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Exploring the binding site of InhA



| IC $_{50}$ | MIC (Mtb H37Rv) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 200 nM | $22 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |
| 100 nM | $11 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |
| -- | $<2.7 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |
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#### Abstract

A series of fluorene-based derivatives was synthesized and evaluated for inhibiting both InhA and Mycobacterium tuberculosis growth. These compounds were inspired by the previously reported Genz-10850 molecule, a good InhA inhibitor, but with a poor activity against $M$. tuberculosis growth. Structure-activity relationships were performed by introducing the following chemical modifications: 1) the piperazine ring; 2) the amide group; 3) the aryl moiety; and 4) the fluorene moiety. Among these new derivatives, one of them was more effective against both the InhA activity and mycobacterial growth, compared to the hit compound. Docking studies were also performed to rationalize activities of these derivatives. Furthermore, we showed for the first time that efflux pump inhibitors potentiated the efficacy of Genz-10850 (GEQ) derivatives against M. tuberculosis growth, demonstrating that these compounds could be substrates of some efflux pumps.


## 1. Introduction

Tuberculosis remains one of the leading infectious diseases around the world with 9 million new cases and 1.5 million deaths in 2013.[1] One-third of the world population has been estimated as infected by Mycobacterium tuberculosis, the causative pathogen of tuberculosis. With the resurgence of the disease related to the HIV-coinfection and to resistance to current clinical treatment, there is a growing need to find new antitubercular drugs.[1,2] In the last few years, M. tuberculosis enzymes involved in the fatty acid synthase type II (FAS-II) system have been identified and validated as relevant drug targets.[3-5] Among the FAS-II enzymes, InhA, a trans-2-enoyl-ACP reductase, is one of the most druggable target in tuberculosis field. Different classes of direct InhA inhibitors, including 4-hydroxy-2-pyridone derivatives, have been recently reported in the literature with potent bactericidal activity against M. tuberculosis strains.[6,7] Among all these inhibitors, Genz-10850 (also called GEQ) has been identified as a very promising inhibitor of InhA (Figure 1), after in vitro screening of a library of 500,000 compounds.[8] Later, He et al. synthesized a series of GEQ derivatives with InhA inhibitory activities ranging from nanomolar to micromolar.[9] Compound $\mathbf{1}$ (Figure 1) was one of these derivatives and it exhibited an $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value in the low nanomolar range. These molecules have poor activity against M. tuberculosis, showing a MIC above $125 \mu \mathrm{M}$ because of their low permeability or the activation of efflux pumps.[9] Therefore, chemical modification of these inhibitors was performed in order to improve their low biological activity.

In the present work, we reported the synthesis and the evaluation of new GEQ analogues with an improved inhibitory activity against both InhA and M. tuberculosis growth. Furthermore, we showed that efflux pumps inhibitors potentiate their effectiveness against M. tuberculosis growth.



1
Figure 1. GEQ and its analogue 1 as inhibitors of InhA

## 2. Results and discussion

2.1. Design of the GEQ derivatives. During the development of GEQ analogues by Ortiz de Montellano et al., a significant improvement was performed by replacing the indole ring with a phenyl group (Figure 1).[9] The reported $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ toward InhA inhibition for benzoyl analogue $\mathbf{1}$ was lower than that of GEQ. Consequently compound $\mathbf{1}$ remained as our reference molecule all along this study.

To ensure similar hydrophobic interactions in the binding site of InhA, the global scaffold of the compound 1 was retained. The proposed modifications were performed in an attempt to improve both inhibition of InhA and the M. tuberculosis membrane permeability (Figure 2).


Figure 2. Structural modifications proposed from the compound 1

## Modification of the central core.

The piperazine central core was replaced with a piperidine in order to overcome the eventual protonation of the nitrogen atom (Figure 2). We are consequently expected to improve activity of the lead molecule concerning its inhibitory action toward mycobacterial growth. GEQ analogues bearing a succinimide central core have been recently reported by our group.[10] These analogues displayed good inhibitory activity against InhA protein and some of them displayed a significantly increased activity against M. tuberculosis growth, with a MIC of $5.4 \mu \mathrm{M}$ for the best compound. Similarly, the replacement of the piperazine ring with piperazinone was proposed in order to enhance the interactions with the InhA enzyme.
Modification of the amide group.
Key interaction has been described between the oxygen atom of the piperazine amide of GEQ and the hydroxyl group of the Tyr158 residue of InhA.[11] Consequently, in an attempt to strengthen this interaction, investigations were performed around the carbonyl group of the
lead molecule 1 through introduction of isosteric groups. Then, the carbonyl group of the amide moiety in compound $\mathbf{1}$ was replaced by various functional groups to gain insights into the specificity of the binding site. Then, sulfonyl-, sulfinyl-, phosphonyl- and phosphinamide were also introduced. In order to gain insights into settled hydrogen bond, urea and thiourea analogues were also prepared. Furthermore, thioamide compounds could be synthesized and evaluated. The length of the $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{S}$ bond coupled with the larger size of the sulfur atom might better be accommodated with the hydroxyl group of the tyrosine.[12]

## Modification of the aryl moiety.

Previously, succinimide GEQ analogues, bearing a long alkyl chain $\left(\mathrm{C}_{8}\right.$ and $\left.\mathrm{C}_{9}\right)$ instead of the indole moiety, were found to be efficient against InhA.[10] In a similar manner, derivatives with a piperazine central core and a fatty alkyl chain were synthesized with either an amide or an (thio)urea linker.

## Modification of the fluorene moiety.

GEQ molecule and the $\mathrm{C}_{16}$ fatty acyl substrate analogue displayed a similar binding mode within the active site of the InhA protein (PDB-1P44 [8] and PDB-1BVR [13]). Indeed, interactions with the key residue Tyr158 were maintained in both situations and hydrophobic contacts guide either the fluorene fragment or the long alkyl chain in the upper part of the cavity. Superposition of both molecules within the binding pocket highlights the possibility of substitution on the fluorene moiety (Figure 3). In a similar strategy, Tonge and coworkers have developed analogues of triclosan through introduction of an alkyl chain.[14] In fact, the 5 -hexyl substituted diphenyl ether analogue of triclosan exhibits a $10^{3}$-fold better activity. [15,16] Consequently, we focused our attention on the synthesis of 2- and 3-alkyl-substituted fluorene derivatives. The length of the chain and the nature of the linker were also investigated. Kuo and coworkers also evidenced, in a similar fashion, the high potency of GEQ derivative substituted with a benzyl amide group on the position 2 of the fluorene moiety.[8] Consequently, a benzyl ether group was also covalently attached to the fluorene in order to explore the whole cavity.


Figure 3. Superimposition of GEQ (blue) and substrate analogue (purple) molecules in the InhA binding site (PDB IDs respectively 1P44 [8] and 1BVR [13]). Colouring according the kd Hydrophobicity [17] scale for each amino acid from dodger blue to the most hydrophilic, to white, to orange red for the most hydrophobic.

### 2.2. Chemistry

The first strategy described in scheme 1 was based upon an $N$-acylation reaction onto the 1 ( 9 H -fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3. The key intermediate $\mathbf{3}$ was synthesized in a quantitative yield via the reaction of 9-bromofluorene $\mathbf{2}$ and piperazine as previously reported.[18] Both reference compounds GEQ and $\mathbf{1}$ were de novo synthesized to serve as a positive control for the subsequent in situ enzyme inhibition. The coupling between the indole carboxylic acid and the piperazine moiety was performed using peptide coupling agents $\mathrm{HOBt}, \mathrm{EDC} . \mathrm{HCl}$ and DIPEA as base to afford the GEQ molecule in a similar manner as previously reported.[9] To yield compound 1, the piperazine synthon $\mathbf{3}$ was coupled to benzoyl chloride reagent in the presence of TEA as a base, in a relatively good yield (72\%). Similarly, valeryl chloride and nonanoyl chloride were engaged in the same coupling reaction to introduce an alkyl chain and provide compounds $\mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{5}$. Compound $\mathbf{1}$ was subsequently involved in a thionation reaction with Lawesson's reagent as described by Coppola et al. to introduce the thioamide function in compound 6.[19] To gain insights into the specificity of the binding site, compounds $\mathbf{7 - 1 0}$ were prepared in a similar fashion with respectively benzenesulfinic chloride, benzene sulfonyl chloride, [20] phenylphosphinic dichloride and methylphenylphosphinic chloride. To get the phosphonamide 10, commercially available phenyl phosphonic dichloride, was coupled to compound $\mathbf{3}$ then, after overnight stirring at room temperature, methanol was
added to quench the reaction and to substitute the last chlorine atom with a methoxy group.[21] The benzenesulfinic chloride reagent was obtained after activation of the corresponding benzenesulfinic acid sodium salt with thionyl chloride.[22] Compounds 7, 9 and $\mathbf{1 0}$ were obtained as racemic mixture of $R$ - and $S$ - derivatives and were directly engaged in enzymatic assay to evaluate their inhibitory potency. The ureas 11, 13-15 and thiourea 12 were synthesized in a one-step reaction from compound $\mathbf{3}$ and the corresponding isocyanate [23] or isothiocyanate.[24]


Scheme 1. General synthetic procedure for replacement of the benzamide moiety. Reagents and reaction conditions: a. TEA, piperazine, THF, reflux 6 h ; b. RCOCl, TEA, DCM (for GEQ compound: RCOOH, HOBt, DIPEA, DMF); c. From compound 1, Lawesson's reagent, toluene; f. RNCX, $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}, 18 \mathrm{~h}$; d. PhXCl , TEA, DCM (for compound $\mathbf{8}, \mathrm{MeOH}$ was added in a second time); e. $\mathrm{RCNX}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}, 18 \mathrm{~h}$.

For substituted fluorene derivatives, the key fluorenone intermediates (17, 18, 20, 21, 23-25, 27) were synthesized according to various routes presented in Scheme 2. 2-Bromo-fluorenone was engaged in a Suzuki coupling reaction with 1-hexene and 1-octene after hydroboration of those last two reagents with 9-BBN to afford 2-alkyl-fluorenone intermediates $\mathbf{1 7}$ and $\mathbf{1 8}$ in yields similar to those previously described.[25] Intermediate 20 was obtained using a pallado-catalyzed reaction in the presence of cesium carbonate and $t$ BuXPhos, with propan-1ol as coupling partner.[26] The 3-methoxy-fluorenone 21 was prepared according to a previously reported method which involved a Suzuki coupling reaction between ethyl-2bromobenzoate and 3-methoxyphenylboronic acid followed by methanesulfonic-acid-
catalyzed ring closure.[27] The 3-methoxy intermediate was partially engaged in a methyl ether deprotective reaction using the couple $\mathrm{HBr} / \mathrm{HOAc}$ to give the corresponding 3-hydroxylfluorenone 22.[28] $O$-alkylation of the hydroxyl intermediate with benzyl, propyl and hexyl bromide permitted us to achieve the 3 -substituted fluorenones with an ether linker (23-25). In a second time, conversion of intermediate 22 to its triflate derivative 26 allowed the introduction of a hexyl chain in the position C2 after a Suzuki reaction, as previously described by Spencer et al.[25] These fluorenone intermediates were respectively engaged in a two-steps reaction implying a ketone reduction using sodium borohydride followed by a specific conversion of the alcohols to the alkyl bromides using phosphorus tribromide. The intermediates were obtained in good to excellent yields without purification. Commercially available 1-benzoylpiperazine was finally coupled to the different 9-bromofluorenes to afford the final products 28-35.


Scheme 2. Synthesis of fluorene substituted derivatives. Reagents and reaction conditions: f. (1) 1-Hexene or 1octene, $9-\mathrm{BBN}, \mathrm{THF}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2 \mathrm{~h}$ then RT, 3 h ; (2) $\mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}, \mathrm{AsPh}_{3}, \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{dppf}) \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{THF}, \mathrm{DMF}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 85^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 18 \mathrm{~h}$; g. $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}, t \mathrm{BuXPhos}, \mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$, propan-1-ol, toluene, $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 18 \mathrm{~h}$; h. $\mathrm{HBr} \mathrm{HOAc}, 6 \mathrm{~h}$, reflux; i. $\mathrm{RBr}, \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$, DMF; j. Tf $2 \mathrm{O}, 2.6$-di-tert-butyl-4-methylpyridine, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2},-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}, 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1.5 \mathrm{~h}$; k. (1) 1-Hexene, 9-BBN,

THF, $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2 \mathrm{~h}, \mathrm{RT}, 3 \mathrm{~h}(2) \mathrm{K}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}, \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{dppf}) \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$, THF, 16 h , reflux; 1. MeOH, $\mathrm{NaBH}_{4}, 0.5 \mathrm{~h}, \mathrm{RT}$; m. DCM, $\mathrm{PBr}_{3}$, $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 2 \mathrm{~h}$; n. 1-benzoylpiperazine, $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$, DMF.

The synthesis of the derivatives $\mathbf{3 9}$ and $\mathbf{4 0}$ bearing a piperidine as a central core is described in Scheme 3. Firstly, the decarbonylation reaction of the $O$-alkylated fluorenone 25 in the presence of hydrazine led to the fluorene intermediate 36.[29] Then, this compound and commercially available fluorene 37 were engaged in a deprotonation reaction with $n \mathrm{BuLi}$ and were coupled with $N$-benzoyl-4-bromopiperidine. The piperazinone core was also introduced to replace the piperazine central ring by using the previously synthesized $N$-Boc protected intermediate 41. Boc deprotection with TFA, followed directly by a coupling reaction with 9bromofluorene in the presence of triethylamine afforded the target compound 42. [30]


Scheme 3. Replacement of the piperazine central core by piperidine and piperazinone. Reagents and reaction conditions: o.(1) $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{NNH}_{2}$, diethylene glycol, 10 min ; (2) KOH , reflux, 4 h ; p. $n \mathrm{BuLi}$, THF, $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{RT}$; q. (1) TFA, DCM, $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to RT, 18 h ; (2) 9-bromo-fluorene, TEA, DCM, 18 h , RT.

### 2.3. Inhibitory InhA activities

The new compounds were tested for their capacity to inhibit the reduction of the substrate double bond by NADH in the presence of InhA. The assays were performed in triplicate in the presence of the substrate analogue 2-trans-dodecenoyl-CoA and the percentage of InhA inhibition was determined by measuring the conversion of the NADH cofactor to its oxidized form $\mathrm{NAD}^{+}$by means of the decreasing of the absorbance at 340 nm . The molecules were
firstly tested at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ and $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ for some of them due to solubility problem. For the more potent compounds, $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ were determined using the 4-parameter curve-fitting software XLFit (IDBS) with at least six points. The results are reported in Tables $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2}$.
As references, GEQ compound and its phenyl analogue 1 were firstly tested on InhA protein to confirm their activity and for comparison (Table 1). Both compounds showed a complete InhA inhibition at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ and $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ in the nanomolar range, as expected [9,11]. Compound $\mathbf{1}$ demonstrated the most potent inhibitory activity by comparison with GEQ.

Investigations around the piperazine amide bond revealed an impressive decrease of activity for these derivatives. Indeed, replacing the oxygen atom with sulfur completely dropped the activity of the molecule (compound 6, Table 1). Additionally, no InhA inhibitory activities were observed for sulfinamide 7, sulfonamide 8, phosphinamide 9 and phosphonamide 10 derivatives. These results demonstrate that the amide bond is critically required for good inhibitory activity by its interaction with the hydroxyl group of Tyr158. Nonetheless, the derivative 11 containing a urea functional group instead of the amide bond showed a relatively good InhA inhibitory activity with about $84 \%$ inhibition at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ and $\mathrm{IC}_{50}=1.18$ $\mu \mathrm{M}$. An additional nitro substituent in the phenyl group at the para position totally abolished the activity (compound 15, Table 1). This result highlighted either the possibility of steric hindrance or the necessity of an electron-rich aromatic ring to maintain interaction with the pyrophosphate moiety of the NADH molecule. Moreover, compound $\mathbf{1 2}$ bearing a thiourea linker, demonstrated a relatively good activity at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ with $57 \%$ inhibition but still far from the reference compound $\mathbf{1}$.
Alkyl chains were also introduced to replace the phenyl ring maintaining either the amide or the urea as a linker to the piperazine ring. Firstly, we could observe a decrease in activity correlated with a longer chain length (compounds $\mathbf{1 3}, \mathbf{1 4}$ and 4, 5; Table 1). The poor activity noticed for long alkyl chain derivatives is in accordance with Tonge and coworkers binding site description.[6] They described this region of the binding site as size-limited and surrounded by both polar and non polar groups. Indeed, both compounds 13 and $\mathbf{4}$ exhibited about $70 \%$ of activity at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (Table 1) toward InhA protein.
Efforts were also furnished to replace the piperazine ring by either piperidine (compound 39, Table 1) or piperazinone (compound 42, Table 1). The additional keto bond in compound 42 abolished the inhibitory activity and comforted the suggested steric clash in the case of carbon substitution of the piperazine ring.[8] Removal of the nitrogen atom in the piperazine ring into compound 39 led to a potent InhA inhibitor with similar potency at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ than the reference
compound $1 . \mathrm{IC}_{50}$ was determined and revealed a sub-micromolar activity for the piperidine derivative.

Table 1. Inhibitory potencies of compounds 1, 3-5, 6-15, 39, 42 against Inh $A$


| Compound | W | X | Y | Z | InhA inhibition $(\%)$ |  | $\mathrm{IC}_{50}(\mu \mathrm{M})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{G E Q}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CO | Indole | 87 | 81 | $0.86 \pm 0.16$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CO | Ph | 94 | 94 | $0.49 \pm 0.06$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | H | - | 7 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CO | $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{9}$ | 75 | 45 | - |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CO | $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{17}$ | 47 | 22 | - |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CS | Ph | 31 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | SO | Ph | 14 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ | Ph | 12 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{PO}\left(\mathrm{OCH}_{3}\right)$ | Ph | 17 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{PO}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$ | Ph | 17 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CONH | Ph | 84 | 79 | $1.18 \pm 0.15$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CSNH | Ph | 57 | 32 | - |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CONH | $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{9}$ | 68 | 42 | - |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CONH | $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{17}$ | 34 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | N | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CONH | $p \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}$ | 33 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{3 9}$ | CH | $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ | CO | Ph | 93 | 88 | $0.94 \pm 0.11$ |
| $\mathbf{4 2}$ | N | $\mathrm{CO}^{2}$ | CO | Ph | 26 | - | - |

Substitutions on the fluorene have already been performed and revealed that, generally, halogen and nitro substituents and even some bulky groups were well tolerated concerning the InhA inhibitory activity.[8] We subsequently investigated compounds bearing fluorene substituted with alkyl chains on either C-2- or C-3 position to mimic the substrate and we introduced for some of them, an ether linker. The biological activities against the InhA protein are reported in Table 2.

Hexyl and octyl chains were subsequently attached on the C-2 position of fluorene and the corresponding derivatives revealed around $50 \%$ inhibition at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$. However, no enhancement was observed compared to the reference compound (compounds 28 and 29, Table 2). A shorter chain seems to be privileged in this position. Lately, compound 27 holding a similar 6-carbons length alkyl chain on the $\mathrm{C}-3$ position of the fluorene revealed a real gain of activity compared to compounds $\mathbf{2 8}$ and $\mathbf{3 0}$ at the C-2 position. Ether-linked derivatives have been particularly studied. First results on the C-3 position of the fluorene revealed a significant improvement of the activity with the increasing length of the alkyl chain (compounds 31-33, Table 2). The rank order of InhA inhibitory potency was $\mathbf{3 1}\left(\mathrm{OC}_{1}\right)$ < $\mathbf{3 2}$
$\left(\mathrm{OC}_{3}\right)<\mathbf{3 3}\left(\mathrm{OC}_{6}\right)$. The hexyloxy derivative $\mathbf{3 3}$ exhibited an $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ of $0.20 \mu \mathrm{M}$, about 2.5 times lower than reference compound $\mathbf{1}$. The additional alkyl chain partly mimicking the substrate would enhance the activity of the molecule and would probably ensure constructive hydrophobic interactions within the active site. The C3-alkyl chain substitution attached via an ether linkage was also investigated at position 2 of the fluorene. No significant difference was observed concerning the substituted position for ether-linked derivatives with such a carbon length (compounds 32 and $\mathbf{3 4}$, Table 2). With respectively $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ of 1.00 and $1.20 \mu \mathrm{M}$, compounds substituted in positions C-2- and C-3- appear equivalent as inhibitors.

In order to explore the whole cavity and to strengthen hydrophobic interactions with the substrate binding loop, a benzyl substituent was covalently attached through an ether linker to the C-3 position of the fluorene. Enzymatic assays also revealed good activity with an $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ estimated at $1.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (compound 35 Table 2).

Then compound $\mathbf{4 0}$ bearing both a piperidine central core and a 3-hexyloxy substituent, was tested. Compared to the unsubstituted derivative 39, no difference of activity was observed (compounds 39 Table 1 and 40 Table 2). Both compounds exhibited $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ in the micromolar range. Nevertheless, it is important to note that compound $\mathbf{4 0}$ is in a racemic mixture due to the asymmetric C-9 on the fluorene moiety. We can subsequently envision that only one of the two enantiomers is biologically active.

Table 2. Inhibitory potencies of compounds 28-35, 40 against InhA

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

### 2.4. Enantiomeric separation by chiral supercritical fluid chromatography

Each substituted fluorene derivatives present an asymmetric carbon at the 9-position of the fluorene. Consequently, two compounds bearing two different alkyl chains, namely $\mathbf{3 1}$ and the more potent 33 were engaged into enantiomeric separation to analyze the contribution of both enantiomers according to their activity against the InhA protein. Chiral chromatography was performed on a Supercritical Fluid Chromatography (SFC) equipment (Prep80Q from Waters) with the AD-H column (from Chiral Technologies) and methanol as co-solvent. Compounds 33a $(\mathrm{rt}=10.4 \mathrm{~min}) / \mathbf{3 3 b}(\mathrm{rt}=16.4 \mathrm{~min})$ and 31a $(\mathrm{rt}=10.5 \mathrm{~min}) / \mathbf{3 1 b}(\mathrm{rt}=12.6 \mathrm{~min})$ were obtained with an excellent enantiopurity (> $98.5 \%$ ). However, none of the isolates were able to crystallize, so the absolute configuration of the chiral carbon was not determined.

### 2.5. Biological activities for enantiopure compounds against the InhA protein

First enzymatic assays were performed for compounds 31a/31b and 33a/33b respectively at 5 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ and 250 nM to evaluate their inhibitory activity against $\operatorname{InhA}$ protein. $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ was measured for the most potent molecules (Table 3). For the methoxy derivative 31, the racemic mixture exhibits $60 \%$ inhibitory activity at $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$. While the first isolated enantiomer ( $\mathrm{rt}=10.5 \mathrm{~min}$ ) did not inhibit InhA activity (compound 31a Table 3), the second one ( $\mathrm{rt}=12.6 \mathrm{~min}$, compound 31b, Table 3) was much more potent $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{50}\right.$ estimated at $2.07 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) and was responsible for the overall activity.

The most interesting result was observed for the hexyloxy derivative. Indeed, the first enantiomer 33a was not successfully efficient on InhA inhibitory activity whereas the other one 33b inhibited at $71 \%$. Consequently, $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ of 102 nM was measured for compound 33b, which displays the best inhibitory activity for this series of molecules.

Table $\mathbf{3}$ inhibitory activities of compounds 31a, 31b, 33a and 33b after enantiomeric separation

| Compound | X | Y | Z | Ligand concentration | InhA Inhibition (\%) | $\mathrm{IC}_{50}(\mu \mathrm{M})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GEQ | - | - | - | - | - | $0.86 \pm 0.16$ |
| 1 | H | H | N | - | - | $0.49 \pm 0.06$ |
| 31 | $\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ | H | N | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | 60 | $2.69 \pm 0.20$ |
| 31a | $\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ | H | N | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | 11 | - |
| 31b | $\mathrm{OCH}_{3}$ | H | N | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | 68 | $2.07 \pm 0.29$ |
| 33 | $\mathrm{OC}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{13}$ | H | N | 250 nM | 53 | $0.20 \pm 0.04$ |
| 33a | $\mathrm{OC}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{13}$ | H | N | 250 nM | 0 | - |
| 33b | $\mathrm{OC}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{13}$ | H | N | 250 nM | 71 | $0.102 \pm 0.004$ |

### 2.6. Computational study

Molecular docking was performed in an attempt to determine the interaction network between the newly synthesized compounds and the receptor, the InhA protein. To model the binding mode of these compounds, we performed a docking study with the InhA protein that was crystallized with GEQ ligand (PDB ID: 1P44, chain a) using Molegro Virtual Docker (MVD). For compounds ( $\mathbf{7}, \mathbf{1 0}, \mathbf{2 8}, \mathbf{2 9}, \mathbf{3 0}, \mathbf{3 1}, \mathbf{3 2}, \mathbf{3 3}, \mathbf{3 4}, \mathbf{3 5}, \mathbf{3 9}, 40$ ) bearing an asymmetric carbon atom, each enantiomer was docked individually. The final (filtered) results were expressed as ligand efficiency (LE) indices [31] rather than RAW docking scores. The docking and filtering procedures gives at least two LE descriptor values per compound: two values for the same molecule (if not asymmetric) or one value per enantiomer. These results are given in the Table S1 of supplementary materials. In order to compare experimental results and theoretical LE values, the InhA inhibition percent at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (PI50) was used, PI50 values being available for each compound.

In the case of InhA, the protein is characterized by $i$ ) a wide and flexible binding site; $i i$ ) some structural transitions giving opening/closing of a minor and major portal; iii) a cofactor ( $\mathrm{NAD}^{+} / \mathrm{NADH}$ ) to be taken into account in calculations. These elements (not exhaustive) reduce the production of correlations between descriptors issued directly (not using a QSAR approach) from docking studies vs. experimental data, even for derivatives that keep an essential feature (i.e. fluorene group) of a single compound.

According to this context, only a coarse-grained approach seems to be relevant for the analysis of this GEQ-focused ligand collection. The PI50 results were classified in 3 groups: group1 for compounds giving upper than $75 \%$ of inhibitory activity; group 3 for compounds that exhibits PI50 values lesser than $30 \%$ and group 2 for intermediate compounds and the docking results were analyzed using this classification. Then, these tree classes were confronted to LE descriptors, and we found that groupl was clearly related to best scores and group3 to worst scores (Figure S1 of supplementary materials). This result is limited but interesting because it gives insights to improve post-docking filter results. Especially since we found that the calculated values of $\operatorname{LogP}$ (octanol/water) for each compound do not seem to be correlated with LE descriptors.

Then, analysis of selected poses after docking study allowed us to understand the biological activities of our compounds regarding their structure.
Sulfinamide derivative 7 showed poor inhibitory activity against InhA (PI50 = 14\%) and docking study revealed, for compound with $S$ configuration, a disfavored orientation (figure

4A) as well as its enantiomer $R$. To maintain the hydrogen bond with the Tyr158 residue, the sulfinamide tetrahedral linker forced the piperazine ring to shift $1.1 \AA$ which induced the fluorene group to rotate $110^{\circ}$ and to clash with Met199 residue. For thioamide derivative 6, the overall binding mode is quite similar to the reference molecule $\mathbf{1}$, even if its enzymatic activity at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ was evaluated at $31 \%$. Indeed, for thioamide $\mathbf{6}$, the C-S bond is longer and the sulfur atom bigger than the corresponding carbonyl in GEQ which induced steric hindrance with the Tyr158 side chain (Figure 4B).

Compounds bearing an alkyl chain on the fluorene moiety (28, 29 and 30) demonstrated a modest activity on the InhA protein up to $\mathrm{IC}_{50}(\mathrm{InhA})$ value of $1.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$. Their corresponding $R$ enantiomers displayed a consistent orientation within the InhA binding site wherein the additional alkyl chain is oriented onto the major portal mimicking, as predicted, the substrate analogue. Interestingly, in the case of compound 32, bearing a 3-propoxy substituent on the fluorene moiety, both enantiomers disclose a consistent orientation. Indeed, similar to the latter compounds, the $R$ enantiomer orientated the alkyl chain within the hydrophobic substrate cavity surrounding with Met103, Ile202 and Leu207 residue (Figure 4C). On the other hand, the $S$ enantiomer oriented the alkyl chain upon the minor portal with close interaction with hydrophobic residues Met155, Leu 218 and Trp222 (Figure 4D).
For benzyloxy derivative 35, the best docking pose allows us to envisage the possibility of binding only for compound with configuration $R$ (Figure 4E) with the benzyl moiety sandwiched between Met103 and Ile202 residues. Nonetheless, the binding site of limited size seems to disfavor such interaction which leads consequently to an increase of docking score values and correlates with the lower activity compared to the reference molecule $\mathbf{1 .}$

Concerning the best molecule 33, only the $R$-enantiomer compound displayed a consistent orientation within the InhA binding site wherein the additional alkyl chain is oriented onto the major portal (Figure 4F). This result supports the biological activity found for only enantiomer 33b. Even though the geometry of the enantiopure compound 33b was not determined, we can suggest, with caution, that $\mathrm{C}-9$ carbon atom is of $R$ configuration.




F. 33R

Figure 4. Selected docking conformations of compounds 7 (A.), 6 (B.), 32 (C. with $R$ configuration and D. with $S$ configuration), $\mathbf{3 5}$ (E. $R$-enantiomer) and 33 (F. $R$-enantiomer). The best pose for each compound (green) was depicted in the InhA binding site, as well NADH cofactor molecule (black), GEQ (grey) for comparison and flexible residues as defined in the experimental part.

### 2.7. Inhibition of Mycobacterium tuberculosis (H37Rv) growth

The activities of the synthesized compounds were evaluated by measuring the inhibition of $M$. tuberculosis (H37Rv) growth. Isoniazid and GEQ molecules were used as control. Results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4 : MIC determination for M. tuberculosis H37Rv strain

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compound | MIC $(\mu \mathrm{M})$ | Compound | MIC $(\mu \mathrm{M})$ |
| GEQ | 50.1 | INH | 0.4 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 14.1 | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | $>21.4$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $>39.9$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | 22.8 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 29.9 | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | 26.0 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 12.8 | $\mathbf{3 1 a}$ | $>26.0$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 13.5 | $\mathbf{3 1 b}$ | $>26.0$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | $>26.7$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | 24.2 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | $>25.6$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | 22.0 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | $>24.7$ | $\mathbf{3 3 a}$ | $>22.0$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $>25.7$ | $\mathbf{3 3 b}$ | 11.0 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $>27.1$ | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | $>24.2$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $>25.9$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $>21.7$ |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 14.3 | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | 28.3 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $>24.7$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | 88.2 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 12.1 | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | $>27.1$ |
| $\mathbf{2 8}$ | 22.8 |  |  |

GEQ molecule did not display any substantial inhibitory activity against M. tuberculosis growth (MIC $>40 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ). Consistent with this, GEQ molecule has been evaluated against $M$. tuberculosis growth through CFU counting method and using the Alamar Blue Assay, giving an MIC value above $125 \mu$ M.[8] Furthermore, we measured a MIC value of $14.1 \mu \mathrm{M}$ for the benzoyl derivative 1, while He et al. reported an MIC above $125 \mu \mathrm{M} .[9]$

The majority of the compounds displayed better activities than GEQ. The first family of compounds related to central core modifications revealed poor MIC values for piperidine derivative 39 and piperazinone derivative $\mathbf{4 2}$ as well (MIC values: 39, $28.3 \mu \mathrm{M}$; 42, > 27.1 $\mu \mathrm{M})$.

As shown in Table 4, investigation around the amide bond showed modest antimycobacterial activity. The thioamide analogue $\mathbf{6}$ displayed MIC in a similar range $(13.5 \mu \mathrm{M})$ as compound 1. The sulfin-, sulfon-, phosphin- and phosphonamide derivatives (compounds 7-10) presented MICs values above $25.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$. The urea and thiourea derivatives $\mathbf{1 1}$ and $\mathbf{1 2}$ did not demonstrate better activities against M. tuberculosis growth. Interestingly, compound 15 bearing an additional nitro group on the phenyl ring exhibited MIC value in a similar range as compound $\mathbf{1}(\mathrm{MIC}=12.1 \mu \mathrm{M})$.

All the derivatives possessing an alkyl chain instead of the benzoyl moiety showed MIC values ranged from 12.8 to above $24.9 \mu \mathrm{M}$; among them, compound $\mathbf{5}$ was the most active ( $\mathrm{MIC}=12.8 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ).
The class of racemic compounds bearing an alkyl chain on the fluorene moiety (28-35) displayed weak in vitro activities against M. tuberculosis with MIC values superior to $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$. In addition, the racemic mixture 33 exhibited MIC value of $22.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$. Interestingly, the corresponding enantiopure compound 33b, showing the best inhibition of InhA enzymatic activity and the lowest MIC $(11.0 \mu \mathrm{M})$. Interestingly, the other enantiomer showed a MIC superior to $22.0 \mu \mathrm{M}$. These results eventually suggest a binding specificity of this enantiomer as observed with InhA binding assays.

### 2.8. Biological activity in the presence of efflux pump inhibitors

In some bacteria, such as in M. tuberculosis, efflux pumps have been described as a possible mechanism for intrinsic and acquired drug resistance.[32] While He et al. suggested the possibility that GEQ compounds are actively extruded out of the bacterial cell by efflux, no studies have been performed to confirm this resistance mechanism.[9] In order to elucidate the role of the efflux pumps in the poor effectiveness of the GEQ compound and its derivatives $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3 3 b}$ and $\mathbf{4 0}$, their activity was determined in the presence of already known efflux inhibitors (reserpine, verapamil or carbonyl cyanide $m$-chlorophenylhydrazone (CCCP)). Reserpine is a calcium channel blocker and plant alkaloid that inhibits P glycoprotein in eukaryotic cells.[33] Moreover, reserpine reduced resistance to isoniazid in some M. tuberculosis strains.[34] Verapamil is a calcium channel blocker that inhibits Pglycoprotein and also several bacterial ABC efflux pumps. CCCP is uncoupler of the proton motive force that inhibits the efflux of several drugs[35], but it is described as a substrate of some efflux pumps.[36] The efflux pump inhibitors, at the used concentration, did not inhibit M. tuberculosis growth. Results are reported in Table 5.

Table 5 : MIC determination for some compounds against M. tuberculosis H37Rv in the presence of efflux pump inhibitors

| Compounds | Efflux pump inhibitors ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\emptyset$ | Reserpine | Verapamil | CCCP |
|  | MIC ( $\mu \mathrm{M}$ ) |  |  |  |
| GEQ | 50.1 | 25.4 | < 12.7 | < 12.7 |
| 1 | 14.1 | 56.5 | 56.5 | $<3.5$ |
| 33b | 11.0 | <2.7 | 11.0 | < 2.7 |


| 40 | 88.2 | 22.1 | 44.1 | nd |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^0]The activity of GEQ compound increased more than four-fold in combination with verapamil and CCCP, underlying the possibility that some transporter could extrude it out of the cells, in agreement with its poor activity.
CCCP increased the effectiveness of the $N$-benzoyl derivative 1 more than five-fold. Reserpine and verapamil decreased the sensitivity to this compound at the used concentration; it could be hypothesized that these combination influenced either the permeability of the compound or its binding with the target.

The efflux inhibitor verapamil did not have effect with our best derivative 33b, whilst in combination with the other two efflux inhibitors its activity was increased more than fourfold. Interestingly, the same behaviour was observed with MmpL7 transporter that pumps out of the cell, isoniazid. [37] It could be hypothesized that the same transporter effluxes compound 33b because both molecules have the same target. In the case of compound $\mathbf{4 0}$ with a piperidine moiety, MICs improved four-fold in the presence of reserpine and two-fold with verapamil.
These results confirmed the possibility that GEQ and its derivatives could be effluxed out of the mycobacterial cell by some efflux pump. The chemical diversity on the fluorene moiety should be enlarged in order to obtain compounds bearing different substitutions to either improve uptake by mycobacteria or to avoid efflux pumps.

## 3. Conclusion

This work describes the synthesis and the evaluation of twenty five GEQ analogues. All these compounds were evaluated for the inhibition of InhA enzymatic activity and against Mycobacterium tuberculosis growth. Thus, we observed that the $N$-benzoyl-piperazine central core is of key importance to ensure good inhibition of InhA enzymatic activity. The majority of the compounds displayed higher activities than GEQ against M. tuberculosis growth.

Among them, compound 33b bearing an additional hexyloxy chain on the fluorene moiety displayed improved activity against both InhA enzyme ( $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ up to 102 nM ) and $M$. tuberculosis growth ( $\mathrm{MIC}=11 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ). In addition, its activity improved in combination of
some efflux inhibitors. These results suggest that the poor biological activity against $M$. tuberculosis of GEQ and its derivatives could depend on the efflux of these molecules by some mycobacterial transporters.
Further work will focus on optimization of drug uptake with the aim of producing a candidate series for the treatment of tuberculosis. Moreover, the research for more effective efflux inhibitors that could be used in combination with conventional antibiotics could be another challenge to pursue.

## 4. Experimental section

### 4.1. General condition

All chemicals were obtained from Aldrich-Sigma or Acros Organics and used without further purification. Anhydrous solvents were freshly distilled before use or were obtained from the M.Braun Solvent Purification System (MB-SPS-800). Optical rotations were measured using a sodium D line on a P-2000 series Jasco, PTC-262 polarimeter. The melting points were determined on a Mettler Toledo MP50 melting point system and are uncorrected. Infra-red spectra were recorded on a Perkin Elmer Spectrum 100 FT-IR Spectrometer. ${ }^{1}$ H NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker spectrometer at 300 MHz using $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, DMSO-d6 or $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ as the solvent. For ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR the residual proton signal of the deuterated solvent was used as an internal reference: $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3} \delta=7.29 \mathrm{ppm}$, DMSO $\delta=2.50 \mathrm{ppm}$ and $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD} \delta=3.31 \mathrm{ppm} .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker spectrometer at 75 MHz . Mass spectra ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}$ ) were obtained on a DSQ Thermo Fisher Scientific. For the MS-ESI a Dionex ultimate 3000 UPLC system with a ABSciex Q TRAP 4500 was used. High-resolution mass spectra (HRMS) were recorded on a UPLC Xevo G2 Q-TOF Waters using electrospray ionization methods. The desired product was purified by flash column chromatography with puriFlash 430 system using puriFlash ${ }^{\circledR}$ columns from Interchim. The purity of title compounds was evaluated by reverse phase LC-MS on a UPLC Acquity system (from Waters) equipped with a photodiode array detector and a simple quadripole detector. The Acquity CSH C18 $1.7 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ $(2.1 \mathrm{~mm} \times 50 \mathrm{~mm})$ column was used as a stationary phase. MilliQ water (with $0.02 \%$ HCOOH ) and acetonitrile (with $0.02 \% \mathrm{HCOOH}$ ) were respectively employed as solvents A and B with a flow rate of $0.6 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$. Purity was estimated at $\lambda=212 \mathrm{~nm}$ and two elution methods were followed and will be mentioned in each case. For the method 1, gradient was 5 min run from $2 \%$ to $98 \%$ B and then returned to initial conditions. For method 2, the gradient was $10 \% \mathrm{~B}$ during 1 min and the percentage of B went from 10 to 30 for 1 to 10 min , and the
percentage of B reached $100 \% 10$ to 12 minutes and then returned to initial conditions. The enzymatic evaluation was performed on a Cary Bio 100.

### 4.2. Chemistry

4.2.1. $\quad$-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)piperazine (3). A solution of 9-bromofluorene $2(8.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~g}, 1.0$ eq), triethylamine ( 1.2 $\mathrm{mmol}, 165 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 0.15 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and piperazine ( $61.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 5.27 \mathrm{~g}, 7 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in dry THF ( 50.0 mL ) was refluxed under argon for 6 hours. The reaction mixture was then filtered off and the filtrate was concentrated under vacuum pressure. The resulting crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic $95 / 5$ dichloromethane/methanol) to afford a white powder ( $2.04 \mathrm{~g}, 100 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.12$ (dichloromethane/methanol 97/3); mp: $133.6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 738, 805, 1007, 1138, 1325, 1448, 2831, 2940, 3294. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.46(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.66(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.86(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.32(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.40(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.83(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (75 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta$ (ppm): $46.7\left(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 50.4\left(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 70.2(\mathrm{CH}), 120.4(2 \times \mathrm{CH}), 126.3(2 \times \mathrm{CH}), 127.5(2 \times \mathrm{CH}), 128.5(2 \times \mathrm{CH}), 140.9(2$ x C), $144.4(2 \times \mathrm{C})$. MS (ESI) m/z: $251.3\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS (ESI): for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 251.1551; found: 251.1548.
4.2.2. (4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)(1H-indol-5-yl)methanone (GEQ). In a round bottom flask submerged in a bath of ice were added indole-5-carboxylic acid ( $0.80 \mathrm{mmol}, 129 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ), $N$-(3-dimethylaminopropyl)- $N^{\prime}$-ethylcarbodiimide hydrochloride, EDC. $\mathrm{HCl},(0.88 \mathrm{mmol}, 168 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq})$ and 1-hydroxybenzotriazole, $\mathrm{HOBt},(0.88 \mathrm{mmol}, 119 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq})$ in DMF ( 5.0 mL ). 1-( $9 H$-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine ( $0.80 \mathrm{mmol}, 200 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and DIPEA ( $2.00 \mathrm{mmol}, 330 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) were subjoined to the reaction mixture and were stirred overnight at room temperature. HCl 1 N was added and the aqueous phase was neutralized with KOH 2 M and the product was extracted with ethyl acetate $(3 \times)$. The organic phase was dried over magnesium sulphate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum pressure. The resulting crude product was purified by flash chromatography (gradient $80 / 20$ to $20 / 80$ petroleum ether/ethyl acetate) to afford a colorless solid ( $154 \mathrm{mg}, 49 \%$ ). HPLC: method 1 , $\mathrm{rt}=2.45 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $95 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.30-3.05(\mathrm{bs}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.35-3.45(\mathrm{bs}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.92$ $(\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.51(\mathrm{t}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.16(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.20(\mathrm{t}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2$ $\mathrm{H}) ; 7.42(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.64-7.70(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 9.13(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (75 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ (ppm): 49.2 (broad, 4 X CH$_{2}$ ); $69.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 102.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 111.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.9(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 120.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 121.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.7(\mathrm{CH})$; $126.0(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 126.6(\mathrm{C}) ; 127.2(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 136.5(\mathrm{C}) ; 141.1(\mathrm{C}) ; 143.3(\mathrm{C}) ; 172.2(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}:$ $394.19\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 394.1919; found: 394.1912.

### 4.2.3. General procedure for $\mathbf{1}, 4,5,8,9$ and 10.

1-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3 ( 1.0 eq ) was dissolved in dry dichloromethane. Triethylamine ( 1.2 eq ) was added and the reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 10 minutes. Benzoyl chloride ( 1.1 eq ) was slowly added to reaction mixture previously cooled with an ice bath. After complete addition the reaction mixture was stirred overnight at room temperature. A saturated aqueous solution of sodium hydrogenocarbonate was added and the product was extracted with dichloromethane $(3 \times)$. The organic phase was washed with a large amount of water, dried over magnesium sulphate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum pressure. The resulting crude product was purified by flash chromatography as indicated in each case to afford the desired compound.
4.2.3.1. (4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)(phenyl)methanone (1). Reagents: 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3 (0.40 $\mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg})$, triethylamine $(0.48 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and benzoyl chloride $(0.44 \mathrm{mmol}, 51 \mu \mathrm{~L})$. The crude product was purified
by flash chromatography (isocratic $50 / 50$ petroleum ether/ethyl acetate) to afford a white solid ( $102 \mathrm{mg}, 72 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.82$ (dichloromethane/methanol 97/3); mp: $186{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 709,741,1005,1275,1426,1636,2826,2880,2906$. HPLC: method 1 , rt $=2.72 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $99 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , DMSO-d6) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.55(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.59(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.00(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; $7.31-7.48(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.84(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , DMSO-d6) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 48.6(2 \mathrm{x}$ $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), $49.4\left(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$, $69.6(\mathrm{CH}), 120.5(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 126.3(2 \mathrm{xCH}) ; 127.4(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.7(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.7(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.8(2$ x CH); $129.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 136.3(\mathrm{C}) ; 140.9(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 143.8(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 169.4(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}(\mathrm{ESI}) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 355.2\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right] .377 .2[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]$. HRMS (ESI): for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 355.1812; found: 355.1810.
4.2.3.2. 1-(4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)pentan-1-one (4). Reagents: 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3 ( 0.40 mmol , 100 mg ), triethylamine ( $0.48 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and valeryl chloride $(0.48 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \mu \mathrm{~L})$. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic $80 / 20$ petroleum ether/ethyl acetate) to afford a white solid ( $112 \mathrm{mg}, 84 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.32$ (dichloromethane/methanol 95/5); mp: $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 672,741,999,1137,1196,1203,1219,1447,1637,2817,2868$, 2927. HPLC: method 2, $\mathrm{rt}=2.10 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $96 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.93(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.33$ (sex, $J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.60(q u i n, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.28(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.49(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.78(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.41(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.66(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.90(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.32(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz} \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.41(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 13.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ;$ $27.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 33.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 42.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 46.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(2 \mathrm{xCH}) ; 125.9(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.2$ $(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.3(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 141.1(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 143.5(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 171.7(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI}^{2} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 363.24\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}{ }^{+}\right], 335.21\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$, 165.07 [M-169]. HRMS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 335.2123; found: 335.2115.
4.2.3.3. 1-(4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)nonan-1-one (5). Reagents: 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine $\mathbf{3}$ ( $0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 100$ $\mathrm{mg})$, triethylamine ( $0.48 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and nonanoyl chloride ( $0.48 \mathrm{mmol}, 86 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic $80 / 20$ petroleum ether/ethyl acetate) to afford a white solid ( $114 \mathrm{mg}, 73 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.62$ (dichloromethane/methanol 95/5); mp: $88^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 673,740,1001,1137,1196,1228,1320,1448,1639,2818,2851$, 2919. HPLC: method 2 , $\mathrm{rt}=5.04 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $95 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.90(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.20-$ $1.42(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.35-1.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.28(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.49(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.77(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.41(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.66(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.90(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.32(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.41(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 25.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.2$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 33.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 70.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 125.9(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.3(2$ $\mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 141.1(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 143.5(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 171.7(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 419.31\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}^{+}\right], 391.27\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right], 165.07$ [M-225]. HRMS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 391.2749; found: 391.2751.
4.2.3.4. 1-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)-4-(phenylsulfonyl)piperazine (8). Reagents: 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3 ( $0.32 \mathrm{mmol}, 80$ mg ), triethylamine ( $0.38 \mathrm{mmol}, 52 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and benzene sulfonyl chloride ( $0.38 \mathrm{mmol}, 49 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic $85 / 15$ petroleum ether/ethyl acetate) to afford a white solid ( $115 \mathrm{mg}, 92 \%$ ), TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.39$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); mp: $161^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 575,646,669,690,736,939,1001,1113,1128,1171,1292$, 1320, 1348, 1447, 2836, 2887, 2942. HPLC: method $1, \mathrm{rt}=3.66 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $98 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm})$ : 2.68-2.78 (m, 4 H ); 2.99-3.10 (m, 4 H ); $4.82(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.28(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.40(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.51-7.70$ $(\mathrm{m}, 5 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.75-7.81(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 46.8\left(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.1\left(2 \times \mathrm{XH}_{2}\right)$; $69.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.9(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 125.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.2(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 129.1(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 132.8(\mathrm{CH})$; $136.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 141.0(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 143.2(2 \times \mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 391.15\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right], 249.14\left[\mathrm{M}-141\left(\mathrm{PhSO}_{2}\right)\right], 165.07$ [M-225 (fluorene)]. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right.$ ): $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~S}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 391.1480; found: 391.1491.
4.2.3.5. (4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)(phenyl)phosphinate (10). Reagents: 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3 ( 0.80 $\mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg})$, triethylamine $(0.80 \mathrm{mmol}, 188 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ and phenylphosphinic dichloride ( $0.96 \mathrm{mmol}, 132 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). Tetrazole ( 0.04 $\mathrm{mmol}, 3 \mathrm{mg}$ ) was also put in the reaction mixture and methanol ( 1.0 mL ) was added after overnight stirring to quench the
reaction and formed the desired product. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic $95 / 5$ petroleum ether/ethyl acetate) to afford a yellow oil ( $92 \mathrm{mg}, 57 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.75$ (dichloromethane/MeOH 90/10). IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 551, 561 , $643,669,695,730,798,910,968,999,1034,1131,1231,1300,1438,1450,1675,1715,2845,2945,3060$. HPLC: method $1, \mathrm{rt}=2.23 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $92 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.61(\mathrm{t}, J=5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.09-3.18(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.76(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $11.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.83(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.30(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.40(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.42-7.56(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.56-7.63(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;$ $7.67-7.78(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 44.8\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.3\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 51.0$ (d, $\left.J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 70.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.2(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ;$ 128.4 ( $\mathrm{d}, J=14.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{CH}$ ); $130.2(\mathrm{~d}, J=172.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{C}) ; 131.3$ (d, $J=9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 131.7$ (d, $J=3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{CH}$ ); 141.0 (C); 141.1 (C); $143.6(\mathrm{C}) ; 143.7(\mathrm{C}) .{ }^{31} \mathrm{P}\{\mathrm{H}\} \mathrm{NMR}\left(121.5 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): 23.0 \mathrm{ppm} .{ }^{31} \mathrm{P}\{\mathrm{H}\} \mathrm{NMR}\left(121.5 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): 23.0$ ppm. MS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 405.176\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right], 239.10[\mathrm{M}-165], 165.07[\mathrm{M}-239]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right):$ for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{P}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 405.1732; found: 405.1730 .
4.2.4. (4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)(phenyl)methanethione (6). A mixture of (4-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1$\mathrm{yl})($ phenyl $)$ methanone $1(0.28 \mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq})$ and Lawesson's reagent ( $0.14 \mathrm{mmol}, 57 \mathrm{mg}, 0.5 \mathrm{eq})$ in 10 mL of toluene was refluxed for 8 hours. Another half equivalent of Lawesson's reagent ( 0.5 eq ) was added and reaction mixture was refluxed overnight. Then, the solvent was removed under vacuum pressure and the residue was dissolved in dichloromethane. The solution was washed with $8 \%$ aqueous sodium hydrogenocarbonate and was dried over magnesium sulphate. The solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the residue flash chromatographed ( $100 \%$ dichloromethane) to afford a yellow solid ( $77 \mathrm{mg}, 74 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.60$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); $\mathrm{mp}: 204{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 618,670,700,738,762,919,928$, 932, 1003, 1040, 1140, 1224, 1254, 1290, 1435, 1469, 1488, 2755, 2880. HPLC: method 1 , $\mathrm{rt}=3.87$ min, purity $97 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.46(\mathrm{t}, J=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.02(\mathrm{t}, J=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.53(\mathrm{t}, J=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.49(\mathrm{t}, J=5.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.94(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.22-7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.29-7.33(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.43(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2$ $\mathrm{H}) ; 7.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 48.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 50.1$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 52.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.9(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 125.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 125.9(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.3(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.5(2 \mathrm{x}$ $\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 141.1(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 142.9(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 143.1(\mathrm{C}) ; 200.4(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 399.19[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}], 371.16\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$, 165.01 [fluorene]. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~S}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 371.1582 ; found: 371.1567 .
4.2.5. 1-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)-4-(phenylsulfinyl)piperazine (7). To a suspension of benzenesulfinic acid sodium salt ( 0.86 $\mathrm{mmol}, 158 \mathrm{mg}, 1 \mathrm{eq})$ in anhydrous dichloromethane ( 5.0 mL ), was added dropwise thionyl chloride ( $1.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 83 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2$ eq) at $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After the addition was finished, stirring was continued for an additional 2 hours at room temperature. The mixture obtained was then directly added into a cooled solution of 1 -( 9 H -fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3 ( $7.99 \mathrm{mmol}, 200 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0$ $\mathrm{eq})$ and triethylamine $(0.96 \mathrm{mmol}, 129 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{eq})$ in anhydrous dichloromethane ( 5.0 mL ). Once the addition was finished, the reaction mixture was stirred overnight at room temperature. Brine was added and the aqueous phase was extracted with dichloromethane. The organic phase was dried over magnesium sulphate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum pressure. The resulting crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic 60/40 petroleum ether/ethyl acetate) to afford a white solid ( $147 \mathrm{mg}, 49 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.39$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $60 / 40$ ); $\mathrm{mp}: 156{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 560, 640, 669, 689, $701,742,756,906,1003,1056,1086,1122,1321,1442,2823,2841,2941$. HPLC: method $1, \mathrm{rt}=2.72$ min, purity $95 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.58-2.80(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.92-3.05(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.10-3.25(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.86(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.32(\mathrm{dd}, J=1.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34(\mathrm{dd}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.41(\mathrm{td}, J=3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.46-7.56(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.61(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63-7.69(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 46.5\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.1\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$; $69.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.7(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 125.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 126.1(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.2(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 130.8(\mathrm{CH})$; $141.0(2 \times \mathrm{C}), 142.8(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 143.6(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 375.15\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right], 249.14[\mathrm{M}-125(\mathrm{PhSO})], 165.07$ [M-209 (fluorene)]. HRMS (DCI/CH $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ) for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 375.1531 found: 375.1536 .
4.2.6. (4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)(methyl)(phenyl)phosphine oxide (9). Reagents: 1( 9 H -fluoren-9-yl)piperazine $3(0.80 \mathrm{mmol}, 200 \mathrm{mg}$ ), triethylamine ( $0.96 \mathrm{mmol}, 129 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and methylphenylphosphinic chloride ( $0.96 \mathrm{mmol}, 132 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic 95/5 petroleum ether/ethyl acetate) to a white solid ( 204 mg , $64 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.19$ (dichloromethane/MeOH 95/5); mp: $178{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; $\mathbb{R}\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 620,639,666$, 692, 713, 737, 883, 901, 965, 998, 1117, 1138, 1186, 1300, 1319, 1377, 1437, 1449, 2839, 2908, 2931. HPLC: method $1, \mathrm{rt}=1.91 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $94 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ (ppm): $1.68\left(\mathrm{~d}, J_{\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{H}}=13.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}\right) ; 2.63(\mathrm{t}, J=4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.94-3.16(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.84(\mathrm{~s}, 1$ H); $7.31(\mathrm{tt}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.43-7.55(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ); 7.69 (d, $J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ); 7.74 (dd, $J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ); 7.76 (dd, $J=1.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 12.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=92.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 44.8(2 \mathrm{x}$ $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ); $49.3\left(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 70.2(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 125.8(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $4.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.1(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(\mathrm{~d}, J=12.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 131.1(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 131.6(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{CH}) ; 131.7$ (C); 133.4 (C); 140.9 ( $2 \times \mathrm{C}$ ); 143.5 (C) . ${ }^{31} \mathrm{P}$ NMR ( $121.5 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 35.32$. MS $\left(\mathrm{DCI}^{2} \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 389.18\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS (DCI/ $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OP}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 389.1783; found: 389.1784.


#### Abstract

4.2.7. General procedure for $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 5}$. The corresponding isocyanate or isothiocyanate ( 1.0 eq ) was dissolved in dry acetonitrile under argon. A solution of 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine $\mathbf{3}(1.0 \mathrm{eq})$ in dry acetonitrile was added to the reaction mixture. After overnight stirring, a precipitate was isolated and washed with acetonitrile. The resulting crude product was purified by flash chromatography to afford the title compound.


4.2.7.1. 4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)-N-phenylpiperazine-1-carboxamide (11). Reagents: 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3 (0.40 $\mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and phenyl isocyanate $(0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 48 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (dryload, gradient $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a white solid ( $67 \mathrm{mg}, 45 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.63$ (dichloromethane/MeOH 90/10); mp: $223{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right.$ ): 527, 691, 742, 872, 944, 972, 995, 1144, 1199, 1209, 1246, 1300, 1312, 1325, 1365, 1439, 1504, 1521, 1596, 1654, 2821, 2947, 3408. HPLC: method $1, \mathrm{rt}=2.25$ min, purity $95 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.55(\mathrm{t}, J=5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.43(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.01(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.93(\mathrm{tt}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.18-7.26(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.29-7.46(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (75 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 44.9\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.0\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.0(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH})$; $120.5(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 122.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.3(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.7(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.7(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 140.9(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 141.0(\mathrm{C})$; 143.9 ( $2 \times \mathrm{C}$ ); 155.3 (C). $\mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 370.19\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right], 251.15$ [M-119], 165.07 [M-205]. HRMS (DCI/CH $)_{4}$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 370.1919; found: 370.1913.
4.2.7.2. 4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)-N-phenylpiperazine-1-carbothioamide (12). Reagents: 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3 (0.40 $\mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and phenyl isothiocyanate $(0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 48 \mu \mathrm{~L})$. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (dry-load, gradient $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a white solid ( $71 \mathrm{mg}, 46 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ :
0.71 (dichloromethane/methanol 90/10); mp: $206{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 525,701,737,746,997,1037,1123,1219,1261,1301$, 1315, 1399, 1439, 1496, 1518, 1591, 2814, 3306. HPLC: method 2 , $\mathrm{rt}=2.86 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $98 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , DMSOd6) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.60(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.88(\mathrm{t}, J=4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.04(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.05-7.13(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.23-7.32(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.36$ (td, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ); $7.43(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.66(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.87(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 9.24(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm})$ : $48.8\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.2\left(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.6(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 124.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.6(2 \mathrm{x}$ $\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.3(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.7(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 141.0(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 141.5$ (C); $143.8(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 181.8$ (C). MS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ) m/z: $386.17\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$, 251.15 [M-134], 165.07 [M-220], 136.02 [M-249]. HRMS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{~S}$ $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 386.1691; found: 386.1690.
4.2.7.3. N-Butyl-4-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine-1-carboxamide (13). Reagents: 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine $\mathbf{3}$ ( 0.40 mmol , 100 mg ) and butyl isocyanate ( $0.48 \mathrm{mmol}, 54 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic, petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 70/30) to afford a white solid ( $72 \mathrm{mg}, 51 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.83$ (dichloromethane/methanol 90/10); $\mathrm{mp}: 174{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 737,758,848,939,1001,1141,1208,1264,1304,1327,1411,1447,1538,1613,2822,2861,2928$, 2956, 3353. HPLC: method $1, \mathrm{rt}=2.05 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $98 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.93(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.26$ $-1.41(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.41-1.54(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.63(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.17-3.26(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.34(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.45(\mathrm{t}, J=5.7$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.88(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.31(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.41(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.71(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm})$ : $13.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 20.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 32.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 40.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 44.5\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.8(2 \mathrm{x}$ $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ); $70.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 126.0(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.2(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 141.0(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 143.6(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 158.0(\mathrm{C})$. MS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ) m/z: $350.22\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right], 251.16$ [M-98], 184.15 [M-165], 165.07 [M-184], 143.12 [M-206]. HRMS (DCI/CH 4 ): for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 350.2232; found: 350.2228.
4.2.7.4. 4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)-N-octylpiperazine-1-carboxamide (14). Reagents: 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3 ( 0.40 $\mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and octyl isocyanate ( $0.48 \mathrm{mmol}, 85 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic, petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 70/30) to afford a white solid ( $85 \mathrm{mg}, 52 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.83$ (dichloromethane/methanol 90/10); $\mathrm{mp}: 139^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 618, 738, 844, 1006, 1127, 1143, 1177, 1206, 1260, 1301, 1326, 1406, 1444, 1466, 1540, 1616, 2851, 2925, 3298. HPLC: method $1, \mathrm{rt}=3.12 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $99 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.86-0.95(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.22-$ $1.38(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.49$ (quint, $J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.64(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.16-3.25(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.35(\mathrm{t}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.36(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.89$ ( $\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ); 7.31 (td, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.41(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 27.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 30.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.8$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 41.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 44.5\left(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.7\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 70.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 126.0(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.2(2 \mathrm{x}$ CH); 141.0 ( $2 \times \mathrm{C}$ ); $143.6(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 157.7$ (C). MS ( $\mathrm{DCI}^{2} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ) m/z: 406.28 [ $\left.\mathrm{M}^{2} \mathrm{H}^{+}\right], 251.16$ [M-154], 240.21 [M-165], 199.18 [M-206], 165.07 [M-240]. HRMS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}$ [M+H ${ }^{+}$]: calcd: 406.2858; found: 406.2840 .
4.2.7.5. 4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)-N-(4-nitrophenyl)piperazine-1-carboxamide (15). Reagents: 1-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazine 3 $(0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg})$ and 4-nitrophenylisocyanate $(0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \mathrm{mg})$. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography chromatography (dry-load, gradient $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a white solid ( $82 \mathrm{mg}, 82 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.71 (dichloromethane/methanol 90/10); mp: $263{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 620,672,690,739,807$, 842, 1001, 1110, 1237, 1299, 1328, 1424, 1497, 1541, 1599, 1611, 1639, 2827, 2913, 3341. HPLC: method $1, \mathrm{rt}=2.68 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $95 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz, DMSO-d6) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.57(\mathrm{t}, J=5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}$ ); $3.47(\mathrm{t}, J=5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.02(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34$ (td, $J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.43(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.65(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.67-7.73(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.86(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2$ H); $8.10-8.19(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 9.18(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , DMSO-d6) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm})$ : $45.1\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.0\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.6(\mathrm{CH})$; 118.7 ( $2 \times \mathrm{CH}$ ); $120.6(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 125.2(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 126.3(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.7(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.7(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 141.0(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 141.2(\mathrm{C})$; $143.8(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 148.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 154.3(\mathrm{C})$. $\mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 415.186\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{DCI}^{2} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 415.1770; found: 415.1779.
4.2.8. General procedure for compounds 17 and 18. To a solution of the corresponding alkene (1.0 eq), in anhydrous tetrahydrofuran was added $9-\mathrm{BBN}(1.2 \mathrm{eq})$ at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours and at RT for 3 hours more, and then was introduced into a mixture of 2-bromofluorenone 16 ( 1.25 eq ), cesium carbonate ( 3.75 eq), triphenylarsine ( 0.25 eq) and $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{dppf}) \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.25 \mathrm{eq})$ in a mixture of 8 mL of $\mathrm{THF}, 8 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{DMF}$ and $2 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The resulting mixture was heated at $85^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight, cooled and passed through a short pad of silica gel with $4: 1$ petroleum ether/ethyl acetate. The solvent was evaporated and the residue was dissolved in ethyl acetate, washed with brine, dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and evaporated. The residue was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $95: 5$ petroleum ether/ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford the title compound.
4.2.8.1. 2-Hexyl-9H-fluoren-9-one (17). Reagents: 1-hexene ( $1.7 \mathrm{mmol}, 211 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ), 9-BBN ( $2.05 \mathrm{mmol}, 4.1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 0.5 M solution in THF), 2-bromofluorenone $16(2.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 550 \mathrm{mg})$, cesium carbonate ( $6.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.07 \mathrm{~g}$ ), triphenylarsine $(0.42$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 130 \mathrm{mg})$ and $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{dppf}) \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.42 \mathrm{mmol}, 346 \mathrm{mg})$. A yellow oil was obtained ( $257 \mathrm{mg}, 57 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.57$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $97 / 3$ ). IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 736, 766, 831, 958, 1106, 1176, 1291, 1457, 1602, 1713, 2854, 2925. ${ }^{1}$ H NMR (300 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.85-0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.25-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.53-1.73(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.66(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.25-7.34(\mathrm{~m}, 2$ $\mathrm{H}) ; 7.44(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.47-7.53(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.66(\mathrm{dt}, J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm})$ : $14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 28.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 35.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 120.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 124.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 124.4(\mathrm{CH})$; $128.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 134.4(\mathrm{C}) ; 134.5(\mathrm{C}) ; 134.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 134.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 142.1(\mathrm{C}) ; 144.5(\mathrm{C}) ; 144.7(\mathrm{C}) ; 194.3(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ : $265.16\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 265.1592; found: 265.1599 .
4.2.8.2. 2-Octyl-9H-fluoren-9-one (18). Reagents: 1-Octene (1.7 mmol, $267 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ), 9 -BBN ( $2.05 \mathrm{mmol}, 4.1 \mathrm{~mL}$ of 0.5 M solution in THF), 2-bromofluorenone $16(2.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 550 \mathrm{mg})$, cesium carbonate ( $6.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.07 \mathrm{~g}$ ), triphenylarsine ( 0.42 mmol, 130 mg , ) and $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{dppf}) \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(0.42 \mathrm{mmol}, 346 \mathrm{mg})$. A yellow oil was obtained ( $170 \mathrm{mg}, 34 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.72$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 95/5). IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 650, 737, 765, 831, 963, 1106, 1176, 1291, 1457, 1603, 1714, 2853, 2923. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.91(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.22-1.43(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.65(\mathrm{q}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.64(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;$ $7.25-7.34(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.45(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.49(\mathrm{dd}, J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.52(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.67$ $(\mathrm{dt}, J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.5$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 35.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 120.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 124.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 124.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 134.7(\mathrm{C}) ; 134.5$ (C); $134.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 134.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 142.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 144.5(\mathrm{C}) ; 144.7$ (C); 194.1 (C). MS (DCI/CH $)_{4}$ m/z: $293.19\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS (DCI/CH ${ }_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 293.1905; found: 293.1906.
4.2.9. 2-Propoxy-9H-fluoren-9-one (20). An oven-dried 5 mL round-bottom flask was charged with $\operatorname{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(0.011$ mmol, $2.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.01 \mathrm{eq}$ ), ligand $t$ BuXPhos ( $0.023 \mathrm{mmol}, 9.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.02 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $\mathrm{Cs}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(1.74 \mathrm{mmol}, 566 \mathrm{mg}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq})$. The round-bottom flask was sealed with septum, evacuated and back-filled with argon. Toluene ( 2.0 mL ), 2-bromo-9-fluorenone $19(1.16 \mathrm{mmol}, 300 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq})$ and propan$-1-\mathrm{ol}(3.47 \mathrm{mmol}, 260 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 3.0 \mathrm{eq})$ were added to the reaction mixture and was stirred overnight at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Brine was added and the product was extracted with ethyl acetate $(3 \times)$. The organic phase was dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum pressure. The resulting crude product was purified by flash chromatography (petroleum ether/diethyl ether $97 / 3$ in 20 minutes) to afford a yellow solid ( $134 \mathrm{mg}, 52 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.35 (petroleum ether/Et ${ }_{2} \mathrm{O} 97 / 3$ ); mp: $61^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 741,766,837,996,1012,1130,1247,1296,1455,1489,1599,1716$, 2875, 2940. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.08(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.85(\mathrm{sex}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.99(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2$ H); $6.99(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.21(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.21(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.37-7.49(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.61$ $(\mathrm{dt}, J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 10.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 70.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 109.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.5$
(CH); $120.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 121.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 124.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 134.3(\mathrm{C}) ; 134.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 135.9(\mathrm{C}) ; 136.8$ (C); $145.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 160.4$ (C); $194.0(\mathrm{C})$. MS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 239.11\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 239.1072; found: 239.1084.
4.2.10. 3-Hydroxy-9H-fluoren-9-one (22). A mixture of 3-methoxyfluorenone 21 ( $1.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 226 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ), acetic acid ( $26 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 25 \mathrm{eq}$ ), and $\mathrm{HBr} 47 \%(2.5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) was heated under reflux for 6 hours. After cooling, the reaction mixture was poured into water $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with ethyl acetate. The organic phase was dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum pressure. The residue was purified by flash chromatography (petroleum ether:ethyl acetate $80: 20$ in 15 minutes) to afford a yellow solid ( $130 \mathrm{mg}, 62 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.42$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $70 / 30$ ); mp: $238{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 670,736,829,870,926,1102,1204,1298,1388,1445,1586,1611,1676,3082 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 6.69(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.31-7.38(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.48-7.61(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 107.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 114.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 123.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.3(\mathrm{C}) ; 126.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.0(\mathrm{CH})$; $134.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 135.1(\mathrm{C}) ; 143.4(\mathrm{C}) ; \mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 197.0603; found: 197.0610.
4.2.11. General procedure for compounds 23-25. 3-Hydroxy-9-fluorenone 22 ( 1.0 eq ) was dissolved in DMF ( 5.0 mL ), potassium carbonate ( 1.5 eq ) and the corresponding alkyl or aryl bromine reagent ( 0.95 eq ) were added. The mixture was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and stirred overnight. The reaction mixture was then cooled and 1 N hydrochloric acid ( 5.0 mL ) was added dropwise thereto in a water bath to quench the reaction. The mixture was extracted with dichloromethane and washed once with 1 N hydrochloric acid and 4 times with water. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum pressure to afford the title compound. No further purification was needed.
4.2.11.1. 3-(Benzyloxy)-9H-fluoren-9-one (23). Reagents: 3-Hydroxy-9-fluorenone 22 ( $0.54 \mathrm{mmol}, 105 \mathrm{mg}$ ), potassium carbonate ( $0.81 \mathrm{mmol}, 111 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and benzyl bromide ( $0.64 \mathrm{mmol}, 77 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). A yellow solid was obtained ( $105 \mathrm{mg}, 88 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.35$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate); mp: $124{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 693,735,767,839,1023,1099,1183,1204,1237,1285$, $1306,1381,1450,1491,1583,1610,1734,2853,2922,3305 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 5.17(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.82(\mathrm{dd}, J$ $=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.10(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.27-7.33(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.38-7.52(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.62(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.64$ (dt, $J=0.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 70.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 108.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 123.9$ (CH);126.3 (CH);127.4 (C); 127.6 ( $2 \times \mathrm{CH}$ ); $128.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.8$ ( $2 \times \mathrm{CH}$ ); $129.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 134.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 135.3$ (C); 136.1 (C); $143.4(\mathrm{C}) ; 147.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 164.5(\mathrm{C}) ; 192.5(\mathrm{C})$. MS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ) m/z: $287.11\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 287.1072; found: 287.1074.
4.2.11.2. 3-Propoxy-9H-fluoren-9-one (24). Reagents: 3-Hydroxy-9-fluorenone 22 ( $0.41 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \mathrm{mg}$ ), potassium carbonate $(0.61 \mathrm{mmol}, 85 \mathrm{mg})$ and bromopropane ( $0.39 \mathrm{mmol}, 35 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). A yellow solid was obtained ( $95 \mathrm{mg}, 98 \%$ ). TLC R $\mathrm{f}: 0.09$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); mp: $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 538,616,642,670,731,762,826,859,924,1007,1013,1109$, 1203, 1218, 1293, 1370, 1447, 1590, 1603, 1616, 1705, 2879, 2938, 2967. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.07(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.85(\mathrm{sep}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.02(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.72(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1$ H); $7.28(\mathrm{dq}, ~ J=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.43-7.48(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.60(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.62(\mathrm{dt}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 10.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 70.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 107.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 123.9(\mathrm{CH})$; 126.3 (CH); 127.0 (C); 129.3 (CH); 134.1 (CH); 135.4 (C); 143.5 (C); 147.0 (C); 165.1 (C); 192.6 (C). MS ( $\left.\mathrm{DCI}^{2} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}:$ $239.10\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 239.1072; found: 239.1060.
4.2.11.3. 3-Hexyloxy-9H-fluoren-9-one (25). Reagents: 3-Hydroxy-9-fluorenone 22 ( $0.41 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \mathrm{mg}$ ), potassium carbonate ( $0.61 \mathrm{mmol}, 85 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and bromohexane ( $0.39 \mathrm{mmol}, 54 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). A brown, solid was obtained ( $106 \mathrm{mg}, 93 \%$ ). TLC R f : 0.81 (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); mp: $84^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 677,728,737,765,846,990,1017,1097,1188,1233$,
$1298,1452,1587,1605,1696,2861,2935,2951 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.96(\mathrm{t}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.32-1.45$ (m, 4 H ); 1.46-1.58 (m, 2 H); $1.86(\mathrm{q}, ~ J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.09(\mathrm{t}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.76(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.05(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.32(\mathrm{dq}, J=3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.45-7.52(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.66(\mathrm{dt}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 25.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 68.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 107.6$ (CH); $113.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 123.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 129.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 134.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 135.4(\mathrm{C}) ; 143.5(\mathrm{C}) ; 147.0(\mathrm{C}) ;$ $165.1(\mathrm{C}) ; 192.6(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 281.15\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 281.1542; found: 281.1543 .
4.2.12. 9-Oxo-9H-fluoren-6-yl trifluoromethanesulfonate (26). To a solution of 3-hydroxy-9-fluorenone 22 ( $2.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 300$ $\mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and of 2,6-di-tert-butyl-4-methylpyridine ( $5.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.05 \mathrm{~g}, 2.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in anhydrous dichloromethane ( 15.0 mL ) was added triflic anhydride ( $2.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 411 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{eq}$ ) dropwise at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The mixture was stirred at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 hour and at $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1.5 hours, and then was evaporated. The yellow residue was directly purified by flash chromatography (isocratic petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $95 / 5$ in 15 minutes) to afford a yellow solid ( $491 \mathrm{mg}, 73 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.90$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $90 / 10) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 7.18(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34-7.40(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.41$ (d, $J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ); 7.54 (dd, $J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.69(\mathrm{dt}, J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.73$ (d, $J$ $=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 114.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 116.8(\mathrm{C}) ; 121.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 121.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 124.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.1$ (CH); 130.5 (CH); 133.8 (C); 134.4 (C); 135.3 (CH); 142.6 (C); 147.3 (C); 154.0 (C); 191.6 (C). MS (DCI/CH 4 ) m/z: 329.01 $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~S}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 329.0100; found: 329.0095 .
4.2.13. 3-Hexyl-9H-fluoren-9-one (27). To a solution 1-hexene ( $0.34 \mathrm{mmol}, 43 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in anhydrous THF ( 3.0 mL ) was added $9-\mathrm{BBN}\left(0.41 \mathrm{mmol}, 812 \mu \mathrm{~L}\right.$ of a 0.5 M solution in THF, 1.2 eq ) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The mixture was stirred at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours and at room temperature for 2 hours additional, and then was introduced to a mixture of 9 -oxo- 9 H -fluoren- 6 - yl trifluoromethanesulfonate $\mathbf{2 6}(0.31 \mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.9 \mathrm{eq}), \mathrm{K}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}(0.47 \mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg}, 1.4 \mathrm{eq})$ and $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{dppf}) \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ $(0.02 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mathrm{mg}, 0.07 \mathrm{eq})$ in anhydrous THF ( 3.0 mL ) . The resulting mixture was heated at reflux overnight, cooled and passed through a short pad of silica gel with petroleum ether:ethyl acetate $4: 1$. The solvent was evaporated and the residue was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a yellow oil ( $77 \mathrm{mg}, 96 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.59$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $95 / 5$ ). IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 677,737,764,838,919,1111,1193$, 1297, 1422, 1448, 1601, 1613, 1708, 2855, 2925. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.88-0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.27-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 6$ H); 1.62 - 1.75 (m, 2 H ); $2.69(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.12(\mathrm{dd}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.30(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34$ - 7.38 (m, 1 H ); 7.49 (td, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.52-7.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.60(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.67$ (td, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz} \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 120.1$ (CH); $120.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 124.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 124.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 132.1(\mathrm{C}) ; 134.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 134.8(\mathrm{C}) ; 144.4(\mathrm{C}) ; 144.8(\mathrm{C})$; $151.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 193.7(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 293.19\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}{ }^{+}\right], 265.16\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+]} \mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)\right.$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 265.1592; found: 265.1599.
4.2.14. General procedure for $\mathbf{2 8} \mathbf{- 3 5}$. To a mixture of 1-benzoylpiperazine ( 1.0 eq ) and potassium carbonate ( 2.0 eq ) in dimethylformamide was added dropwise a solution of the corresponding substituted 9-bromo-9H-fluorene ( 1.0 eq ) in dimethylformamide (The synthesis of 9-bromo-9H-fluorene derivatives is reported in supporting information). After stirring for 24 hours at room temperature, solvent was removed and the crude residue was dissolved in diethyl ether, washed with brine, dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum. The residue was purified by flash chromatography as indicated in each case to afford the title compound.
4.2.14.1. (4-(2-Hexyl-9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)(phenyl)methanone (28). Reagents: 1-Benzoylpiperazine ( 0.15 mmol , 29 mg ), potassium carbonate ( $0.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 42 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and 9-bromo-2-hexyl-9 H -fluorene $(0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \mathrm{mg})$. The crude product
was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic, petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 80/20) to afford a yellow oil ( $66 \mathrm{mg}, 99 \%$ ). $\operatorname{TLC~R~}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.34$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 80/20). IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 697,708,739,766,1001,1137,1256,1277,1426,1455,1632$, $1674,1715,2854,2925$. HPLC: method $2, \mathrm{rt}=2.67 \mathrm{~min}$ purity $98 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.93(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.24-1.48(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.63-1.76(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.44(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.72(\mathrm{t}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.91$ (s, 2 H ); $3.38(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.84$ ( s , $2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.88$ (s, 1 H ); 7.23 (dd, $J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ); 7.29 (td, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34-7.42$ ( $\mathrm{m}, 6 \mathrm{H}$ ); 7.46 (s, 1 H ); $7.61(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.8\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 43.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.9(\mathrm{CH})$; $119.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.5(\mathrm{CH})$; 129.6 (CH); 135.9 (C); 138.7 (C); 141.2 (C); 142.4 (C); 143.3 (C); 143.6 (C); 170.3 (C). MS (DCI/CH 4 ) m/z: 438.27 [M]. HRMS (DCI/ $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ [M]: calcd: 438.2671; found: 438.2660 .
4.2.14.2. (4-(2-Octyl-9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-l-yl)(phenyl)methanone (29). Reagents: 1-Benzoylpiperazine ( 0.16 mmol , 30 mg ), potassium carbonate ( $0.31 \mathrm{mmol}, 43 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and 9-bromo-2-octyl- 9 H -fluorene ( $0.16 \mathrm{mmol}, 55 \mathrm{mg}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a yellow oil ( $38 \mathrm{mg}, 53 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.10$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $90 / 10$ ). IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 697,708,740,765,828,1001,1015$, 1141, 1154, 1255, 1277, 1302, 1425, 1455, 1634, 1715, 2853, 2923. HPLC: method 2, rt $=7.63 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $97 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.82-1.01(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.23-1.47(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.59-1.78(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.43(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.72(\mathrm{t}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.92(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.38(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.85(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.88(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.30(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; $7.34-7.43(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.47(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.61(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$; $22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$; $43.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.7(\mathrm{CH})$; 127.1 ( 2 x CH ); $128.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4$ ( 2 x CH ); 128.5 (CH); 129.6 (CH); 135.9 (C); 138.7 (C); 141.2 (C); 142.4 (C); 143.3 (C); $143.6(\mathrm{C}) ; 170.3(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 467.31\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right], 277.20$ [M-189]. HRMS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{39} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 467.3062; found: 467.3063.
4.2.14.3. (4-(3-Hexyl-9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-l-yl)(phenyl)methanone (30). Reagents: 1-Benzoylpiperazine ( 0.08 mmol , 15 mg ), potassium carbonate ( $0.15 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and 9 -bromo-3-hexyl- 9 H -fluorene $(0.08 \mathrm{mmol}, 25 \mathrm{mg})$. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic, petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 70/30 in 15 minutes) to afford a yellow oil (18 $\mathrm{mg}, 56 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.11$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 80/20). IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 630,674,697,708,739,768,787,1001,1015$, $1142,1155,1255,1277,1301,1424,1447,1633,2854,2925$. HPLC: method $2, \mathrm{rt}=2.56 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $97 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.85-1.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.29-1.48(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.62-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.46(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.72(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;$ $2.86(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.38(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.87(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.15(\mathrm{dd}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.32(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; $7.35-7.48(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.53(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.70(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 43.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$; $48.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.5$ (CH); $128.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 129.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 135.9(\mathrm{C}) ; 140.7(\mathrm{C}) ; 141.1(\mathrm{C}) ; 141.2$ (C); 143.3 (C); 143.8 (C); 170.3 (C). MS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ) m/z: $438.26\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right], 249.16[\mathrm{M}-188]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI}^{2} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 438.2671; found: 438.2674.
4.2.14.4. (4-(3-Methoxy-9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)(phenyl)methanone (31). Reagents: 1-Benzoylpiperazine (0.20 mmol, 38 mg ), potassium carbonate ( $0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 55 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and 9-bromo-3-methoxy- 9 H -fluorene ( $0.20 \mathrm{mmol}, 55 \mathrm{mg}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (isocratic, petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 80/20 in 15 minutes) to afford a brown solid ( $64 \mathrm{mg}, 83 \%$ ). TLC R $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.17$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); mp: $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 615,632,669,709$, $739,769,846,1000,1016,1031,1169,1212,1277,1427,1453,1489,1577,1628,2830,2934$. HPLC: method 2, rt $=1.94$
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min, purity $97 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.44(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.85(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.37(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.91(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;$ $4.85(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.88(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.33(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.36-7.45(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.64(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.68(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 42.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.7$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 105.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.3(\mathrm{CH})$; 128.3 (CH); 128.4 ( 2 x CH); 129.6 (CH); 135.4 (C); 135.9 (C); 140.9 (C); 142.6 (C); 144.4 (C); 160.3 (C); 170.3 (C). MS (DCI/CH $4_{4}$ ) m/z: 384.18 [M]. HRMS (DCI/CH ${ }_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ [M]: calcd: 384.1838; found: 384.1835.
4.2.14.5. Phenyl(4-(3-propoxy-9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)methanone (32). Reagents: 1-Benzoylpiperazine ( 0.23 mmol , 43 mg ), potassium carbonate ( $0.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 62 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and 9-bromo-3-propoxy- 9 H -fluorene ( $0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 68 \mathrm{mg}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a brown oil ( $20 \mathrm{mg}, 22 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.20$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $70 / 30$ ). IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 670,709,727,768,907,980$, 1001, 1016, 1142, 1192, 1256, 1277, 1427, 1448, 1490, 1577, 1628, 2855, 2928. HPLC: method 2, rt = 3.40 min , purity $95 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.11(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.89$ (quint, $J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ); $2.44(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.86(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.37$ ( $\mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ); $3.80(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.04(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.86(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.87(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.24(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; 7.32 (td, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.36-7.45(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.53(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 10.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.6\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.5\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 69.8$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 105.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(2 \mathrm{x}$ CH); 129.6 (CH); 135.2 (C); 135.9 (C); 141.0 (C); 142.5 (C); 144.4 (C); 159.9 (C); 170.3 (C). MS (DCI/ $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ) m/z: 441.25 $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}^{+}\right], 412.22[\mathrm{M}], 223.11$ [M-189]. HRMS (DCI/ $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ [M]: calcd: 412.2151; found: 412.2158.
4.2.14.6. (4-(3-(Hexyloxy)-9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)(phenyl)methanone (33). Reagents: 1-Benzoylpiperazine ( 0.21 $\mathrm{mmol}, 40 \mathrm{mg}$ ), potassium carbonate ( $0.42 \mathrm{mmol}, 58 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and 9-bromo-3-hexyloxy- 9 H -fluorene ( $0.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 63 \mathrm{mg}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a brown oil ( $54 \mathrm{mg}, 57 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.20$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $70 / 30$ ). IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 615,633,670,708,734,768$, $788,847,1000,1016,1142,1190,1256,1277,1301,1426,1449,1490,1578,1630,2857,2929$. HPLC: method 2 , rt $=5.36$ min , purity $98 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.91-1.02(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.33-1.47(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.47-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.87$ (quin, $J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ); $2.44(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.86(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.37(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.82(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.07(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.85(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.87$ (dd, $J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ); $7.24(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.32(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.36-7.45(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.52(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 25.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 42.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 68.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 105.8$ $(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 129.6$ (CH); 135.2 (C); 135.9 (C); 141.0 (C); 142.5 (C); 144.4 (C); 159.9 (C); 170.3 (C). MS ( $\mathrm{DCI}^{2} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ) m/z: 454.26 [M], 265.16 [M-189]. HRMS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ [M]: calcd: 454.2620; found: 454.2607.
4.2.14.7. Phenyl(4-(2-propoxy-9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)methanone (34). Reagents: 1-Benzoylpiperazine ( 0.06 mmol , 11 mg ), potassium carbonate ( $0.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 16 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and 9-bromo-2-propoxy- $9 H$-fluorene ( $0.06 \mathrm{mmol}, 18 \mathrm{mg}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a yellow oil ( $10 \mathrm{mg}, 42 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.34$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 70/30). IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 708,738,766,824,1002$, 1141, 1277, 1454, 1632, 1716, 2868, 2927, 3047, 3449. HPLC: method 2, rt $=4.12 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $95 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.12(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.89(\mathrm{sex}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.47(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.89(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.38(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.83(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ;$ $4.03(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.85(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.95(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.20(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.25(\mathrm{t}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.33-7.44$ (m, 6 H$) ; 7.56-7.64(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 10.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 42.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.6$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 77.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 112.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 114.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1$
( $2 \times \mathrm{CH}$ ) ; $128.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4$ ( $2 \times \mathrm{CH}$ ); $129.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 133.8(\mathrm{C}) ; 135.9(\mathrm{C}) ; 141.2$ (C); 142.9 (C); 145.3 (C); 159.1 (C); 170.3 (C). MS (DCI/ $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 413.22$. HRMS (DCI/ $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{4}\right): \mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 413.2229; found: 413.2235.
4.2.14.8. (4-(3-(Benzyloxy)-9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-1-yl)(phenyl)methanone (35). Reagents: 1-Benzoylpiperazine (0.23 $\mathrm{mmol}, 44 \mathrm{mg}$ ), potassium carbonate $(0.46 \mathrm{mmol}, 64 \mathrm{mg})$ and 3-(benzyloxy)-9-bromo- 9 H -fluorene ( $0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 81 \mathrm{mg}$ ). The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a yellow oil ( $54.3 \mathrm{mg}, 50 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.40$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ). IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 697, 710, 770, 1001, 1017, $1186,1257,1278,1427,1448,1488,1578,1628,2851,2920$. HPLC: method 2, $\mathrm{rt}=3.65 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $98 \%{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.45(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.86(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.38(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.83(\mathrm{bs}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.86(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.18(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.97(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34(\mathrm{td}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.37-7.48(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.51(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.53(\mathrm{t}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.65(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 42.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.6\left(2 \times \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 49.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 70.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 106.3$ $(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.1(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.6(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.3$ (CH); 128.4 (2 x CH); 128.7 (2 x CH); 129.6 (CH); 135.7 (C); 135.9 (C); 137.0 (C); 140.9 (C); 142.6 (C); 144.4 (C); 159.5 (C); $170.3(\mathrm{C})$. MS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 461.22\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 461.2229; found: 461.2235.
4.2.15. 3-(Hexyloxy)-9H-fluorene (36). A mixture of 3-(hexyloxy)-9H-fluoren-9-one 25 ( $97.8 \mathrm{mg}, 0.34 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and hydrazine hydrate $(247 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was stirred on 3.7 mL diethylene glycol for 10 minutes, then $40 \% \mathrm{KOH}$ solution ( $365 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) was added dropwise, and the mixture was refluxed for 4 hours. Brine was added and the product was extracted three times with ethyl acetate, dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated under vacuum pressure. The crude product was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a yellow powder (89 $\mathrm{mg}, 98 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.48$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $97 / 3$ ); $\mathrm{mp}: 111^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; $\mathrm{IR}\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 730 ; 765,808,851,900,1033,1186$, $1211,1243,1280,1306,1325,1399,1450,1474,1492,1578,1608,2855,2871,2887,2921,2947 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}(300 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.0(\mathrm{t}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.28-1.49(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.52-1.70(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.69(\mathrm{quint}, J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.88(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.11$ $(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.93(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.36(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.38(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.43(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.46(\mathrm{t}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.81(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (75 MHz, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ (ppm): $14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 25.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 68.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 105.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8$ $(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 135.2(\mathrm{C}) ; 141.8(\mathrm{C}) ; 143.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 144.3(\mathrm{C}) ; 158.8(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}$ $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 267.18\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd 267.1749; found 267.1761.
4.2.16. General procedure for 39 and 40. Reagent $\mathbf{3 8}$ was synthesized according to a procedure reported in supporting information. The corresponding fluorene ( 1.0 eq ) was dissolved in dry tetrahydrofuran ( 2.5 mL ) under argon. $n$-Butyl lithium solution ( 1.6 M in hexanes, 1.0 eq ) was added slowly to the reaction mixture at room temperature. The reaction mixture was then cooled to $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a solution of N -benzoyl-4-bromopiperidine 38 ( 1.0 eq ) in dry tetrahydrofuran ( 5.0 mL ) was added dropwise. The reaction mixture was then warmed slowly to room temperature and let stirring overnight at room temperature. Saturated solution of ammonium chloride ( 20.0 mL ) was then added and the product was extracted three times with ethyl acetate. The organic phase was then washed with brine, dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated under vacuum pressure. Preparative scale liquid chromatography
with Xbridge C18 column $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ( 19 x 150 mm ) was achieved on AutoPurification HPLC/PDA System (from Waters). The mixture water/acetonitrile as gradient eluant was needed to separate unreacted starting compound and product. The AutoPurification HPLC System included 2767 Sample Manager, 2545 Binary Gradient Module, System Fluidics Organizer, 2489 UV/Visible Detector and MassLynx Software with the FractionLynx Application Manager.
4.2.16.1. (4-(9H-Fluoren-9-yl)piperidin-1-yl)(phenyl)methanone (39). Reagents: Fluorene 37 ( $0.37 \mathrm{mmol}, 62 \mathrm{mg}$ ), $n$-butyl lithium solution ( 1.6 M in hexanes, $0.37 \mathrm{mmol}, 233 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and $N$-benzoyl-4-bromopiperidine $\mathbf{3 8}(0.37 \mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg})$. The crude product was purified by HPLC to afford a yellow oil ( $60 \mathrm{mg}, 46 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.16$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate). IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 696,707,727,908,968,1167,1276,1290,1325,1376,1446,1575,1611,2858,2940$. HPLC: method $2, \mathrm{rt}=4.22$ min, purity $99 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.06-1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.48-1.90(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.39-2.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.65$ - 2.87 (m, 1 H); $2.87-3.08(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.60-3.89(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.67-4.97(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.31-7.48(\mathrm{~m}, 9$ H); $7.56(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.79(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 28.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 41.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 43.3$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 52.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.9(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 124.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.9\left(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 127.0(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.4(2 \times \mathrm{CH})$; $128.5(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 129.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 135.4(\mathrm{C}) ; 141.6(2 \times \mathrm{C}) ; 145.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 145.4(\mathrm{C}) ; 170.8(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 354.18\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS (DCI/ $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{NO}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 354.1858; found: 354.1855.
4.2.16.2. (4-(3-(Hexyloxy)-9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperidin-1-yl)(phenyl)methanone (40). Reagents: 3-(Hexyloxy)-9H-fluorene 36 ( $0.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 59 \mathrm{mg}$ ), $n$-butyl lithium solution ( 1.6 M in hexanes, $0.25 \mathrm{~mol}, 156 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) and $N$-benzoyl-4-bromopiperidine 38 $(0.21 \mathrm{mmol}, 56 \mathrm{mg})$. The crude product was purified by HPLC to afford a yellow oil ( $49 \mathrm{mg}, 49 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.32$ (petroleum ether/EtOAC). IR (cm ${ }^{-1}$ ): 707, 735, 771, 970, 1022, 1051, 1204, 1237, 1284, 1370, 1448, 1491, 1578, 1629, 1707, 2856, 2930, 3057. HPLC: method $1, \mathrm{rt}=1.21 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $96 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.96(\mathrm{t}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.22$ (bs, 2 H ); 1.32-1.45 (m, 4 H ); 1.47-1.58 (m, 2 H ); 1.67 (bs, 2 H ); 1.87 (quint, $J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ); 2.30-2.47 (m, 1 H ); 2.74 (bs, $1 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.91$ (bs, 1 H ); 3.70 (bs, 1H); $3.95(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.08(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.81$ (bs, 1 H$) ; 6.90(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.26-7.47(\mathrm{~m}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.52(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.72(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 25.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 28.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 41.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 42.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 51.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 68.3$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 105.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.8(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 127.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(2 \mathrm{x}$ CH); 129.5 (CH); 136.2 (C); 141.6 (C); 142.9 (C); 144.7 (C); 146.5 (C); 159.1 (C); 170.3 (C). MS (DCI/CH 4 ) m/z: 454.27 $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{31} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 454.2746; found: 454.2741 .

[^1]petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford the title compound as a yellow solid ( $46 \mathrm{mg}, 52 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.41 (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); mp: 175.6; IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 571, 622, 701, 742, 949, 1014, 1075, 1152, 1236, 1278, 1323, 1395, 1449, 1600, 1681, 1711, 3062. HPLC: method 2 , $\mathrm{rt}=1.32 \mathrm{~min}$, purity $87 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ (ppm): 3.12 (dd, $J=3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.40(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.86$ (dd, $J=3.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6.9 . \mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.01(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.37(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.41(\mathrm{tt}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.44-7.61(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.76(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 45.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 46.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 54.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 68.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.5(\mathrm{CH})$; $128.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 131.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 135.8(\mathrm{C}) ; 141.3(\mathrm{C}) ; 142.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 169.6(\mathrm{C}) ; 173.8(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ : $369.16\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 369.1603; found: 369.1620 .
4.2.18. Chiral chromatography. Supercritical fluid chromatography (SFC) preparative scale was performed on a Purification Prep 80 system (from Waters) with a chiralpak AD-H $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ( $10 \times 250$ ) mm column for enantiomeric separation of compounds 31 and 33 . Those racemic mixtures were respectively eluted with $20 \%$ and $25 \%$ methanol at $15 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}\left(\mathrm{P}_{\text {out }}=100 \mathrm{bar}\right.$, oven temperature $=40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). For analytical chromatography, a SFC-Piclab Analytic Picsolution instrument was used with an AD-H $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ( $4.6 \times 250$ ) mm column. Each analysis was performed at $4 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{out}}=100 \mathrm{bar}\right.$, oven temperature $\left.=35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ in an identical co-solvent percentage than in purification step.

The retention times for each enantiomers are the following: 31a: $\mathrm{rt}=10.5 \mathrm{~min} ; \mathbf{3 1 b}, \mathrm{rt}=12.6$ $\mathrm{min} ; 33 \mathrm{a}: \mathrm{rt}=10.4 \mathrm{~min} ; \mathbf{3 3 b}: \mathrm{rt}=16.4 \mathrm{~min}$. Additional informations are reported in supporting information document.

### 4.3. Biology

4.3.1. InhA expression and purification. The production and purification of the InhA- $6 x$ His protein from a protease-deficient strain of E. coli BL21(DE3) transformed with the $\mathrm{pHAT} / \mathrm{inh} A$ plasmid were performed as followed. 1 mL of the bacteria was grown in 100 mL of LB medium containing ampicillin $(100 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL})$ at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 4 h , the solution was rediluted in 1 L of the same medium and re-grown at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. When the proper concentration $\left(\mathrm{OD}_{595}=0.6-0.8\right)$ was reached, protein expression was induced for overnight incubation with 1 mM isopropyl- $\beta$-D-galactopyranoside (IPTG) at $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Cells were harvested by centrifugation at $6,000 \mathrm{~g}$ for 30 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The dry pellet was kept at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for several months. Thawed cells ( 1.5 g ) were sonicated in 20 mL lysis buffer ( $300 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{NaCl}, 10 \mathrm{mM}$ imidazole, 50 mM sodium phosphate buffer, pH 8.0 ). After centrifugation at $10,000 \mathrm{~g}$ for 45 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the supernatant was applied onto a nickel-chelated His-Trap HP 1 mL column (GE Healthcare) previously equilibrated with the binding buffer ( $50 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{NaCl}, 10 \mathrm{mM}$ imidazole, 50 mM sodium phosphate buffer, $\mathrm{pH} 8,0$ ). First, the unbound proteins were washed out with 10 column volume of binding buffer, and then a higher imidazole concentration ( 25 mM ) allows the elution of non-specifically bound proteins. The His ${ }_{6}$-tagged InhA protein was eluted with an imidazole gradient from 25 mM to 300 mM over a range of 20 column volume. Fractions containing the target protein were pooled, concentrated to 2.0 mL and loaded on a HiLoad $16 / 60$ Superdex 200 column (GE Healthcare) equilibrated with $150 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{NaCl}, 30 \mathrm{mM}$ PIPES, pH 6.8. Samples were analyzed using SDS-PAGE and Coomassie blue staining and then stored at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for short term storage or $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with $20 \%$ glycerin for long-term storage.
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4.3.2. InhA activity inhibition. Triclosan and NADH were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich. Stock solutions of all compounds were prepared in DMSO such that the final concentration of this co-solvent was constant at $5 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ in a final volume of 1 mL for all kinetic reactions. Kinetic assays were performed using trans-2-dodecenoyl-coenzyme A (DDCoA) and wild type InhA as previously described.[38] Briefly, reactions were performed at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an aqueous buffer ( 30 mM PIPES and 150 mM NaCl pH 6.8 ) containing additionally $250 \mu \mathrm{M}$ cofactor (NADH), $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ substrate (DDCoA) and the tested compound (at 50 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ or $10 \mu \mathrm{M})$. Reactions were initiated by addition of InhA ( 100 nM final) and NADH oxidation was followed at 340 nm . The inhibitory activity of each derivative was expressed as the percentage inhibition of InhA activity (initial velocity of the reaction) with respect to the control reaction without inhibitor. Triclosan was used as a positive control. All activity assays were performed in triplicate. For the most potent compounds, $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values were determined using the 4-parameter curvefitting software XLFit (IDBS) with at least six points.


4.3.3. MIC determination in M. tuberculosis growth inhibition. M. tuberculosis H37Rv strain, used as the reference strain, was grown at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in Middlebrook 7 H 9 broth (Difco), supplemented with $0.05 \%$ Tween 80 , or on solid Middlebrook 7H11 medium (Difco) supplemented with oleic acid-albumin-dextrose-catalase (OADC). MICs for the new compounds were determined by means of the micro-broth dilution method. Dilutions of M. tuberculosis wild-type culture (about $10^{5}-10^{6}$ $\mathrm{cfu} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) were streaked onto 7 H 11 solid medium containing a range of drug concentrations $(0.25 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL})$. Plates were incubated at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for about 21 days and the growth was visually evaluated. The lowest drug dilution at which visible growth failed to occur was taken as the MIC value. Results were expressed as the average of at least three independent determinations. The MIC was also determined in the presence of efflux pumps inhibitors reserpine, verapamil and carbonyl cyanide $m$-chlorophenylhydrazone (CCCP) used at $3.0,40.0$ and $7.5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ final concentration, respectively.
4.4. Computational chemistry. Molecular graphics, particularly depicted molecular surfaces [39] were performed with the UCSF Chimera package.[40] Chimera is developed by the Ressource for Biocomputing, Visualization, and Informatics at the University of California, San Francisco (supported by the NIGMS P41-GM103311). The protein structures used in this paper were structurally aligned with structure 1BVR (chain A) set as reference (defining a reference space) and using UCSF Chimera/Matchmaker [41] program. The protein structures in the reference space were prepared (structure checks, rotamers, hydrogenation) using Accelrys (Discovery Studio Modeling Environment, Release 4.0, San Diego: Accelrys Software Inc., 2013) Discovery Studio Visualizer 4.0 (DSV) and UCSF Chimera. The new compounds were sketched using ChemAxon Marvin 5.5, (http://www.chemaxon.com). All ligands (extracted from protein structures or new) were checked (hybridization, hydrogenation, some geometry optimizations, 3D sketching) and were merged in SDF libraries using DSV.

Molecular modeling studies [42] were carried with Molegro Virtual Docker 6 software (http://www.clcbio.com) using the chain A of structure 1P44 (1P44a) as target and a search space volume of $17 \AA$ radius centered in the binding pocket. Ligands were set flexible during the Docking. According to structural study, 23 residues were defined for flexible docking:

ARG225, TRP222, GLU219, LEU218, ILE215, ILE202, MET199, ALA198, THR196, PRO193, LYS165, MET161, TYR158, ALA157, MET155, ARG153, PHE149, SER123, MET103, GLN100, PRO99, MET98 and PHE97. Final minimization was parameterized using 10000 steps for lateral chains or binding pocket residues, other parameters (backbone) were let with default values. No water molecules were taken in account in the study. Docking process uses the PLANTS [43] function for scoring and Moldock optimizer (MVD, 6000 iteration steps, other parameters let as default) for searches. MolDock and Rerank [44] scores were calculated post-docking. Each compound was docked using 50 independent runs. For chiral compounds, both configurations $R$ and $S$ were taken in account in the process.
The 1050 docking poses ( 21 ligands including GEQ) issued from the calculations were visually checked using MVD's features and a filter was applied on these RAW results in order to give secondary data: two 'best' poses per compound. For visual inspection, the following rule was defined: al) the pose was selected if the conformation of substituted fluorine group of compound was very close with the fluorine/piperazinamide/indole alignment found in crystallographic conformation of GEQ. These poses were considered to fulfill structural conformity criterion. For scores, the following rules were defined: a2) the pose was selected if the lowest negative values of PLANTS and MolDock and Rerank scores were found for the same pose; a3) if not, the pose with best scores combination (priority PLANTS > MolDock > Rerank) was retained. The PLANTS scoring scheme was used in calculations, so it was selected for the higher priority. The poses corresponding to rules al-a2 were called 'strong' poses because they combine best scoring results and structural conformity. Then, the rules $a 2$ $a 3$ were repeated with the second ranked scores values of the set, to ensure that, at least, two poses (more conform as possible) will be available per compound. We noticed that a lot ( $75 \%$ ) of selected poses were strong poses independently of the stereochemistry or the substitution of fluorene scaffold.

Then in order to rank ligands, another set of rules was applied on the secondary data giving a final table (See Supporting Information): b1) the best 'strong' pose was retained; if not found b2) the pose corresponding to the best score combination was retained using the priority (Rerank > MolDock) > PLANTS. Rerank score is generally used in ligand ranking, so it was selected for the higher priority. Then, in order to approach in silico ligand efficiencies (LE) values, we used the following metric: MolDock, PLANTS and Rerank scores were divided by the number (HA) of heavy ( $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{O}$ ) atoms, giving LE1, LE2 and LE3 descriptors [32].
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## Highlights :

- Multi-step synthesis of GEQ analogues as potential inhibitors of InhA.
- One of the 25 compounds was effective against InhA and Mtb H37Rv strain.
- The same compound exhibited moderate antimycobacterial activity.
- Efflux pump inhibitors potentiate the activity of these inhibitors.
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## Synthesis of the intermediates

## 1.1. tert-butyl 3-oxopiperazine-1-carboxylate


$\mathrm{Boc}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 436 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq})$ was added in portions under stirring and cooling on an ice bath to a suspension of piperazin-2-one ( $2.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 200 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in anhydrous dichloromethane ( 10.0 mL ). The reaction mixture was stirred overnight at room temperature, during which a homogeneous solution formed. The solvent was evaporated and the solid residue was vacuum-dried to furnish a yellow solid ( $300.0 \mathrm{mg}, 100 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.51(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.37-3.46(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.66(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.12(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H})$; $6.39(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 27.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 28.3\left(3 \times \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 41.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$; $77.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 80.9(\mathrm{C}) ; 153.9(\mathrm{C}) ; 168.0(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{NH}_{3}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 201.1\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right] ; 218.1[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{NH} 4^{+}$].

## 1.2. tert-butyl 4-benzoyl-3-oxopiperazine-1-carboxylate (41)


tert-butyl 4-benzoyl-3-oxopiperazine-1-carboxylate (41) was synthesized according to a previously reported procedure. ${ }^{1}$

A solution of tert-butyl 3-oxopiperazine-1-carboxylate ( $0.50 \mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in anhydrous DMF ( 7.5 mL ) was treated with sodium hydride ( $60 \%$ oil dispersion, 0.60 mmol , $24 \mathrm{mg}, 1.2 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and benzoyl chloride ( $0.60 \mathrm{mmol}, 70 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.2 \mathrm{eq}$ ), and stirred overnight at room temperature. The reaction mixture was concentrated under vacuum pressure and ethyl acetate $(20.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. The organic phase was washed with brine, dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum pressure. The residue was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to
afford a colorless oil ( $65 \mathrm{mg}, 43 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.45$ (PE/EtOAc 70/30). IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 666,684$, $704,932,1128,1165,1244,1287,1323,1419,1452,1679,2552,2977 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.53(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.73-3.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.92-4.01(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.25(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.40-$ 7.48 (m, 2 H ); $7.55\left(\mathrm{tt}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right.$ ); $7.59-7.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 28.4\left(3 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 43.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 81.3(\mathrm{C}) ; 128.2(2 \mathrm{x}$ $\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.3(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 132.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 135.1(\mathrm{C}) ; 153.8(\mathrm{C}) ; 168.2(\mathrm{C}) ; 172.9(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ m/z: $304.14\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right], 249.09$ [M-55 (tBu)], 204.09 [M-100 (Boc)]. HRMS (DCI/CH4): for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{O}$ [M]: calcd: 265.1592; found: 265.1599.

## 1.3. (4-bromopiperidin-1-yl)(phenyl)methanone (38)



4-Bromopiperidine hydrobromide ( $1.63 \mathrm{mmol}, 300 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was dissolved in dry tetrahydrofuran $(5.0 \mathrm{~mL})$. After cooling the reaction mixture in an ice bath, triethylamine ( $3.56 \mathrm{mmol}, 485 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 2.2 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and benzoyl chloride ( $1.63 \mathrm{mmol}, 190 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) were slowly added. After overnight stirring at room temperature, the reaction mixture was concentrated under vacuum pressure, dissolved in dichloromethane and was successively washed with water and brine. The organic phase was dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum pressure. The resulting crude product was purified by flash chromatography (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 90/10 10 minutes, then gradient until $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 10 minutes) to a colorless oil ( $214 \mathrm{mg}, 98 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.77$ ( $\mathrm{DCM} / \mathrm{MeOH}$ 95/5). IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 569, 638, 691, 702, 714, 787935, 996, 1139, 1209, 1263, 1270, 1335, 1343, 1367, 1431, 1623, 2874, 2928. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.70-2.42$ (bs, 4 H ); 3.15-4.19 (m, 4 H ); $4.47(\mathrm{sep}, J=3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.38-7.47(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 35.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 35.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 40.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 45.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 48.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.9(2 \times \mathrm{CH})$; 128.6 ( $2 \times \mathrm{CH}$ ); 129.8 (C) 135.7 (C); 170.4 (C). MS ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ) m/z: 266.02 [M]. HRMS (DCI/ $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{BrNO}$ [M]: calcd: 266.0181 found: 266.0176.

### 1.4. Ethyl 3'-methoxy-[1,1'-biphenyl]-2-carboxylate



Ethyl 3'-methoxy-[1,1'-biphenyl]-2-carboxylate was synthesized according to a previously reported procedure. ${ }^{2}$

Ethyl 2-bromobenzoate ( $2.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 500 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) and tetrakistriphenylphosphinPEalladium ( $0.06 \mathrm{mmol}, 76 \mathrm{mg}, 0.03 \mathrm{eq}$ ) were dissolved in 1,2-dimethoxyethane ( 25.0 mL ). A 2 M solution of sodium carbonate ( $4.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.2 \mathrm{~mL}$ of a 2 M aqueous solution, 2.0 eq ) was added via a syringue. A solution of 3-methoxyphenylboronic acid ( $2.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 365 \mathrm{mg}, 1.1 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in 1,2-dimethoxyethane ( 10.0 mL )was subsequently added. The reaction mixture was heated at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and allowed to stir overnight. It was then cooled, diluted with water, extracted with ethyl acetate, and washed with an aqueous saturated solution of sodium hydrogenocarbonate and brine. The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue was purified by flash chromatography (petroleum ether:ethyl acetate 95:5 in 15 minutes) to afford the a colorless oil ( $390 \mathrm{mg}, 70 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.32 ( $\mathrm{PE} / \mathrm{EtOAc} 95 / 5$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.07(\mathrm{t}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ); 3.86 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ); 4.16 (q, $J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ); 6.91-6.99 (m, 3 H ); 7.29-7.38 (m, 1 H); 7.40-7.49 (m, 2 H ); 7.51-7.59 (m, 1 H) ; 7.84-7.89 (m, 1 H$).{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 13.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$; $55.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 61.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 112.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 114.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 121.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.6$ (CH); 130.5 (CH); 131.1 (CH); 131.5 (C); 142.2 (C); 142.9 (C); 159.4 (C); 168.9 (C). MS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 255.1$ [M]. 211.1 [M-45 (OEt)]. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ [M]: calcd: 256.1104; found: 256.1099.

### 1.5. 3-methoxy-9H-fluoren-9-one (21)



3-Methoxy-9H-fluoren-9-one (21) was synthesized according to a previously reported procedure.

A solution of ethyl 3'-methoxy-[1,1'-biphenyl]-2-carboxylate ( $1.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 390 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) in methanesulfonic acid ( $320 \mathrm{mmol}, 20.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 210 \mathrm{eq}$ ) was stirred and heated to $110^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 hour. The resulting black mixture was poured slowly into stirred ice water and then extracted with diethyl ether. The combined organic layers were washed with saturated aqueous solution of sodium hydrogenocarbonate, and water, and then dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum pressure. The residue was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $100 \%$ ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) to afford a colorless oil ( $260 \mathrm{mg}, 81 \%$ ). TLC R $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.38$ (PE/EtOAc 90/10). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ (ppm): 3.94b (s, 3H); 6.77 (dd, $J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ); $7.06(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.29-7.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; 7.44-7.55 (m, 2 H ); 7.61-7.70 (m, 2 H ). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 55.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$; $107.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 123.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 134.2(\mathrm{CH})$; 136.0 (C); 143.4 (C); 147.1 (C); 165.4 (C). MS ( $\left.\mathrm{DCI}^{(\mathrm{CH}} 44\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 211.1\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS (DCI/ $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 211.0756; found: 211.0759
1.6. General procedure for reduction of the ketone by $\mathbf{N a B H}_{4}$. The corresponding substituted 9 H -fluoren-9-one ( 1.0 eq ) was dissolved in methanol and cooled in an ice bath. Sodium borohydride ( 1.2 eq ) was added and after 15 minutes stirring at room temperature, the reaction mixture became colorless. A 6 M hydrochloric acid solution was added to the reaction mixture until $\mathrm{pH}=7$. Methanol was removed under vacuum pressure and the residue was extracted with ethyl acetate. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum to furnish the titled compound. No further purification was needed.

2-Hexyl-9H-fluoren-9-ol. Reagents: 2-Hexyl-9H-fluoren-9-one $\mathbf{1 7}$ ( $0.38 \mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and sodium borohydride ( $0.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 17 \mathrm{mg}$ ). A yellow oil was obtained ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 100 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.20$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 95/5). IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 527,623,735,745,767,828,1022,1180,1232,1303$, $1458,1466,2850,2920,3217,3314 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.88-1.00(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.30-$ $1.48(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.63-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.70(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.55(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.23(\mathrm{dd}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.32$ (td, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.40(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.49(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.57$ (d, $J=$ $7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.60-7.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.1$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 75.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.2$ (CH); 127.3 (CH); 129.0 (CH); 129.2 (CH); 137.6 (C); 140.2 (C); 143.1 (C); 145.7 (C); 145.9 (C). MS
$\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 267.17\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right] ; 249.16[\mathrm{M}-17(\mathrm{OH})]$. $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{O}[\mathrm{M}]$ : calcd: 267.1749; found: 267.1744.

2-Octyl-9H-fluoren-9-ol. Reagents: 2-Octyl-9H-fluoren-9-one $\mathbf{1 8}(0.34 \mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg})$ and sodium borohydride ( $0.41 \mathrm{mmol}, 16 \mathrm{mg}$ ). A white solid was obtained ( $99 \mathrm{mg}, 99 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.16$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $95 / 5$ ); $\mathrm{mp}: 95{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 527,623,735,745,767,828,1022,1180,1232,1303$, $1458,1466,2850,2920,3217,3314 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.94(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H})$; $1.25-1.47(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.70(\mathrm{q}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.93(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.71(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.55(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; 7.23 (dd, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.32(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.40(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1$ $\mathrm{H}) ; 7.49(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;-7.61-7.67(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm})$ : $14.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 29.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 75.2$ $(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 137.6$ (C); 140.2 (C); 143.1 (C); 145.6 (C); 145.9 (C). MS (DCI/CH $\left.)_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 295.20\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right] . \mathrm{HRMS}$ ( $\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ): for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 295.2062; found: 295.2057.

2-Propoxy-9H-fluoren-9-ol. Reagents: 2-Propoxy-9H-fluorenone 20 ( $0.56 \mathrm{mmol}, 134 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and sodium borohydride ( $0.67 \mathrm{mmol}, 26 \mathrm{mg}$ ). A white solid was obtained ( $107.5 \mathrm{mg}, 79 \%$ ). TLC R $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.35 (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); mp: $122{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; $\mathrm{IR}\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 611,743,765,815,986,1028,1101$, $1125,1148,1182,1263,1303,1457,1607,2876,2931,2962,3248 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ (ppm): $1.09(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.84(\mathrm{sex}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.30(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.96(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$; $5.45(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.90(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.16(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.25(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.36(\mathrm{td}, J=0.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.52-7.60(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (75 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 10.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 75.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 111.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 115.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.1$ $(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 132.5(\mathrm{C}) ; 140.1(\mathrm{C}) ; 145.4(\mathrm{C}) ;$ $147.6(\mathrm{C}) ; 159.5(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 241.12\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 241.1229 found: 241.1224 .

3-Methoxy-9H-fluoren-9-ol. Reagents: 3-Methoxy-9H-fluorenone 21 ( $0.41 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and sodium borohydride ( $0.46 \mathrm{mmol}, 17 \mathrm{mg}$ ). A white solid was obtained ( $66 \mathrm{mg}, 82 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.32$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); mp: $114{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 631,643,742,768,835,844,884,942$, 1010, 1019, 1096, 1111, 1167, 1210, 1236, 1277, 1303, 1441, 1454, 1488, 1608, 2835, 3345. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 2.10(\mathrm{bs}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.86(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.50(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.83(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1$ $\mathrm{H}) ; 7.14(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.40(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; $7.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.59-7.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 55.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 74.6$ $(\mathrm{CH}) ; 105.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 137.9$
(C); 139.8 (C); 141.6 (C); 146.7 (C); 160.7 (C). MS (DCI/CH $)_{4}$ m/z: 212.08 [M]. HRMS (DCI/CH $)_{4}$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]$ : calcd: 212.0837 found: 212.0836 .

3-(Benzyloxy)-9H-fluoren-9-ol. Reagents: 3-(Benzyloxy)-9H-fluoren-9-one $\mathbf{2 3}$ ( $0.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 130 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and sodium borohydride ( $0.68 \mathrm{mmol}, 26 \mathrm{mg}$ ). A yellow solid was obtained ( $128 \mathrm{mg}, 97 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.30 (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); $\mathrm{mp}: 171^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 730,768,791,1020,1236,1289$, $1383,1446,1450,1583,1624,2853,2919,3021,3060,3385 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}):$ 1.96 (bs, 1 H$) ; 5.16\left(\mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 5.54(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.95(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.28(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1$ H); $7.35(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.36-7.53(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.5(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.60-7.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2$ H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 70.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 74.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 106.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 114.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.9(\mathrm{CH})$; $125.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.5(2 \times \mathrm{CH}) ; 128.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.7(2 \mathrm{x} \mathrm{CH}) ; 129.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 136.9$ (C); 138.2 (C); 139.8 (C); 141.7 (C); 146.7 (C); 160.0 (C). MS (DCI/CH $)_{4}$ m/z: $289.12\left[\mathrm{M}^{+} \mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS (DCI/ $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 289.1229 found 289.1243.

3-Propoxy-9H-fluoren-9-ol. Reagents: 3-Propoxy-9H-fluorenone 24 ( $0.34 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and sodium borohydride ( $0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 15 \mathrm{mg}$ ). A white solid was obtained ( $77 \mathrm{mg}, 95 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.48$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); mp: $103{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 614,631,651,738,765,810,840,980,1011,1019$, 1097, 1170, 1182, 1206, 1303, 1449, 1490, 1582, 1609, 2875, 2964, 3312. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.10(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.88(\mathrm{q}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.05(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 3.98(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2$ H); $5.51(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.83(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.15(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.33(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.40(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.58-7.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 10.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 69.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 74.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 106.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.9(\mathrm{CH})$; 119.9 (CH); 125.1 (CH); 125.9 (CH); $127.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 137.7$ (C); 139.9 (C); 141.5 (C); 146.7 (C); $160.3(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 241.12\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 241.1229 found: 241.1217.

3-(Hexyloxy)-9H-fluoren-9-ol. Reagents: 3-Hexyloxy-9H-fluorenone 25 ( $0.28 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and sodium borohydride ( $0.34 \mathrm{mmol}, 13 \mathrm{mg}$ ). A brown solid was obtained ( $78 \mathrm{mg}, 97 \%$ ). TLC R $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.45$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); $\mathrm{mp}: 74{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 648,744,769,786,1018,1034,1172$, 1181, 1206, 1287, 139, 1450, 1622, 2868, 2929, 3484. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.97(\mathrm{t}, J$ $=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.35-1.47(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.48-1.62(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.85(\mathrm{q}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.05(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.02(\mathrm{t}$, $J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.51(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.83(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.15(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.33$ (td, $J$ $=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.40(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.61(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.6$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 25.8$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 68.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 74.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 106.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 113.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.1$
(CH); 125.9 (CH); 127.9 (CH); 128.9 (CH); 137.7 (C); 139.9 (C); 141.5 (C); 146.7 (C); 160.3 (C). MS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 283.17\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 283.1698 found: 283.1690 .

3-Hexyl-9H-fluoren-9-ol. Reagents: 3-Hexyl-9H-fluoren-9-one 27 ( $0.29 \mathrm{mmol}, 77 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and sodium borohydride ( $0.35 \mathrm{mmol}, 13 \mathrm{mg}$ ). A white solid was obtained ( $20 \mathrm{mg}, 26 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.10$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 95/5); mp: $75^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 630,657,805,846,1025,1098,1164,1199,1260$, $1299,1426,1449,1614,2854,2926,2955,3218,3313$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.89-$ 0.98 (m, 3 H ); 1.24-1.48 (m, 6 H ); 1.70 (quin, $J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ); 2.72 (t, $J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ); 5.58 (s, 1 H ); 7.17 (dd, $J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.42(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; $7.50(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63-7.71(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}):$ $14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 75.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.9(\mathrm{CH})$; $120.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 124.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 125.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 138.3(\mathrm{C}) ; 140.2(\mathrm{C})$; 143.1 (C); 144.2 (C); 146.1 (C). MS (DCI/CH $)_{4}$ m/z: 267.17 [M+H ${ }^{+}$, 249.16 [M-OH], 181.07 [M-85]. HRMS (DCI/ $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{O}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$: calcd: 267.1749 found: 267.1746.
1.7. General procedure for bromation with $\mathbf{P B r}_{3}$. The corresponding substituted fluoren-$9-\mathrm{ol}(1.0 \mathrm{eq})$ was dissolved in anhydrous dichloromethane and cooled in an ice bath. Phosphorus tribromide ( 1.2 eq ) was slowly added. The mixture was stayed at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight and then saturated sodium bicarbonate aqueous solution was added under stirring until no bubble generated. Then the water extracted with dichloromethane. The combine organic layer was washed with brine, dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated in vacuum pressure to afford the titled compound. No further purification was needed.

9-Bromo-2-hexyl-9H-fluorene. Reagents: 2-Hexyl-9H-fluoren-9-ol ( $0.37 \mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and phosphorus tribromide ( $0.45 \mathrm{mmol}, 44 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). A yellow oil was obtained ( $84 \mathrm{mg}, 68 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.79$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 97/3). IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 736, 759, 827, 994, 1057, 1117, 1136, 1210, 1456, 1607, 1716, 2854, 3924. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): ~ 0.88-0.98(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.28-1.46(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$; 1.63-1.77 (m, 2 H ); $2.72(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.01(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.24(\mathrm{dd}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.34$ (td, $J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.41(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.51(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.61(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; 7.64-7.70 (m, 2 H$).{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.6$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 46.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.7(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.2$ (CH); 129.5 (CH); 137.4 (C); $140.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 143.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 144.1(\mathrm{C}) ; 144.3(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 328.08$ [M]; 249.16 [M-80 (HBr)]. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{Br}$ [M]: calcd: 328.0838; found: 328.0827.

9-Bromo-2-octyl-9H-fluorene. Reagents: 2-Octyl-9H-fluoren-9-ol ( $0.34 \mathrm{mmol}, 100 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and phosphorus tribromide ( $0.41 \mathrm{mmol}, 40 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). A yellow oil was obtained ( $63 \mathrm{mg}, 52 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.90 (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 90/10). IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 576, 606, 658, 735, 759, 827, 994, 1057, 1136, 1210, 1456, 2852, 2923. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.95(\mathrm{t}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.28-1.45(\mathrm{~m}, 10$ $\mathrm{H}) ; 1.71(\mathrm{q}, ~ J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.73(\mathrm{t}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.01(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.26(\mathrm{dd}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1$ H); $7.35(\mathrm{td}, 1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.42(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.52(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.61(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}) ;-7.65-7.71(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.3(\mathrm{CH})$; $29.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.5\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 46.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.0(\mathrm{CH})$; 126.3 (CH); 126.4 (CH); 127.6 (CH); 129.2 (CH); 129.5 (CH); 137.4 (C); 140.0 (C); 142.4 (C); 144.1 (C); 144.3 (C). MS $\left(\mathrm{DCI}^{2} \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 356.11$ [M], 277.20 [M-Br], 179.08 [M-178]. HRMS (DCI/CH4): for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{Br}$ [M]: calcd: 356.1140 found: 356.1140 .

9-Bromo-2-propoxy-9H-fluorene. Reagents: 2-Propoxy-9H-fluoren-9-ol ( $0.44 \mathrm{mmol}, 107 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and phosphorus tribromide $(0.67 \mathrm{mmol}, 63 \mu \mathrm{~L})$. Flash chromatography (gradient from $100 \%$ petroleum ether to $90 / 10$ petroleum ether/ethyl acetate in 15 minutes) was performed and allowed to isolate partially a yellow oil ( $18 \mathrm{mg}, 13 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}: 0.36$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $90 / 10$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 300 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.11(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.88(\mathrm{sex}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.97(\mathrm{~s}, 1$ H); $6.97(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.29(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; $7.39(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.59(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.60(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 10.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 46.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 69.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 112.3(\mathrm{CH})$; $116.0(\mathrm{CH}) ; 119.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 121.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.8(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 132.4(\mathrm{C}) ; 140.0(\mathrm{C})$; 143.7 (C); 145.9 (C); 159.7 (C).

9-Bromo-3-methoxy-9H-fluorene. Reagents: 3-Methoxy-9H-fluoren-9-ol ( $0.28 \mathrm{mmol}, 60 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and phosphorus tribromide ( $0.34 \mathrm{mmol}, 33 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). A brown solid was obtained ( $63 \mathrm{mg}, 81 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.59 (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $80 / 20$ ); mp: $122{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 644,731,761,827,841,1030,1124$, $1175,1211,1240,1278,1304,1312,1439,1454,1488,1609,2833,2937,3367 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}(300 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 3.89(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 5.99(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.88(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.18(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1$ H); $7.34(\mathrm{td}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.40(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; 7.61 - 7.66 (m, 2 H ). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 46.3(\mathrm{C}) ; 55.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 105.6(\mathrm{CH}) ; 114.0$ (CH); $120.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.3(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 136.2(\mathrm{C}) ; 139.7(\mathrm{C}) ; 141.4(\mathrm{C}) ;$ $145.3(\mathrm{C}) ; 161.0(\mathrm{C}) . \mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 275.00[\mathrm{M}], 195.08$ [M-HBr]. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{OBr}$ [M]: calcd: 275.0072; found: 275.0071.

3-(Benzyloxy)-9-bromo-9H-fluorene. Reagents: 3-(Benzyloxy)-9H-fluoren-9-ol ( $0.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 71 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and phosphorus tribromide ( $0.37 \mathrm{mmol}, 35 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). A red powder was obtained ( $81 \mathrm{mg}, 92 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.32 (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 90/10). The product was used in the next step without further purification. $\mathrm{MS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 351.04\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right] . \mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{BrO}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right]$calcd 351.0385 found 351.0381 .

9-Bromo-3-propoxy-9H-fluorene. Reagents: 3-Propoxy-9H-fluoren-9-ol ( $0.33 \mathrm{mmol}, 80 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and phosphorus tribromide ( $0.40 \mathrm{mmol}, 38 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). A brown solid was obtained ( $67 \mathrm{mg}, 67 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.95 (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $90 / 10$ ); mp: $139{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; IR $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right): 625,648,733,765,980,1185,1203$, $1235,1273,1450,1489,1578,1610,2874,2933,2963 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 1.13(\mathrm{t}$, $J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.90(\mathrm{sex}, J=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.05(\mathrm{t}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.03(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.92(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.33-7.47(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.57(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.64-7.70$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 10.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 46.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 69.9\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 106.3$ $(\mathrm{CH}) ; 114.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 136.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 139.8$ (C); 141.4 (C); 145.3 (C); 160.5 (C). MS (DCI/CH $)_{4}$ m/z: 446.22 [2M-2 Br], 302.03 [M], 223.11 [M$\mathrm{Br}], 181.06$ [M-122]. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{BrO}$ [M]: calcd: 302.0306, found: 302.0301.

9-Bromo-3-(hexyloxy)-9H-fluorene. Reagents: 3-Hexyloxy-9H-fluoren-9-ol ( $0.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 70$ $\mathrm{mg})$ and phosphorus tribromide ( $0.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 29 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ). A brown oil was obtained ( $67 \mathrm{mg}, 67 \%$ ). TLC R $\mathrm{f}: ~ 0.95$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $90 / 10$ ). IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 649, 732, 762, 843, 940, 1024, 1137, 1184, 1207, 1238, 1285, 1303, 1450, 1467, 1489, 1580, 1609, 2856, 2927. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (300 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): ~ 0.93-1.03(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.36-1.47(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.48-1.61(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.87$ (q, $J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 4.08(\mathrm{t}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.03(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.91(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;$ $7.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.38(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.42(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;$ $7.57(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.64-7.69(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 25.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 46.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 68.4\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 106.2(\mathrm{CH})$; $114.5(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 135.9(\mathrm{C}) ; 139.8$ (C); 141.4 (C); 145.3 (C); 160.5 (C). MS ( $\left.\mathrm{DCI}^{(C H 4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 344.08$ [M], 265.16 [M-Br], 181.06 [M-164]. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{BrO}$ [M]: calcd: 344.0776, found: 344.0762.

9-Bromo-3-hexyl-9H-fluorene. Reagents: 3-Hexyloxy-9H-fluoren-9-ol ( $0.07 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \mathrm{mg}$ ) and phosphorus tribromide $(0.11 \mathrm{mmol}, 11 \mu \mathrm{~L})$. A yellow oil was obtained ( $24 \mathrm{mg}, 95 \%$ ). TLC $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ : 0.92 (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 95/5). IR ( $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 631, 656, 736, 761, 826, 890, 1137, 1164, 1199, 1303, $1425,1452,1614,2853,2924,2953 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 0.87-0.99(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.28-$
$1.48(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ; 1.64-1.77(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 2.73(\mathrm{t}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) ; 6.02(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.19(\mathrm{dd}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.36(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.43(\mathrm{td}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.51-7.54(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;$ $7.58(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7.65-7.72(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm}): 14.1\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right) ; 22.6$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 29.0\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.6\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 31.8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 36.2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) ; 46.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 120.2(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.1$ $(\mathrm{CH}) ; 126.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 127.9(\mathrm{CH}) ; 128.4(\mathrm{CH}) ; 129.1(\mathrm{CH}) ; 139.9(\mathrm{C}) ; 140.0(\mathrm{C}) ; 141.5(\mathrm{C}) ; 144.5(\mathrm{C})$; 144.6 (C). MS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right) \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}: 329.09$ [M], 249.16 [M-80]. HRMS $\left(\mathrm{DCI} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}\right)$ : for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{Br}[\mathrm{M}]$ : calcd: 329.0905 found: 329.0891 .

## NMR spectra
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### 1.12. Compound 5
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### 1.15. Compound 8
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### 1.20. Compound 13
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### 1.21. Compound 14
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### 1.22. Compound 15
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### 1.23. Compound 28
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### 1.24. Compound 29
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### 1.25. Compound 30
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### 1.26. Compound 31
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### 1.27. Compound 32
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### 1.28. Compound 33
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### 1.29. Compound 34


${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR



### 1.30. Compound 35





### 1.31. Compound 39
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### 1.32. Compound 40
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### 1.33. Compound 42
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## Enantiomeric separation

### 1.34. Enantiomeric separation of compound 31

1.34.1. Analytical chromatography of the racemic mixture

| Colum | Chiralpak AD-H $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}(4.6 \times 250) \mathrm{mm}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Flow (CO $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{2}}$ +co-solvant) (mL/min) | $4 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ |
| Co-solvant | MeOH |
| \% Co-solvant | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ |
| Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | 35 |
| $\mathbf{P}_{\text {out }}($ bar $)$ | 100 |
| $\lambda(\mathbf{n m})$ | $220 \mathrm{~nm}, 254 \mathrm{~nm}$ |
| $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{m i n})$ | 7.78 and 9.34 |
| Duration (min) | 12 |



Chromatogram for the analytical chiral chromatography of the crude compound $\mathbf{3 1}$ at $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$.

### 1.34.2. Preparative chromatography

| Column | Chiralpak AD-H 5 $\mu \mathrm{m}(10 \times 250) \mathrm{mm}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Flow (CO $\mathbf{C O}_{2}+\mathbf{c o - s o l v a n t ) ~ ( m L / m i n ) ~}$ | $15 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ |


| Co-solvent | MeOH |
| :--- | :--- |
| \% Co-solvent | $20 \%$ |
| Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | 40 |
| $\mathbf{P}_{\text {out }}($ bar $)$ | 100 |
| $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathbf{n m})$ | 214 nm |
| Duration $(\mathbf{m i n})$ | 25 min |
| Injection | $2.5 \mathrm{~mL} / 4$ stacking injections |

Sample: 34 mg of racemic mixture of compound $\mathbf{3 1}$ in 10 mL MeOH .


Chromatogram for the preparative chiral chromatography of compound $\mathbf{3 1}$
1.34.3. Analytical chromatography of enantiopurs compounds 31a and 31b

The elution fractions were respectively named 31a and 31b.


Chromatogram for the analytical chiral chromatography of compound 31a at $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ after purification.


Chromatogram for the analytical chiral chromatography of compound 31b at $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ after purification.

| Compound | Enantiomeric purity <br> according to analytic SFC |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 1 a}$ | $99.0 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 1 b}$ | $99.2 \%$ |

### 1.35. Enantiomeric separation of compound 33

1.35.1. Analytical chromatography of the racemic mixture

| Colum | Chiralpak AD-H $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}(4.6 \times 250) \mathrm{mm}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Flow (CO $\mathbf{2}$ +co-solvant) (mL/min) | $4 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ |
| Co-solvant | MeOH |
| \% Co-solvant | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ |
| Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | 35 |
| $\mathbf{P}_{\text {out }}($ bar $)$ | 100 |
| $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ (nm) | $220 \mathrm{~nm}, 254 \mathrm{~nm}$ |
| $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{m i n})$ | 6.73 and 10.62 |
| Duration (min) | 15 |



Chromatogram for the analytical chiral chromatography of the crude compound $\mathbf{3 3}$ at $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$.

### 1.35.2. Preparative chromatography

| Column | Chiralpak AD-H 5 $\mu \mathrm{m}(10 \times 250) \mathrm{mm}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Flow (CO $\mathbf{C}^{+}$co-solvant) (mL/min) | $15 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ |
| Co-solvent | MeOH |
| \% Co-solvent | $25 \%$ |
| Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}$ ) | 40 |
| $\mathbf{P}_{\text {out }}($ bar $)$ | 100 |
| $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\mathbf{n m})$ | 220 nm |
| Duration (min) | 30 min |
| Injection | $1 \mathrm{~mL} / 15$ stacking injections |

Sample: 200 mg of racemic mixture of compound $\mathbf{3 3}$ in 20 mL MeOH .


Chromatogram for the preparative chiral chromatography of compound 33

### 1.35.3. Analytical chromatography of enantiopurs compounds 33a and 33b

The elution fractions were respectively named 33a and 33b.


Chromatogram for the analytical chiral chromatography of compound 33a at $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ after purification.


Chromatogram for the analytical chiral chromatography of compound 33b at $\lambda=220 \mathrm{~nm}$ after purification.

| Compound | Enantiomeric purity <br> according to analytic SFC |
| :---: | :---: |
| 33a | $99.8 \%$ |
| 33b | $98.9 \%$ |

## Computational study

Table S1 : Docking results
The compound identifiers are given in columns Id (compound) and Ligand. The column Ligand emphasizes on the corresponding stereochemistry of each compound. The value of InhA inhibition (\%) at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ is given in column PI50, racemic mixtures are marked by $\left({ }^{*}\right)$ after PI50 values.
The HA column stands for heavy atoms ( $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{N}$ ) count for each ligand. The normalized docking scores are given in columns LE1, LE3, LE2 for each compound (or enantiomer), these descriptors are calculated using docking scores values (MolDock and Rerank ${ }^{3}$, PLANTS ${ }^{4}$ scoring schemes, respectively) divided by HA values. MolDock, Rerank and PLANTS scores were calculated using Molegro Virtual Docker 6.0 software ${ }^{5}$.
LogP values are calculated using Chemaxon Marvin $\log P$ calculator ${ }^{6}$ working in default weighted mode (average of $\mathrm{VG}^{7}$, $\mathrm{KLOGP}^{8}$ and PHYSPROP ${ }^{9}$ methods), molecules were sketched using Chemaxon Marvin. ${ }^{6}$

The Group column follows the compound activity class (group1, group2, group3) as discussed in article.

| $1 d$ | Compound | P150 | HA | Log P | Ligand | LE1 | LE3 | LE2 | Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GEQ |  | 87 | 30 | 4.13 | GEQ | -7.52 | -5.24 | -4.25 | 1 |
| 1 |  | 94 | 27 | 4.30 | 1 | -7.35 | -5.24 | -4.51 | 1 |
| 4 |  | 75 | 25 | 4.04 | 4 | -7.79 | -5.52 | -5.08 | 1 |



ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT



Figure S1: Plot of LE2 vs. LE1 descriptors.
Data from Table S1 values, when two enantiomers are found (i.e. 10rs) for a given compound (i.e. 10) the plotted score values of each enantiomer (i.e. $\mathbf{1 0 r}$ and $\mathbf{1 0 s}$ ) are connected by a continuous line.

The compounds related to group1 (PI50> 75\%) are plotted using filled circles, the compounds of group2 (40-70\%) are plotted using squares, and the compounds of group3 (PI50 < 30\%) are plotted using diamonds symbols. Compounds 14 and 5 are plotted using hexagons. Compounds 5 and 14 seems to be difficult to classify, with good docking scores and bad activity values (group1-group2, group2-group 3 respectively) interestingly these compound share a structural amide function associated to an alkyl chain.
Data was plotted using SciDavis ${ }^{10}$ software.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Reserpine, verapamil and CCCP were respectively added at $3.0,40.0$ and $7.5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ final concentration. ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ nd for not determined

[^1]:    4.2.17. 1-Benzoyl-4-(9H-fluoren-9-yl)piperazin-2-one (42). Reagent $\mathbf{4 1}$ was synthesized according to a procedure reported in supporting information. A solution of tert-butyl 4-benzoyl-3-oxopiperazine-1-carboxylate $\mathbf{4 1}(0.24 \mathrm{mmol}, 72 \mathrm{mg}, 1.0 \mathrm{eq})$ in anhydrous dichloromethane ( 5.0 mL ) was treated with trifluoroacetic acid ( $3.55 \mathrm{mmol}, 264 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 15.0 \mathrm{eq}$ ) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The solution was allowed to warm to room temperature and stirred overnight at room temperature. The solvent was removed under vacuum pressure and the crude mixture was used as such (without further purification) in the following step. The crude $N$-Boc deprotected compound was dissolved in anhydrous dichloromethane ( 5.0 mL ) and triethylamine ( $0.47 \mathrm{mmol}, 64 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, 2.0 eq ) was added. After 30 minutes stirring at room temperature, a solution of 9-bromo-fluorene ( $0.47 \mathrm{mmol}, 116 \mathrm{mg}, 2.0$ eq) in anhydrous dichloromethane ( 2.0 mL ) was added to the cooled reaction mixture. After overnight stirring, brine ( 20.0 mL ) was added and the compound was extracted with dichloromethane. The organic phase was dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered and concentrated under vacuum pressure. The residue was purified by flash chromatography (gradient, 100\%

[^2]:    | $5.0 E+08$ |
    | :---: |
    | $4.5 E+08$ |

