SECONDARY METABOLITES OF THE ENDOPHYTIC FUNGI Penicillium polonicum AND THEIR MONOAMINE OXIDASE INHIBITORY ACTIVITY

Muammer Abdelwahed Elsunni¹ and Zhong-Duo Yang^{1,2*}

Plant endophytic fungi are well known as common sources of bioactive secondary metabolites [1, 2]. *Penicillium polonicum* is a species of the genus *Penicillium*, which produces a variety of bioactive natural products such as antibiotics, antifungal, anticancer, and a potential chemotherapeutic agent [3–5]. Monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs) are chemicals that inhibit the activity of the monoamine oxidase enzyme family. They have a long history of use as medications prescribed for the treatment of depression [6]. They are also used in the treatment of Parkinson's disease and several other disorders.

Endophytic fungi (SMH-3) was isolated from stems of the Chinese medicinal plant *Desmodium elegans* identified as *Penicillium polonicum* based on both morphology on PDA and analysis of the DNA sequences of the ITS1-5.8S-ITS2 ribosomal RNA gene region. A GenBank search for DNA sequence similarity revealed that ITS1-5.8S-ITS2 of SMH-3 was 99% homologous to that of *Penicillium polonicum* reference strain (GenBank accession No. JF731260).

In investigations of new MAO inhibitors, we found that the extract of strain SMH-3 showed relatively high monoamine oxidase inhibitory activity. The isolation led to six compounds that were identified as flufuran (1) [7], deacetylfructigenine A (2) [8], fructigenine B (3) [8], N-(4-hydroxy-2-methoxyphenyl)acetamide (4) [9], ergosterol (5) [10], and ergosterol peroxide (6) [11], and their structures were identified based on MS and NMR spectral data by comparing their ¹H NMR and ¹³C NMR data with those reported in the literature.

Compound 1 showed relatively high anti-monoamine oxidase activity with IC₅₀ of 16.2 \pm 0.9 μ M; the IC₅₀ of iproniazid A as standard was 0.95 \pm 0.1 μ M; compounds 2–6 showed weak inhibitory activity against MAO (Table 1).

Extraction and Isolation of the Metabolites. The strain SMH-3 was inoculated into 10 Erlenmeyer flasks (500 mL) for 7 days, each containing 250 mL potato-dextrose broth (PDB). Then the cultures were transferred into 50 L fermenters, which were cultured in 50 LPDB media at 28°C for 20 days. The fermented broth (50 L) was extracted with EtOAc (50 L × 2) to afford the crude extract (3.1 g). The crude extract was subjected to macroporous resin column chromatography and eluted with a gradient of aqueous EtOH (20%, 40%, 60%, 80%, 100%) to give six fractions (A–F). Fractions A and C were subjected to HPLC separation (Waters-510 pump, Waters 2487 Dual λ absorbance detector, YMC-Pack ODS-A column, 250 × 10 mm, 5 μ m). Fraction A was eluted with MeOH–water (25:75, flow rate 2 mL/min, 254 nm) to yield compounds 1 (13 mg, t_R = 9 min) and 4 (6 mg, t_R = 21 min). Fraction C was eluted with MeOH–H₂O (74:26, flow rate 2 mL/min, 254 nm) to yield compounds 2 (8.1 mg, t_R = 17 min) and 3 (9 mg, t_R = 15 min). Fraction F was subjected to silica gel column chromatography (GF254, 200–300 mesh) eluting with petroleum ether–acetone (5:1) to give compounds 5 (8 mg) and 6 (12 mg).

¹⁾ School of Life Science and Engineering, Lanzhou University of Technology, 730050, Lanzhou, P. R. China, fax: +86931 2973924, e-mail: yangzhongduo@126.com; 2) The Provincial Education Key Laboratory of Screening, Evaluation and Advanced Processing of Traditional Chinese Medicine and Tibetan Medicine, School of Life Science and Engineering, Lanzhou University of Technology, 730050, Lanzhou, P. R. China. Published in *Khimiya Prirodnykh Soedinenii*, No. 5, September–October, 2018, pp. 862–863. Original article submitted January 2, 2017.

TABLE 1. The Inhibitory Activity of Compounds 1–6 against MAO (IC₅₀ \pm S.D, μ M)

Compound	Inhibition rate at 100 μg/mL, %	IC ₅₀ value, μM	Compound	Inhibition rate at 100 μg/mL, %	IC ₅₀ value, μM
Crude extract	51.6 ± 2.4	121 ± 3.5	4	13.8 ± 2.1	NULL
1	80.4 ± 1	16.9 ± 0.9	5	5.7 ± 3.7	NULL
2	8.5 ± 1.7	NULL	6	11.6 ± 4.3	NULL
3	8.9 ± 3.2	NULL	Iproziazid*		0.95 ± 0.1

^{*}Iproziazid is a positive control.

Bioassay Procedures for MAO Inhibition. The procedure for testing MAO inhibiting activity was the same as that reported in our pervious paper [12].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 21762027), the Elitist Teachers Program of Lanzhou University of Technology (No. J201303), the project of the Bureau of Science and Technology, Lanzhou (No. 2014-1-151), and the project of the Science and Technology Department of Gansu Province, China (No. 1604FKCA084).

REFERENCES

- 1. B. Schulz, C. Boyle, S. Draeger, A. K. Rommert, and K. Krohn, Mycol. Res., 106, 996 (2002).
- 2. G. A. Strobel, *Micr. Infect.*, **5**, 535 (2003).
- 3. P. Singh, K. Rathinasamy, R. Mohan, and D. Panda, *IUBMB Life*, **60**, 368 (2008).
- 4. R. Nicoletti, E. Manzo, and M. L. Ciavatta, Int. J. Mol. Sci., 10, 1430 (2009).
- 5. R. Nicoletti, E. Buommino, A. De Filippis, M. P. Lopez-Gresa, E. Manzo, A. Carella, M. Petrazzuolo, and M. A. Tufano, *World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol.*, **24**, 189 (2008).
- 6. M. A. Cristancho, J. P. O'reardon, and M. E. Thase, *Psychiatric Times*, 28, 42 (2011).
- 7. A. Evidente, G. Cristinzio, B. Punzo, A. Andolfi, A. Testa, and D. Melck, Chem. Biodiv., 6, 328 (2009).
- 8. Z. Xin, Y. Fang, and T. Zhu, *Chin. J. Mar. Drugs*, **25**, 1 (2006).
- 9. Z. Yi, W. Tao, P. Yuehu, H. Huiming, and Feng Baomin, J. Chin. Pharm. Sci., 10, 190 (2001).
- 10. J. Gao, Z. Dong, and J. Liu, Acta Bot. Yunnanica, 22, 85 (1999).
- 11. Y. M. Ying, Z.-J. Zhan, Z.-S. Ding, and W.-G. Shan, Chem. Nat. Compd., 47, 541 (2011).
- 12. Z. D. Yang, J.-B. Liang, W.-W. Xue, J. Sheng, Y. Shi, X.-J. Yao, J. Ren, and L. Liu, *Chem. Nat. Compd.*, **50**, 1118 (2014).