for their antimicrobial potential against two strains of *S. aureus*: ATCC 25923 and MRSA strains (Table S1). Fractions EA8 and EA9 were the most active fractions, which were then selected for further chemical analysis and consequently led to the isolation of 1-8. Compounds 1-8 were tested for their activity on the aforementioned two *S. aureus* strains and revealed that 4 and 6 were the most active compounds, with inhibition zones of 12 and 13 mm against *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 and the MRSA strains, respectively. The MIC values of 4 and 6 were higher than 256 μg/mL, indicating their weak activity toward two tested *S. aureus* strains. This indicated that the presence of a free OH group at C-7 would decrease the activity, as observed in cases 2 and 5. A comparison between 3 and 4 highlights the important role of 6-OAc in antimicrobial activity.

Compounds 1-8 were examined for their inhibition of α-glucosidase. Compounds 3 and 7 demonstrated significant efficacy, with IC\(_{50}\) values of 157 ± 15.0 and 94.2 ± 7.7 μM, respectively, when compared to the positive control acarbose (IC\(_{50}\) 331 ± 4.2 μM) (Table 2). The remaining compounds were inactive (IC\(_{50}\) >200 μM). For γ-butenoids 1-6, the presence of the acetyl group at either C-6 or C-7 would decrease the activity. It is worth noting that there is limited existing research on the α-glucosidase inhibition of 1-8.

### Table 2. α-Glucosidase inhibitory activity of 1-8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>IC(_{50}) (μM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>157 ± 15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>94.2 ± 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acarbose</td>
<td>331 ± 4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Molecular docking serves as a valuable approach to elucidate the interaction mechanism between a ligand and a receptor, while also providing predictions for the potential binding sites of the ligand. Two active compounds 3 and 7 were docked into the active site of the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* α-glucosidase, and the outcome was illustrated in Figure 3.

The evaluated binding energies between the α-glucosidase and 3 and 7 were −8.4 kcal.mol\(^{-1}\) and −9.4 kcal.mol\(^{-1}\), respectively. As depicted in Figure 3, when bound to α-glucosidase, 3 formed a hydrogen bond with Gln181 and hydrophobic interactions with Tyr71, Phe157, Phe177, Thr215, Leu218, Glu276, Ala278, and Phe300. For compound 7, its two hydroxyl groups formed hydrogen bonds with Arg-213 (2.02 Å) and Arg-439 (3.14 Å), and its phenyl group formed Pi-interactions with Tyr-71. Additionally, a hydrophobic patch comprising Phe157, Phe158, Phe177, Thr215, Leu218, Glu276, Ala278, and Phe300 enclosed and participated in hydrophobic interactions with 7. The docking outcomes showed that 7 exhibited higher activity compared to 3 because it formed more hydrogen bonds and had lower binding energy. Previous studies have indicated that the formation of hydrogen bonds could play a role in increasing the stability of the complex [28]. As a result, the inhibitor attaches more firmly to the enzyme, leading to an increase in its inhibitory activity. The contribution of Pi-effects is crucial in protein-ligand recognition, as they contribute a substantial amount of binding enthalpy [29].

To summarize, the predominant interaction forces between our inhibitors and α-glucosidase may involve hydrogen bonding and hydrophobic interactions.
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![Figure 3](image)

**Figure 3.** (A–B) Binding modes of 3 (magenta) and 7 (cyan) in α-glucosidase; (C–E) Detailed interactions of 3 and 7
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